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ABSTRACT

This dissertation presents research conducted across one hundred sections of First-Year Composition (FYC) that were part of the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa Writing Mentors Program. In contrast to the usual teacher-student binary configuration of FYC, these sections were configured according to a trinary model consisting of three distinct classroom actors: an instructor, first-year students, and a “writing mentor-researcher.” Writing mentor researchers, who were generally MA students in English, attended class as participant-observers and held an average of four writing conferences with each student outside of class, documenting these interactions in standardized conference logs and reflecting upon challenges, successes, and evolving roles in weekly memos. This IRB-approved study draws upon (a) auto-ethnographic fieldnotes taken across four years of program workshops and bi-weekly mentor roundtables; (b) 6,602 conference logs; (c) 653 weekly memos; (d) 89 anonymous end-of-semester program evaluations by mentors; (e) 1,452 anonymous end-of-semester evaluations by students; (f) 133 end-of-semester evaluations by instructors; (g) five participant check roundtable discussions with mentors who read chapter drafts; (h) a large-scale writing assessment comparing scores from binary and trinary FYC sections; (i) demographic surveys of mentors and instructors; and (h) institutional records. Combining qualitative codings of participant discourse with quantitative renderings of programmatic data, this mixed-methods study analyzes the enormous range of roles writing mentors performed in relation to students, instructors, WPAs, the institution, and Hawai‘i. Drawing upon theories of performance and spatial composition, I argue that while trinary configurations present challenges to WPAs and classroom participants, they also help first-year students
to write more effectively, introduce new performative possibilities to FYC; reveal the classroom *mise-en-scène* to be a paradoxical rather than transparent space; extend the teaching and learning that occurs in FYC across campus; support students’ transitions to college by orienting them to academic and cultural facets of performing in the university; offer rich avenues for preparing future composition teachers; provide the profession with researchers who are privy to both student and instructor performances available to few other researchers; and present a compelling counter-model to the short-term “efficiency” approaches that increasingly characterize national scenes of FYC specifically and higher education more broadly.
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PREFACE

Documenting (my Roles in) the Evolution of a Dissertation Project

In Fall of 2006, as a first-semester Ph.D. student in the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa Department of English, I had the good fortune of being assigned to Professor Jim Henry’s section of First-Year Composition (FYC) as a Ph.D. apprentice. The apprenticeship was designed to offer incoming Ph.D. students an opportunity to acclimate to the classroom cultures at UHM, to observe an experienced faculty member teaching the course, and to gain practice and feedback on a teaching a unit. Furthermore, Ph.D. apprentices were tasked with tutoring those students on the roster who had performed poorly on the university’s writing placement exam and were mainstreamed into FYC, while being required to enroll in a 1-hour lab section with additional writing tutoring. When his lab section under-enrolled, Professor Henry proposed that we experiment with my serving as a writing tutor and mentor to all enrolled students. (At the time, we were using the term “tutor” and “mentor” interchangeably). In performing this new institutional role, I worked to create rapport and conferencing opportunities with students by conversing with them in the hallway before and after class, passing around conference sign-up sheets, noting ways in which individual mentoring could supplement classroom instruction, and taking an interest in students’ paper topics and overall well-being in their transitions to college.

One experience in particular illustrated to me the power of classroom configurations involving an instructor, students, and writing mentor—a teaching and learning phenomenon I would later term “trinary collaborations.” The experience involved a Japanese-American, male, first-year student from a Hawai‘i public school
whom I will refer to as “Kenton.” During the first month of the semester, Kenton generally arrived late to class with work that was partially completed. Reflecting upon his rocky transition to college, Kenton later wrote:

On the first day, I felt a bit nervous going to [FYC] class. It felt kind of the same as my first day of high school, but the campus was so much bigger. . . . On the next day that we had class, I was a bit late, so I tried to take a shortcut to get to the building. Unfortunately, I made a wrong turn and got completely lost, so when I finally got to the building I forgot the classroom number. Since I didn’t want to disrupt anyone’s classes, I wandered around, trying to remember which class was mine.

Kenton’s struggles to orient himself to the campus, accompanied by his desire to act honorably and not to disrupt others, also characterized his early negotiations with FYC writing assignments. In a writing conference about a month into the semester, Kenton arrived without the necessary draftwork on an assignment that required students to interview a family member. Kenton explained that he had planned to interview his father but the two had been playing phone tag due to his father’s work schedule. Furthermore, although Kenton had just purchased his first laptop, he did not previously have regular access to the course website, and the quick succession of class deadlines had caught him by surprise. When I asked Kenton what he was planning to do about the situation, he said that he was prepared to “take a zero” for this major assignment. He had never heard of an extension and was hesitant to approach the instructor with such a request. Worried that he was checking out of the course, I engaged Kenton in a role play, encouraging him to imagine that I was Professor Henry and to rehearse his extension request to me. Kenton
later explained, “Doing this trial run helped to boost my confidence, even though I was still scared as hell.” At his request, I accompanied Kenton on his first-ever visit to a professor’s office. Although I had been role playing as Professor Henry, it was not until I stepped through the threshold of his office door and met his inquisitive glance that I realized the degree to which my presence beside Kenton was placing Professor Henry in a potentially difficult position. In the silence before Kenton began to speak, I questioned the accuracy of my assumptions about both teacher and student that had led to this intervention and hoped my actions would not damage my relationship with the instructor or backfire on the student. As Kenton performed his carefully-rehearsed and detailed plan for completing the assignment, I nodded in support whenever he glanced in my direction, while also exchanging a series of confirmatory glances with Professor Henry on those occasions when Kenton looked down to consult his notes. In the end, Professor Henry granted the extension, and Kenton went on to submit a paper that insightfully explored the circumstances that led his father to drop out of college after the first year, pondering his own present situation as a first-year college student in light of his father’s professed regrets.

Over the course of the semester, Kenton met with me individually at least a dozen times: these writing conference not only addressed how to ask for an extension, but also how to access his university email account, attach papers for electronic submission, find resources in the library, and select courses that would address both graduation requirements and the student’s interests. Kenton ultimately earned a B in FYC and graduated six years later. At the semester’s end, here is how Kenton reflected upon the extension request:
Holly became a mentor for me. Through this event, I learned how to do stuff to get an extension. I learned that you need to have a game plan, or at least a partial game plan, rather than just completely winging it. It’s important to know how to approach your professors so this is a skill that I will need to know for the rest of my college career.\textsuperscript{1}

In a separate email interview, Professor Henry explained that this extension experience involving teacher, student, and mentor helped Kenton to “get over a vital hurdle that could have well resulted in a downward spiral.” Within a FYC course structured according to the traditional teacher-student binary positions, this event simply could not have transpired. This intervention was enabled by many facets of the trinary, including my having been imbued enough in the day-to-day context of the course and having communicated frequently and extensively enough with the instructor to feel confident (at least initially) that my actions were consistent with his pedagogical vision.

However, my relationship with Kenton was hardly one sided, for that same semester I myself was a first-year resident on O’ahu, a place the student had lived all his life. Over the semester, Kenton taught me about his Japanese heritage; the stereotypes attached to various local public and private high schools; and the value of Hawai‘i Creole English, or “Pidgin,” to his home community. One day, Kenton saw me reading Lee Tonouchi’s “Da State of Pidgin Address,” and I confessed that I was nervous about the prospect of being called upon to read this piece aloud in class, as my Pidgin was “horrible.” In a reverse role play, he coached me on my pronunciations and inflections, while also pointing out the differences between Tonouchi’s version of HCE and the versions spoken in other parts of the Hawaiian islands. Being positioned as a classroom
member who was neither student nor instructor—and who was freed from the pressures of formally evaluating student writing—afforded me insights into student and teacher perspectives and performances that I had never experienced before and will likely never directly experience again. Performing this writing mentor role allowed me to experience a kind of “positional reflexivity” (Bourdieu and Wacquant)—a unique perspective of institutional others available to third classroom actors within trinary arrangements that Professor Henry and I would later document and analyze (Henry and Bruland).

During the Fall 2006 pre-pilot section in which I served as a writing mentor, I was concurrently enrolled in Professor Henry’s graduate seminar, “Workplace Writing as Cultural Inscription,” which proceeded from the premise that both universities and businesses/non-profits were organizations that regularly inscribed cultural values through everyday composition practices. One course objective was for participants to identify such values by deploying auto-ethnographic fieldworking methodologies in their own places of work, so I conducted my research on the pre-pilot sections. Course readings traced the interpretive turn in anthropology with its demands for heightened reflexivity on the part of the ethnographer, while course discussions engaged what that turn means to someone conducting research in Hawai‘i, a question I continue to wrestle with today. The text that troubled, inspired, and challenged me most was Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s monograph, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, as it underscored to me that although I could satisfy the institution’s requirements for ethical research by gaining approval for my proposed research by the Institutional Review Board (which I did), the place in which my research was situated demanded additional levels of reflexivity, a point I return to in greater depth in my methodology chapter. For my
seminar research, which functioned as an *entrepr* to this dissertation project, I took fieldnotes during classes and student conferences, qualitatively coded data from my section plus another concurrent experimental section, and wrote a seminar paper that led to an eventual publication in *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal* (Bruland).

In Fall 2007 and 2008, when a formalized UH Writing Mentors Program was in place, I had the opportunity to serve as a FYC instructor in two different trinary classrooms. My first pairing was with Kenneth L. Quilantang, who was then an MA student in Creative Writing and has since gone on to teach FYC at Kapi‘olani Community College. My second pairing was with Jennifer Sano-Franchini, an MA student in Composition and Rhetoric who is now a Ph.D. candidate in the Rhetoric and Writing Program at Michigan State University. While it required additional planning and communication to integrate a mentor into the course, collaborating with writing mentors offered a number of pedagogical insights that were not the kind I could have gained from formal coursework or from teaching in a binary FYC classroom. Not only did a mentor’s presence in the classroom heighten my sense of audience and accountability, but these mentors were also able to offer me detailed feedback from their unique positions on how students were faring with various assignments, alerting me to several instances when I needed to re-visit a concept in class. Given that I was Caucasian and new to the islands, I especially appreciated being able to offer students access to a non-white classroom member and university representative who was born and raised in Hawai‘i. And I found that Ken and Jen were able to deploy these aspects of their identities to reach certain students in ways that I as an instructor and relative outsider to the islands could not. Furthermore, at my request both Ken and Jen generously previewed several writing
assignments and lesson plans and helped me to adjust them so as to be more student
friendly and place appropriate. For example, one day I handed Ken a list of proposed
writing groups, and he suggested a few key changes based upon student dynamics he was
uniquely aware of from his out-of-class conferences, leading to some of the most
productive groupwork that I have witnessed in a FYC setting. Based upon these
experiences, I understood why instructors so often referred to the mentor assigned to their
section as “my mentor.” More than a slippage, this designation indicates what Professor
Henry referred to as the “trickle up” theory of mentoring, in which mentors impart to
instructors invaluable insights about the complexities of such categories as place,
classroom cultures, generational differences, composition theory, and technology.

And finally, over the five-year span from Fall 2006-Spring 2011, I held various
administrative and research positions within the UH Writing Mentors Program. In Spring
of 2007, I served in the capacity of a volunteer advisor and researcher to four additional
pilot sections, sharing my seminar project from the first two pilot sections, presenting
revised data collection instruments, and recording participants’ observations and
administrative suggestions. From Fall 2007 through Spring 2011 when the program was
operating at approximately fifteen sections per semester, I was employed formally as a
Graduate Research Assistant and Assistant WPA to Program Director Jim Henry. During
this four-year span, my primary duty entailed overseeing programmatic data collection
and assessment. Across the bi-weekly mentor roundtables, program orientations, and
departmental meetings that I attended in the capacity of programmatic researcher, I took
copious fieldnotes of observations and developing theories. These twenty-one notebooks
containing fieldnotes constitute one of the data sources upon which I draw and form the foundation for one of the authorial voices I deploy—the auto-ethnographic.

**Auto-Ethnography as Theoretical Lens and Narrative Voice**

In a 1979 article titled “Auto-ethnography: Paradigms, Problems, and Prospects,” David Hayano offered the first written account of “auto-ethnography” as a category in its own right. He narrated a timeline of the demise of logical positivism in anthropology and sociology, tracing the shift away from studies of non-Western societies by “objectively”-positioned Westerners toward participant-observations of (1) “one’s own people” and/or of (2) “sub-cultural, recreational, or occupational groups” with whom the researcher “has acquired an intimate familiarity” (100). Hayano recognized, following Diane Lewis, that group membership exists in varying degrees, explaining that “This insider/outsider (or auto-ethnography/ethnography) dimension is best seen as a continuum rather than a rigid dichotomy” (qtd. in Hayano 100: 599). In my own positionality, there exists a tension between Hayano’s first and second categories of auto-ethnography, for while I am in many ways an insider to the Writing Mentors Program, I am also an outsider to the place in which the program is situated, including the home cultures of many participants in the Writing Mentors Program.

As a settler who arrived in Hawai‘i less than a year before this project began, my research does not constitute “autoethnography” in the sense that Mary Louise Pratt deploys the term, as “instances in which colonized subjects undertake to represent themselves in ways that engage with the colonizer’s own terms” (*Imperial Eyes* 7, her italics). My disciplinary identity as a member of a Department of English bears the weighty colonial legacy of carrying out the near extinction of the Hawaiian language
(Nee-Benham and Heck; Young). While the days of inflicting corporal punishment for speaking Hawaiian are thankfully over, I am nonetheless aware of my own complicity in the enduring colonial project, as a significant portion of UHM’s campus is located on lands that were taken illegally from the Hawaiian kingdom. Acknowledging such historical facts requires me to grapple continually with the question: How can non-Hawaiians teach and conduct research in Hawai‘i in ways that are as ethical as possible? While I address this question more fully in my methodology chapter, here I will note briefly how one non-Hawaiian scholar has inspired my work. In her preface to Legendary Hawai‘i and the Politics of Place, Cristina Bacchilega positions herself vis-à-vis Hawaiian culture, struggles, and scholarship “somewhat analogously to men supporting feminism,” seeking to be “a student” and “an ally” (x). In desiring to embody these roles as a composition researcher and to represent participants’ perspectives in ways that are pono (a powerful word I have heard translated in multiple ways, including just, accurate, and balanced) I have experienced degrees of anxiety that have at times kept me from writing altogether, as it was easier to imagine a project that gave life to the richness of mentors’ voices and paid justice to the significance of their work than to risk an inevitably imperfect attempt.³ Ultimately, I believe that the loss would be greater if the story of the program and its participants were not recorded, analyzed, and commemorated, however imperfect the narration.

Due in large part to the burdens of responsibility that accompany it, I still see in auto-ethnography the prospects that David Hayano enumerated for it in 1979:

(1) the substantive and heuristic values of its diverse concepts and theories; (2) the ethical and moral issues it perpetually confronts with respect to the use of
human subjects as sources of data; (3) the voices from within—the internal political affirmation of cultural diversity and autonomy for sometimes neglected populations and peoples; and (4) its potential advisory capabilities in programs of change or development. (103)

In the Methodology chapter, I analyze this project in light of Hayano’s first and second facets of auto-ethnographic research; and in the chapter on Program Contexts I address Hayano’s fourth facet of auto-ethnography. Here, I want to focus on Hayano’s third prospect. Despite increased administrator attention to first-year experiences, first-year students at most research universities all too often remain a “neglected population” with few avenues for improving their access to quality teaching, learning, and advising scenarios (Nathan). Master’s-level students, too, constitute one of these “voices from within.” This observation is illustrated dramatically in Jessica Restaino’s 2012 NCTE-sponsored ethnography, *First Semester: Graduate Students, Teaching Writing, and The Challenge of Middle Ground*. While Restaino positions her project as an ethnography, her work also includes auto-ethnographic elements, for she (like I) was also a graduate student conducting research involving other graduate students— in her case four beginning graduate student instructors. Restaino analyzes how previous decades of scholarship have tended to lay out “best practices” for using graduate students in the FYC classroom rather than “to imagine them as potential contributors to how writing gets taught and theorized” (19).4 By featuring the perspectives and performances of MA student writing mentors, this dissertation answers Restaino’s call for a “record of graduate students’ pedagogical contributions, reflective writing, curricular revisions, and programmatic suggestions that could serve the field—from new graduate students
themselves to experienced WPA’s—as a teaching and research tool” (118). Of course, Restaino primarily had in mind graduate students occupying the instructor position, whereas the graduate students in my dissertation are positioned as third classroom actors, a positionality that offers them perspectives unavailable to instructors. By virtue of their unique institutional position(alities), these “writing mentor-researchers” represent a new research agent in Composition Studies. While the fifty-one writing mentor-researchers who agreed to participate in my dissertation occupy a common institutional position, their backgrounds and perspectives are richly varied. A goal of my narration, following Hayano, is to represent as ethically as possible “the internal political affirmation of cultural diversity and autonomy,” including those perspectives on Hawaiian sovereignty informing the work of many of the Kanaka Maoli (or Native Hawaiian) mentors as well as several non-Hawaiian mentors with political and scholarly commitments to Hawaiian rights.

In representing others, one of the auto-ethnographer’s most important responsibilities is to exercise reflexivity at every turn and to account as fully as possible for the limitations of her vantage point. In their inventory of the pitfalls of autoethnography, however, Stacy Holman Jones and Tony E. Adams cite repeated criticisms of the tendency for reflexive accounts to lapse into narcissistic personal storytelling that loses sight of the researcher’s relations to the study’s participants and cultures (142-143), or what Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant have termed positional reflexivity (39). Heeding Jones and Adams’ warnings, I will focus here on three areas of relationality that most influence this project: my relationship to the study participants; my relationship to the participants’ cultures; and my relationship to the dissertation’s focus of
trinary classrooms. While this third relationship does not emerge directly from my relations to the study’s participants and cultures it is vital to the study, as it engages both “personal reflexivity,” which involves examining “the ways in which our own values, experiences, interests, beliefs, political commitments, wider aims in life and social identities have shaped the research” (Willig 10), as well as epistemological reflexivity, which involves examining “the assumptions (about the world, about knowledge) that we have made in the course of the research and... the implications of such assumptions for the research and its findings” (Willig 10).

From 2007-2011, I interacted almost daily with the program’s writing mentors; occasionally with the instructors; and very rarely with mentored first-year students (with the exception of my own two trinary teaching experiences and two focus group interviews with students). My institutional position as a Graduate Research Assistant to the program positioned me as both an insider and outsider with the mentors, occupying a space between the writing mentors and Professor Henry that may to a limited degree be analogous to the space that mentors occupied between first-year students and the instructor of record. The position also provided me with frequent opportunities to “mentor the mentors,” including listening to concerns and offering feedback in roundtable forums and individual meetings, responding to individual questions over email, engaging in writing with mentors’ observations and ideas recorded in their logs and memos, coaching mentors through the steps of turning their research into professional presentations, and occasionally writing recommendation letters for future employment. However, my simply saying “hello” to mentors on campus frequently resulted in apologies for late conference logs— an experience that apparently overlaps
with that of other graduate student WPAs (J. Brown)— reminding me that my positionality as part-peer and part-authority inflects my relationships with those mentors whom this dissertation researches.

My relationship to mentors’ cultures is more complex. The ethnicities of mentors, as presented according to UHM’s classification system (which Georganne Nordstrom has insightfully analyzed for its many problems; “Locating” 119-125) are as follows: Caucasian (39%), Mixed Race (15%), Hawaiian (14%), Japanese (11%), Mixed Asian (8%), Chinese (5%), Korean (4%), Filipino (2%), Hispanic (2%), and Thai (1%). Across the 100 sections, 60% were staffed by mentors who graduated from high schools in Hawai‘i; 26% from high schools in the continental US; and 14% from non-US high schools. My own background most closely aligns with those Caucasian mentors who came to Hawai‘i only shortly before enrolling in graduate school, and in my chapter on mentors’ place-based work I identify with some of these mentors’ transitional struggles. In this chapter, I also attempt to represent various kinds of place-based work in relation to Hawai‘i performed by selected Kanaka Maoli and non-Kanaka Maoli mentors who graduated from Hawai‘i high schools. My approach to Hawaiian culture has been inspired by a piece of advice I first read in Cristina Bacchilega’s Legendary Hawai‘i and the Politics of Place. Bacchilega quotes Hawaiian scholar Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa during a 2003 “Conversation of Indigenous Issues and Settler Viewpoints” as exhorting those non-Hawaiians in her audience: “Don’t become us. Honor your own ancestors. But learn about the land and the language, for there is no Hawaiian sense of place without Hawaiians” (28). As a newcomer to Hawai‘i, I have attempted to learn about Hawaiian culture through taking a beginning Hawaiian language course from Kumu Carol Silva;
paddling for Ānuenue Canoe Club under Kumu Kāwika Napoleon; and attending numerous talks and performances pertaining to Hawaiian issues. I have also attempted to learn about Asian cultures (including the ways in which the signifier “Asian” erases important differences) by enrolling in a “Rhetoric of East and West” graduate seminar that examined rhetorical traditions from ancient China, presenting at the Association for Asian American Studies Conference, and listening to talks and reading scholarship by members of the Asian/Asian American Caucus of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Perhaps most importantly my conversations, collaborations, and friendships with people who were born and raised in Hawai’i have heightened my respect and appreciation of “local” cultures (itself a problematic identity marker for the ways in which it undermines claims to Hawaiian sovereignty; see, for example Fujikane and Okamura). These combined experiences have also reinforced to me how rudimentary my understanding of Hawai’i is, making me aware that mentors’ perspective and performances include layers of meaning which I cannot (and in certain cases should not) access.

Perhaps the most significant predisposition I must account for is my own investment in the program’s success. During my dissertation prospectus defense, a committee member inquired about the degree to which this dissertation was invested in ensuring the sustainability of the Writing Mentors Program. At the time, I was simultaneously composing both my dissertation proposal and arguments for continued funding beyond the program’s initial guarantee of three years, and it was difficult to separate the voice of program advocate from that of program researcher. As Shirley Rose and Irwin Weiser explain in their preface to The Writing Program Administrator as
Researcher: Inquiry in Action and Reflection, such tensions characterize writing program administrator (WPA) research more broadly:

The ways in which WPAs conduct research and the kinds of expertise that research requires are not categorically different from other research in rhetoric and writing studies. WPA research differs because of the institutional role of the writing program administrator. Because the WPA is held responsible for the writing program, research on that program is in the WPA’s own interest. Thus, the WPA finds it disingenuous to narrate the story of the research project as though she were a disinterested inquirer. The WPA cannot pose as a seeker of knowledge for its own sake, but must acknowledge that the outcome of the inquiry may have immediate, obvious impact on many teachers and students. The WPA’s interest does not, however, diminish the desire to understand, intellectual engagement with the issue the research projects address, or the obligation and commitment to conduct principled inquiry and circulate its conclusions. (ix)

While the voice of the WPA will always be present in my writing, formally taking off my administrator’s hat prior to writing the dissertation itself—and doing so with the knowledge that the program would continue into the foreseeable future—has allowed me to inhabit a more critical research persona, heightening my awareness of the ways in which my own investment in programmatic survival has influenced the data from which I draw and the ways I am inclined to interpret it.

While accounting for my own position(alties) is important, ultimately it is not I but the mentors themselves who are the focus of this dissertation. As a majority of these mentors have deep roots in Hawai‘i, the term “auto-ethnography” is perhaps more
appropriately applied to their work than mine. I approach the project as an auto-
ethnography of mentors’ auto ethnographically inflected institutional reporting on their
work across 100 classroom trinaries that seeks to illuminate the perspectives and
performances that emerged from this configuration. This part of my research design was
inspired by Professor Jim Henry, who drew upon the ethnographies of eighty-four
graduate students who took his “Cultures of Professional Writing” course at George
Mason University from 1993 to 1999 to produce Writing Workplace Cultures: An
Archeology of Professional Writing. Henry depicts the methodological and
epistemological challenges of such project:

Aware of recent ethnographic thought that lobbies for constant reflection on the
politics and poetics of representation, striving to enact postmodern tenets that call
us to resist totalizing accounts of any cultural trends or practices, I sought a way
to highlight the petits recits that these researchers provided and to represent their
work in ways useful to them, their teachers, and their workplace colleagues. (xi-xii)

While I attempt an analysis that brings together mentors’ collective research in order to
generalize about the work of trinary classrooms, I do not attempt to author(ize) a
definitive meta-narrative of the Writing Mentors Program or of trinary classrooms.
Within a single classroom, each relationship among a mentor, student, and instructor
takes shape differently according to the individuals’ respective institutional positions and
performances of identity, as inflected by such factors as geographic origin, gender,
etnicity, and language. Furthermore, within each mentor-student-instructor triad, this
triangulation shifts day to day, assignment to assignment, and genre to genre.
Ethnographic theory, informed by postmodern tenets, reminds me of the partial nature of my perspective and the need to contextualize and code such destabilizations and realignments, listening to my data in nuanced ways. Perhaps more accurately, then, my account is an attempt at what ethnographic theorist James Clifford describes as “a cultural poetics that is an interplay of voices, of positioned utterances” (12). And when this interplay of positioned utterances encompasses three distinct classroom actors, the conversations become even more dynamic and rich.

**A Note on my Uses of the Hawaiian Language**

As with most matters related to the ethics of location, my decision about whether or not to italicize Hawaiian language terms was a matter of ongoing deliberation. I agree with the argument that in Hawai‘i, Hawaiian should not be treated as a foreign language. However, for the vast majority of my professional community in Composition and Rhetoric, Hawaiian will be a foreign language. Furthermore, my own experience with the Hawaiian language is limited to a semester-long beginning Hawaiian language course with Kumu Carol Silva and sporadic independent study. As Cristina Bacchilega eloquently put it: “Due to no fault of the teachers, I am learning Hawaiian all too slowly and, while I hope to make more time for it, I come to it definitely as a foreign language” (xi). When quoting texts with Hawaiian language, I remain consistent with the author’s orthography and italicization. When employing Hawaiian words myself, I italicize the term and offer a gloss from one of the trinary classroom participants and/or from Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert’s *Hawaiian Dictionary*.

As for specific terminologies, in referring distinctly and exclusively to the indigenous people of Hawai‘i, I use the words *Kanaka Maoli*, Native Hawaiian, and
Hawaiian. Other place-based categories of identity employed by participants include “local” (which I discuss further in Chapter Two) and haole (a term that in participants’ usage generally refers to Caucasians). When mentors refer to themselves according to any of these terms, I attempt to follow their lead in using the same term whenever possible in reference to themselves and their work.
Notes

1 At the end of the semester, this student granted me permission to quote anonymously from his reflective paper detailing the extension request episode as well as from the earlier passage I cited describing his first week of college.

2 Although Hayano’s article has since been recognized as the first print publication to engage with “auto-ethnography” as a category of research, Hayano notes that his first contact with the term came in a seminar taught by Sir Raymond Firth. Firth related a heated debate that occurred in classical anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski’s 1938 graduate seminar in which Kenyan anthropologist Jomo Kenyatta was angrily criticized by a white African graduate student for the fieldwork he presented on his own Kikuyu people. As Hayano explained, “their argument pointedly raised the question of judging the validity of anthropological data by assessing the characteristics, interests, and origin of the person who did the fieldwork” (100).

3 Native Hawaiian scholar Ty Kāwika Tengan describes this burden of auto-ethnographic representation in his 2008 Native Men Remade: Gender and Nation in Contemporary Hawai‘i: “I initially resisted the urge to write about the group because I was aware of the dangers that came with being an indigenous anthropologist: reconciling competing obligations to community and academia; determining what level of discussion and critique was appropriate; producing work that was accessible to multiple audiences; encountering unforeseen constraints as an insider; and wrestling with my own multiple positionalities, which also made me an outsider. Most importantly, I was afraid of alienating myself from the group by objectifying and analyzing everything said and done there. Then I started to see that the stories shared and experiences created needed to be told to others. I was in the group for a purpose, and that was to write” (27). While I wrestled with many of these issues myself, I cite Tengan’s account to acknowledge the incomparably deeper turmoil and heightened sense of accountability that accompany an indigenous auto-ethnographer.

4 Restaino also highlights recent exceptions to this problematic trend in Tina Lavonne Good and Leanne B. Barshauer’s 2000 anthology, In Our Own Voice: Graduate Students Teach Writing and Mary Lou Odom’s 2004 dissertation, “Before the Classroom: Teachers Theorizing First-Year Composition Pedagogy” (20). I would also add Ruth Ray’s early calls for graduate programs to include structured opportunities for conducting teacher-research in The Practice of Theory: Teacher Research in Composition, including Ray’s appendix with thirteen writing prompts for research logs, which offered useful direction to me in designing mentor reflection instruments.

5 In “Educating Reflexive Practitioners: Casting Graduate Teaching Assistants as Mentors in First-Year Classrooms,” Jim Henry and I develop more fully the various dimensions of reflexivity that are critical to ethnographic classroom research.

6 Jim Henry provides the following elaborated depiction of his research design: “These [graduate student] researchers received instruction in ethnographic theory and methodology, fieldwork methodology, and cultural analysis. Using a workshop format, they produced analyses of discursive processes and products in workplace cultures. They also agreed to serve as subjects in teacher-research on writers’ subjectivities as shaped by the discourses of the workplace and the academy. Their work and my analysis of it form the foundation of this book” (xi).
CHAPTER 1: Framing A Study of Trinary First-Year Composition Classrooms

From Binary to Trinary Models of First-Year Composition (FYC)

In her 2010 CCCC Chair’s Address, Marilyn Valentino argued that first-year composition is in a state of unprecedented crisis. She depicted the entire profession—but most especially the students—on the losing end of nation-wide trends toward the elimination of tenure-track and full-time positions for writing instructors in favor of contingent laborers, the institutionalization of master syllabus/master teacher first-year writing courses, the increase in dual credit college composition courses taught inside of high schools, the outsourcing of grading, and the rise of for-profit online institutions (370-371). To dramatize this sad state of affairs, Valentino played a video of a cattle drive set to the following lines from the country Western song, “Rawhide:” “Don’t try to understand ‘em,/ Just rope and throw and brand ‘em” (371). In an Althusserian moment, members of the audience spontaneously joined in the singing, while the more serious implications of the analogy simultaneously set in. According to this (country) Western depiction of assembly-line education, student writers are reduced to an undifferentiated “them” or “‘em.” Furthermore, composition instructors are not only overworked by but also complicit in a system of branding that discourages attempts to understand in depth their institutional “others” on the opposite end of the educational binary.

This dissertation narrates the story of an initiative that offers a counter-model to the practices, politics, and epistemologies that increasingly standardize first-year writing instruction. From Fall 2007 through Spring 2011, the University of Hawai‘i Writing Mentors Program conducted 125 sections of FYC according to a “trinary” model. In
contrast to the traditional teacher/student classroom binary, these trinary classrooms were composed of the three distinct institutional positions: that of teacher, student, and “writing mentor-researcher.” Writing mentor-researchers were mostly MA students in English who attended classes in the role of participant-observers, generally sitting among the students, taking class notes and fieldnotes, joining in small group activities, modeling engagement, and occasionally teaching a lesson or leading a discussion. Outside of class, they served as writing mentors to first-year students, getting to know them individually through regular writing conferences, coaching them through the challenges of composing academic discourse, offering support and encouragement as they negotiated the transition to college, but never formally assessing student work. And finally, writing mentor-researchers functioned as trained composition researchers in their own right, drawing on their heightened awareness of the classroom context, participants, and (inter)relationships to problematize student performance, document and sometimes present their work, and offer the instructor feedback, when solicited, on class trends.

This dissertation introduces and theorizes the term “classroom trinaries.” I first presented the term “classroom trinaries” on a 2010 CCCC’s panel of WPAs leading various classroom-based tutoring programs, both as a means of naming the instructor-mentor-student configuration and of underscoring the ways in which it interrogates the teacher-student binary framing so many college classrooms. In her response to the panel, WAC scholar Terry Zawacki highlighted the significance of this term and suggested that it become more widely utilized. I explored this term more directly in my 2011 CCCC’s presentation, “A New Turn in Teacher Research: Contesting the Teacher/Student Binary through Trinary Classroom Configurations.” Critical theories across the humanities and
social sciences generally conclude that binaries—whether related to identity, geography, history, or other categories—are problematic in the hierarchies they reinforce and the complex ways of knowing and being they obscure or erase. As such, I approach trinaries as not only a pedagogical but also an epistemological category. This dissertation argues that classroom trinaries offer promising possibilities for (re)configuring FYC courses, approaching and understanding writing conferences, preparing writing teachers, researching first-year students’ negotiations with FYC and the university, and conceptualizing institutional others.

As the above list indicates, far more than three parties or entities come into contact in what I am calling “classroom trinaries.” While this term is beneficial in drawing a contrast to binary classrooms, it also functions as what Kenneth Burke calls a terministic screen, artificially blinding one to the ways in which additional entities are always powerfully at play in first-year composition classrooms. Figure 1.1 attempts to illustrate six of these many interrelated entities:

![Figure 1.1 The “trinary classroom” expanded](image)

Figure 1.1 The “trinary classroom” expanded

The boldest lines connecting mentor, student, and instructor indicate the three parties to which the term “trinary” directly refers. However, the additional lines connecting each of
the six entities to and through one another reflect the complex web of interrelationships any third classroom actor must navigate. As addressed in Chapters Three and Four, writing mentors frequently conceptualized their work in relation (and sometimes in resistance) to writing program directors’ administrative visions and research agendas. Even more powerfully, mentors found that their work was always inflected by their own and their counterparts’ relations to the university, which I have indicated by the term “institution,” and their relations to Hawai‘i, which I have referenced using the Hawaiian word “ā'ina.” While ‘ā’ina can be quickly glossed as “land” or “earth” (Pukui and Elbert), in Chapter Five I consider further genealogical and political dimensions of the term in light of Kanaka Maoli scholarship. “Ā’ina” is positioned at the foundation of Figure 1.1 to indicate the primacy of the land and the ways in which classroom experiences and mentoring efforts are grounded in and by place.

While my research reflects the influence of (at least) these six parties, it focuses primarily on writing mentors as a third classroom actor, a term I derive from the branch of Performance Studies that combines theatre studies with anthropology and sociology to examine the workings of social actors within everyday settings. As I elaborate in Chapter Four, these theories of performance offer a means of probing how the introduction of a third classroom actor shifts the familiar terms of the FYC mise-en-scène, with this revised staging enabling alternative enactments of roles, arrangements of actors, and environments for teaching and learning. Furthermore, the third actor functions as a co-performer with the instructor in both scripted and impromptu scenes, allowing for a greater variety of pedagogical performances. In “Performing Writing, Performing
Literacy,” Jenn Fishman, Andrea Lunsford, Beth McGregor, and Mark Otuteye argue for the power of performance to engage students:

Today’s eighteen- and nineteen-year-olds belong to a generation that learns to drive—if not to walk or crawl—on an information superhighway crowded with multiple media, and when these students arrive at school they take for granted the interplay between bodies, screens, and documents. Performance has a tremendous appeal for many of these students, and, during the early college years, we believe it helps them learn to work with different systems of signification in multiple modalities and to participate effectively as well as eloquently in a culture of secondary literacy. (245-246)

Mentors both embodied performance and introduced multiple media to classroom and conferencing scenes, drawing parallels between the performances inherent in students’ everyday lives and the performances prompted by FYC writing assignments.

Fishman, Lunsford, McGregor, and Otuteye also observe that theories of performance remind us not to reduce notions of student writing performance exclusively to “something we can measure and assess using rubrics, grades, or test scores,” and help us take into account “the live, scripted, and embodied activities” involved in teaching and learning writing (226). These two understandings of writing performance parallel performance scholar Jon McKenzie’s categories of organizational performance, or those kinds of performance designated as “student learning outcomes” to be measured by scores and grades, and cultural performance—the kinds of performances that are “living, embodied expression of cultural traditions and transformations” (8). To these categories McKenzie adds the third arena of technological performance, or those performances
conducted by, and by means of, technology. Re-reading the anecdote in this dissertation’s Preface involving the first-year student “Kenton” through McKenzie’s three concepts underscores the range of mentoring performances available to a third classroom actor. For example, coaching Kenton on how to access his university email address, attach papers for electronic submission, and find resources in the library can be classified primarily as mentoring in the realm of technological performance. Each of the two role plays can be understood as enactments of cultural performance, with my mentoring Kenton on the extension request engaging a cultural tradition of the university and Kenton’s mentoring of me on Hawai‘i Creole English pronunciations and inflections engaging a cultural tradition of Hawai‘i. And the degree to which Kenton complied with the assignment rubric, as measured by his paper grade of an A-, denotes organizational performance. Although I have isolated McKenzie’s three concepts of performance for the purposes of this example, both McKenzie and the writing mentors in this study indicate these categories to be dynamic and overlapping. (Even the cultural performance of the extension request can be seen as the “outcome” of a failed organizational performance in terms of meeting the assignment’s deadline; this lateness was fueled, in part, by Kenton’s difficulties making phone contact with his father and accessing the course website, which are facets of technological performance.) Performance theory enables the composition researcher to illustrate how much insight would be lost if the value of FYC were assessed through artifacts of organizational performance alone, ignoring the significant cultural and technological performances involved. Qualitative research on writing informed by broadened notions of performance might help educators to push back more effectively against the ascendant paradigm of outcomes assessment in higher education. Thus, in
addition to offering salient concepts through which to analyze writing mentors’ work within trinary configurations, theories of performance also enable perspectives on teaching and learning that have the potential to transform writing instruction beyond UHM.

**Trinary Demographics of the UHM Writing Mentors Program**

This dissertation presents IRB-approved research on 100 of the 125 trinary FYC classrooms within the UHM Writing Mentors Program from Fall 2007 through Spring 2011. (As I address more fully in the Methodology Chapter, any participant discourse I quote from within these hundred sections is accompanied by the mentor’s, instructor’s, and/or student’s consent. Furthermore, all quotations of program participants are presented in Arial font.) Table 1.1, below, offers a demographic portrait the study’s participants:
**Table 1.1**  
Trinary Demographics Across 100 Sections of FYC in Dissertation Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Category</th>
<th>Instructors (n=62)</th>
<th>Writing Mentors (n=51)</th>
<th>FYC Students (n=1,946)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Position</td>
<td>Full Professor 20%; Associate Professor 12%; Assistant Professor 11%; Instructor 7%; Lecturer 4%; Ph.D. Student 46%</td>
<td>First-Sem. Ph.D. student in English 10%; M.A. student in English 89%; Other 1%</td>
<td>First-year undergraduate (&lt;30 credits) 99%; Transfer student &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female: 67%; Male: 33%; Transgender: 0%</td>
<td>Female: 64%; Male: 36%; Transgender: 0%</td>
<td>Female: 55%; Male: 45%; Transgender: &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (by UH Classification)</td>
<td>Black or African American: 2%; Amer. Indian or Alaska Native: 1%; Asian: 22%; Chinese 3%; Filipino 0%; Indian Subcontinent 1%; Japanese 8%; Korean 1%; Thai 3%; Vietnamese 0%; Mixed Asian 3%; Other Asian 3%</td>
<td>Black or African American: 0%; Amer. Indian or Alaska Native: 0%; Asian: 31%; Chinese 5%; Filipino 2%; Indian Subcontinent 0%; Japanese 11%; Korean 4%; Thai 1%; Vietnamese 0%; Mixed Asian 8%; Other Asian 0%</td>
<td>Black or African American: 2%; Amer. Indian or Alaska Native: 0%; Asian: 43%; Chinese 6%; Filipino 10%; Indian Subcontinent 0%; Japanese 13%; Korean 3%; Thai 0%; Vietnamese 1%; Mixed Asian 9%; Other Asian 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian: 60%; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 8%; Guamanian or Chamorro 0%; Hawaiian or Part Hawaiian 7%; Micronesian 0%; Samoan 1%; Tongan 0%; Mixed Pacific Islander 0%; Other Pacific Islander 0%; Hispanic/ Latino: 0%; Two or more races: 6%; No Data: 0%</td>
<td>Caucasian: 39%; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 14%; Guamanian or Chamorro 0%; Hawaiian or Part Hawaiian 14%; Micronesian 0%; Samoan 0%; Tongan 0%; Mixed Pacific Islander 0%; Other Pacific Islander 0%; Hispanic/ Latino: 2%; Two or more races: 15%; No Data: 0%</td>
<td>Caucasian: 21%; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 18%; Guamanian or Chamorro 1%; Hawaiian or Part Hawaiian 14%; Micronesian &lt;1%; Samoan 1%; Tongan 1%; Mixed Pacific Islander 1%; Other Pacific Islander &lt;1%; Hispanic/ Latino: 2%; Two or more races: 13%; No Data: &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Location</td>
<td>Hawai‘i 24%; Cont. US 51%; Intl. 25%</td>
<td>Hawai‘i 60%; Cont. US 26%; Intl. 14%</td>
<td>Hawai‘i 70%; Cont. US 28%; Intl. 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Gen. Status</td>
<td>First-Generation College Student: 19%; First-Generation Grad School Student: 54%</td>
<td>First-Generation College Student: 29%; First-Generation Grad School Student: 65%</td>
<td>First-Generation College Student: 22%; First-Generation Grad School Student: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Bachelor’s</td>
<td>Attended and/or grad. from UHM with BA: 20%</td>
<td>Attended and/or grad. from UHM with BA: 70%</td>
<td>Currently attending UHM: 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing mentors in a majority of sections found themselves positioned in between the instructor and students in the categories of institutional position and age. On average, instructors were 26 years older than their assigned students, while mentors were 8 years older than their students. In other demographic categories such as high school location and ethnicity, the cohort of mentors more closely mirrored the first-year student body than the FYC instructors. I believe there to be value in the fact that these trinary configurations brought together individuals across multiple institutional positions and backgrounds in ways that offset and/or reconfigured binaries, while also introducing demographic combinations that potentially offered students avenues for positive identification with a member of the FYC classroom and institution. In “Diving for Pearls: Mentoring as Cultural and Activist Practice among Academics of Color,” Gail Okawa argues that such identifications with a mentor of a similar culture are particularly important for first-generation and minority students, illustrating this value through her own qualitative research and through referencing multiple studies of mentoring relationships with individuals of shared cultural and/or ethnic backgrounds.

**Precedents for Research on Trinary Collaborations in Writing Classrooms**

Within the literature of Composition Studies exist numerous models of writing support offered within three-party classroom configurations. Such writing programs are situated within college preparatory schools, community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and research universities. Many are administered as an extension of the writing center (Mullin “Writing Centers”); others are stand-alone programs funded by central administration; and a few are attached to Departments of English. These programs evidence a range of names for the third classroom actor, including “classroom tutor,” “peer consultant,” “peer
fellow,” “peer group leader,” “peer tutor,” “tutor,” “writing assistant,” “writing associate,” “writing center consultant,” “writing fellow,” and “writing mentor.” While “writing fellow” is perhaps the most widely-used descriptor of the third classroom actor, University of Texas Austin Writing Mentors Program Directors Joan Mullin and Susan Schorn have stated a preference similar to that of the UHM Writing Mentors Program for the term “writing mentor” (n.p.). Mullin et al. based their naming upon Charles Healey and Alice Welchert’s model of mutual mentoring as a relationship that differs "from other superior/subordinate helping relationships” and is defined by “a reciprocity between mentor and protégé and an accomplishment of an identity transformation by each party” (qtd. in Mullin et al. n.p.: 18). Applying this concept of mutual mentoring to the WAC classroom, Mullin et al. theorize that the term “writing mentor” best reflects “the exploration of internal dialogue and authoritative discourse in which faculty, students and mentor all engage” (n.p.). In the section that follows, I briefly present two trinary models in the literature (curriculum-based and classroom-based tutoring); analyze how the UHM Writing Mentors Program offers a synthesis of these two models; and note some observations from the literature that apply to my own dissertation research.

The most well-established third classroom actor is that of the “writing fellow” (WF), generally an accomplished student writer assigned to writing-intensive courses across the curriculum. One of the earliest examples of curriculum-based tutoring involving “writing fellows” is Brown University’s Writing Fellows Program, founded by Tori Haring-Smith in 1982. This program presently involves 45-50 courses, or approximately 60% of the student population, in any given year. The Brown University Writing Fellows website explains WF’s work in the following terms:
In a “fellowed” course, students submit the first draft of each paper to their Writing Fellow one week before it is due to the professor. During the first week, the Writing Fellows comment on the drafts, responding to argumentation, analysis, organization, clarity and style and suggesting strategies for revision. When the drafts are handed back, students have an additional week to consider these suggestions, meet individually with their Fellow and revise their drafts. Professors receive both the first draft, with annotations by the Writing Fellows, and the final version, so that they may review the process of their students’ work. Students receive detailed commentary on at least two papers during the semester.

(Writing Fellows “About”)

While the Brown University Writing Fellows Program has served as a model for hundreds of other programs (Cairns and Anderson n.p.; Soven “Curriculum” 59), much variation in this model is apparent within the 33 current listings on the Writing Fellows Programs page of The WAC Clearinghouse website, edited by Terry Zawacki.

The range of administrative, theoretical, and research approaches to trinary classrooms across the WAC and WID communities was also highlighted in the 2008 special focus issue of *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning, and Academic Writing* titled “Re-Writing the Curriculum: Writing Fellows as Agents of Change in WAC” (Hughes and Hall). For example, within the Brown model, writing fellows tend to approach writing as specialists and course content as generalists, avoiding negotiations of content in student writing conferences (Haring-Smith). However, when biology professors and other faculty involved with the Swarthmore Writing Associates Program (based upon the Brown model) requested writing tutors with greater disciplinary knowledge, WPA Jill
Gladstein reported that she began to rethink this division. After conducting ethnographic research involving Writing Associates (WAs), students, and faculty in introductory biology courses, Gladstein concluded: “The work of the WA does not fit within the binaries of generalist/specialist or content/writing, but rather the work takes place in gray spaces between these binaries” (n.p.).

Whereas in the curriculum-based tutoring model a majority of writing fellows’ work may often occur outside the classroom, in the classroom-based tutoring model, by contrast, writing tutors work primarily during class time and inside the classroom. In their 2005 edited volume, On Location: Theory and Practice in Classroom-Based Writing Tutoring, Candace Spigelman and Laurie Grobman define CBT in the following terms:

On-location occurs in the thick of writing instruction and writing activity, and on-location tutors operate within complex hierarchical, contested classroom spaces. . . Classroom-based writing tutors facilitate peer writing groups, present programs, conference during classroom workshops, help teachers to design and carry out assignments, and much more. (1)

Spigelman and Grobman trace the origins of classroom-based tutoring to the four “parent genres” of writing center tutoring, writing across the curriculum programs, supplemental instruction, and writing group pedagogy. They argue, however, that CBT should be understood as its own distinct form or “genre” of writing support, drawing upon contemporary genre theory to conceptualize it as a hybrid genre that is “greater than the sum of is parts, accomplishing intellectual work that could not be done in either of the parent discourses alone” (qtd. in Bizzell 13: 4). The hybridity of CBT, Spigelman and Grobman argue, helps to account for its complex and unpredictable nature, as well as for
the exciting possibilities enabled by the configuration. Although the programs featured in this anthology spanned developmental writing, FYC, and WAC classes, many of the articles focused on trinary configurations involving first-year student writers. As such, contributors found these third actors’ on-location activities often moved beyond the purview of traditional “tutoring” into the enlarged terrain of affective, interpersonal, and cultural issues, although they did not explicitly theorize the practice as mentoring. Since the publication of Spigelman and Grobman’s anthology, additional scholarly attention has been paid to classroom-based tutoring in the form of a 2007 special of Praxis: A Writing Center Journal focused on “The Writing Center and the Classroom” as well as a 2008 dissertation by Steven Corbett titled “Rhetorics of Close Collaboration: Four Case Studies of Classroom-Based Tutoring and One-to-One Conferencing.”

Like many other programs, the UH Writing Mentors Program borrows from elements of both the curriculum-based and classroom-based models, while introducing additional unique features. Appendix A offers a detailed table of three trinary classroom models: the Brown University Writing Fellows Program, the UHM Writing Mentors Program, and the classroom-based tutoring models depicted in Spigelman and Grobman’s anthology. The table traces differences and similarities across these models according to the courses to which the third actor is assigned; the third actor’s in-class roles; typical conferencing cycles and topics; the third actor’s relationship to grading; and the terms, (potential) motives, and implications in the naming of the third classroom actor. Of course, these comparisons are unable to capture the considerable variations within models, given the variety of goals, circumstances, cultures, and demographics found across programmatic stakeholders (Corbett 3-4; Soven “Curriculum”). Even within a
single program, the workings of classroom trinaries may vary dramatically from one section to another, given the multiplicity of actors involved (Cairns and Anderson; Corbett). For example, in a participant-observation study of four writing associates (WAs) within WAC courses at the Miami University of Ohio, Rhonda Cairns and Paul Anderson found that the large discrepancies in the roles performed by WAs could be explained, in part, by the different faculty members’ approaches in the following key areas:

- When [in the course of an assignment] they asked their WAs to work with the students' writing;
- How they coordinated the WAs' work on students' final papers with their own;
- How they encouraged students to meet with the WAs;
- How closely they defined the work they wanted WAs to do;
- How much prominence they gave their WAs in class meetings. (n.p.)

Cairns and Anderson observed that the roles of WAs are shaped dynamically by the forces and interactions of multiple social actors, including collaborating faculty members; the WA herself or himself; students in the WA-assisted course; and the cohorts of instructors and WAs as they meet (with those colleagues occupying the same trinary position) to discuss experiences and exchange ideas (n.p.). To this list of influences, I would add WPAs and program researchers. Based upon the overlaps in WA roles that surfaced across all four trinary sections in their study, Cairns and Anderson proposed a “conceptual model of the WA’s role” which included the following “essential tasks for a Writing Associate:”

- Learning how the WA program, faculty member, and students define the WA’s role
- Negotiating among these three definitions as well as the WA’s own definition
- Enacting the negotiated role as the WA understands it
- Learning about the course material and associated writing tasks
- Building a partnership with the faculty member
- Establishing rapport with the faculty member’s students
Looking for additional ways to assist the faculty member and students (n.p.)

Although Professor Henry and I wrote the official job description for UHM writing mentors prior to the release of this study, Cairns and Anderson’s list of WA tasks overlaps significantly with the responsibilities enumerated in mentors’ job descriptions, which I present in Chapter Three. Despite these shared tasks, Cairns and Anderson assert: “Because the array of variables that influence a WA’s role is so large, we assume that the role for every WA will be distinct from all others, including others working under the policies of the same WA program” (n.p.). Chapter Four of this dissertation, which explores the paradoxes of mentors’ lived positionalities, offers a concordant theory of the variability of writing mentors’ work and of trinary classrooms collaborations.

A number of additional observations in the literature on classroom-based and curriculum-based tutoring overlap with my dissertation research. While some of this literature features empirical research (Cairns and Anderson; Corbett; Gladstein; Soven), much of it could be classified as anecdotal accounts of single trinary classrooms or programs.15 One consistent theme is the limitations of writing center experiences and theories in preparing classroom-based tutors for the complex classroom dynamics they must navigate and the expanded array of roles they must perform. For example, as coordinator Barbara Little Liu and undergraduate tutor Holly Mandes found, writing center tutors functioning on location were unprepared for the requirements to serve as “catalysts” for their interactions with students (90), to negotiate the grey spaces between cultivating authority and friendship (96), and to take on directive roles that violated orthodox theories of nonintrusive tutoring (97). UH writing mentors’ logs, memos, and program evaluations provide abundant qualitative evidence of each of these demands of
Table 1.2, below, highlights a few themes from the extant literature that my research corroborates— and that future dissertation chapters address more fully:

Table 1.2
Selected Observations from the Literature on Classroom-Based and Curriculum-Based Tutoring Applicable to Dissertation Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Position</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| WPAs                   | - Recruitment and placement of collaborating faculty and WF’s/tutors is critical and takes considerable time on the part of WPAs (Soven “Curriculum” 68; Zawacki “Change Agents”).  
- To collaborate effectively with a third classroom actor, instructors need an orientation to the configuration and the assigned mentor (Grobman and Spigelman 220-223; Mullin et al.).  
- To collaborate effectively with a third classroom actor, students also need to be orientated to the configuration and the assigned mentor (Grobman and Spigelman 223-224; Soliday 67). One approach that has proven successful is a brief required individual conference with each student in the semester’s opening weeks to develop rapport, discuss roles, and “initiate a semester-long dialogue about writing” (Mullin and Schorn n.p.).  
- Many program have witnessed consistently high evaluations across all three parties (Mullin and Schorn; Soven “Curriculum” 66). |
| Instructors            | - Instructors must be willing to set aside considerable time for collaborating with a third classroom actor (Soven “Curriculum” 62; Corbett 78-80).  
- Feedback from the third actor on student challenges “foster[s] faculty understandings of student positions” (Mullin et al. n.p.) that often leads faculty to revise assignments and instruction to be more responsive to student needs (Mullin et al.; Schultz; Soven “Curriculum” 67; Zawacki “Change Agents”).  
- When instructors assign papers that are too open-ended (with few guidelines and/or no transparent grading criteria), tutors also have a difficult time knowing how to help students perform successfully (Zawacki “Change Agents”).  
- The third actor’s presence can be both invigorating and unsettling for instructors (Spigelman 203; Corbett 82-85; Soliday 63-64). |
| Third classroom actors | - The third actor is “poised in a middle space” between instructors and students, and as such is often theorized as a liaison between the two institutional positions (Hughes and Hall; Mullin et al.; Zawacki).  
- The third actor must perform a wide array of roles and shift frequently across these roles (Corbett 4; M. Harris 35 “What’s Up”; Soliday).  
- The third actor often encounters role confusion on the part of both students and instructors (Nicolas; Schultz; Soliday)  
- To be successful, third actors must “assimilate into classroom culture without losing a sense of their difference” (Soliday 69).  
- Third actors who attend class regularly and become immersed in the classroom cultures participate in and observe the nuances of classroom routines and relationships, allowing them “to act as a type of classroom ethnographer” (Mullin et al. n.p.). |
| Students               | - The third actor must frequently serve as a “catalyst” for interactions with students and cannot assume that students will automatically seek out a tutor’s help (Liu and |
In particular, this dissertation is based upon the premise that the third classroom actor is uniquely positioned as a researcher of student writers and writing classrooms. Joan Mullin and co-authors offer a similar proposition: “Writing mentors' immersion in the course enables them to act as a type of classroom ethnographer, observing the "routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions or concepts that the community has produced or adopted in the course of its existence and which has become part of [its] practice" (qtd. in Mullin et al. n.p.: Geller et al. 36). As addressed in Chapters Two and Four, the UHM writing mentors received training in participant-observer methodologies and were encouraged to problematize student performances and classroom cultures in their personal fieldnotes and programmatic record-keeping. In their critical introduction to the 2008 special focus issue of Across the Disciplines on the work of writing fellows in WAC, editors Brad Hughes and Emily Hall theorize that writing fellows offer “a new kind of lens” through which to view ongoing themes in WAC discourse. Hughes and Hall speculate that this third actor allows the profession “to see directly into the WAC classroom, and into the pedagogical practices of professors and student writers,” offering “fresh perspectives on the relationships among students, faculty, writing, and the disciplines.” The unique and important work of this third actor, Hughes and Hall claim, is made possible by the in-between spaces they occupy:
The authors in this special issue acknowledge the complexities and contradictions inherent in the role of Writing Fellow (occupying the spaces between peer and professor, specialist and generalist, WAC and WID). At the same time, these articles show how the interstitial position of Writing Fellows affords new ways to view these contradictions. Taken collectively, these pieces testify to the ways in which Writing Fellows, rather than reifying existing binaries, work to transform and refigure how we think about the binary relationships that structure our lives in university settings. (n.p.)

This dissertation empirically catalogues the contradictions and complexities identified by writing mentors serving in one hundred trinary FYC classrooms. In doing so, it examines a multitude of ways in which UH Writing Mentors function interstitially, leveraging their institutional positioning and individual identities to engage “the spaces between” students and instructors, sides of arguments, constructions of insiders and outsiders, and more. And this dissertation illustrates how trinary writing classrooms work on so many levels to “transform and refigure how we think about the binary relationships that structure our lives and university settings.”

Professional Literature on Mentoring

Mentoring is a longstanding, though somewhat peripheral, theme in rhetoric and composition. Within the professional literature, mentoring is most frequently discussed in the context of recruiting and retaining graduate students and professors (Eble and Gaillet; Lauer; Okawa) or in terms of preparing new teachers to enter the classroom (Barr Ebest; Reid; Rickly and Harrington). One of the field’s earliest and most compelling cases for mentoring undergraduate student writers was made in Mike Rose’s Lives on the
Boundary. Describing his own experiences as a first-generation college student and his interactions with future generations of underprivileged students, Rose claims: “Research universities are awful places for freshmen to be adrift, to be searching, to be in need” (204). To navigate the educational system successfully, Rose explains, students need multiple mentors:

You’ll need people to guide you into conversations that seem foreign and threatening. You’ll need different models, lots of them, to show you how to get at what you don’t know. You’ll need people to help you center yourself in your own developing ideas. You’ll need people to watch out for you. (48)

Another first-generation college graduate and venerated composition and rhetoric scholar, Victor Villanueva, describes the nature of mentoring in an interview with Gail Okawa as follows:

There is a knowledge that is assumed, the kind of thing Gramsci says the middle class knows by a kind of osmosis. Mentoring, then, is something beyond teaching. It is making explicit what is implicitly known, assuming nothing of tacit understanding of academic or white or middle class workings, no matter who ends up being the mentee. And mentoring is being able to enter into an intellectual friendship. (Okawa 511)

These poignant explanations of mentoring informed Professor Henry and my adoption of the term “writing mentors.” Such naming, however, was primarily inductive, proceeding from our observations in the early pilot sections that the third actor’s scope of work was much broader than that of traditional tutors, often addressing transitional challenges and personal issues that indicated the presence of rapport and trust. As Professor Henry and I
became acquainted with the professional literature on mentoring, we found through empirical research that this naming was indeed qualitatively merited. Furthermore, the literature on mentoring dovetailed with the literature on composition in a number of ways, and when placed in conversation, the two offered useful insights on the subject of “mentoring composition.”

In their article “Mentoring College Students: A Critical Review of the Literature Between 1990 and 2007,” Gloria Crisp and Irene Cruz note the existence of over fifty different definitions of mentoring, varying greatly in orientation and scope. Carol Mullen, a leading scholar of mentoring theory and practice from the fields of educational leadership and curriculum studies who has served as editor of the international journal, *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, defines mentorship broadly as “an educational process focused on teaching and learning within dyads, groups, and cultures” (1). To Mullen’s definition, I would also add “within triads,” as UH writing mentors depicted themselves as simultaneously engaged in reciprocal teaching and learning relationships with both instructors and students (Henry and Bruland). Mullen delineates two contrasting poles of mentoring: *technical mentoring*, which involves “hierarchically transmitting authoritative knowledge within organizational and relational systems” and *alternative mentoring*, which entails “engaging in shared learning, inquiry, and power across status, racial, gender, and other differences, with a vision of empowerment and equality” (8). My research indicates that while UHM writing mentors generally leaned toward alternative approaches to mentoring, they also situationally combined, shifted between, and held in tension elements of both models. According to the professional literature, mentoring relationships can be pre-assigned or self-selected, formal or
informal, short-lived or lifelong, mandatory or voluntary (Crisp and Cruz 529; Mullen 21). However, as Mullen argues “mandatory mentoring” is an oxymoronic concept, as it involves “compulsory requirements to commit to an educational process that is presumed voluntary” (12). Within the UH Writing Mentors Program, mentoring was configured as a quarter-time paid position that, depending upon instructors’ and mentors’ determinations, often involved formal conferencing policies and requirements for students. Despite these constraints, program records evidence writing mentors working to imbue their relationships with an informal, voluntary, and reciprocal ethos. And although the mentoring relationship was formally limited to the sixteen-week semester, on their anonymous end-of-semester program evaluations fully 69% of returning mentors claimed to have kept in touch with students from previous semesters, providing numerous examples of the ways in which their initially-formal and mandatory mentoring relationships were carried on informally and voluntarily. (For a synopsis of mentors’ comments on this topic, see Appendix B.) Chapter Four further analyzes writing mentors’ struggles and successes in straddling these various binaries in the professional literature on mentoring.

In our early research involving pilot section data, Professor Henry and I found especially valuable a review of the mentoring literature by Andy Roberts published in a 2000 volume of *Mentoring and Tutoring*. Roberts identifies eight “essential attributes” of mentoring: “a process; a supportive relationship; a helping process; a teaching-learning process; a reflective process; a career development process; a formalized process; and a role constructed by or for a mentor” (145). Roberts’ repeated depictions of mentoring as a process parallel the field of composition’s approach to writing as (among many other
understandings) a process. Furthermore, Roberts’ claim that mentoring roles must be “constructed by or for a mentor” overlaps with the literature on writing fellows that signaled such role construction to be an ongoing and shared responsibility across writing mentors, instructors, and WPAs (Grobman and Spigelman; Mullin; Zawacki). Professor Henry and I leaned upon Roberts’ work not only in constructing mentors’ official job descriptions, but in composing a co-authored piece with pilot study mentor Ryan Omizo titled “Mentoring in First-Year Composition: Tapping Role Construction to Teach.” The final section of our article included reflections on constructing mentoring roles from our various perspectives as a mentor, instructor, and program administrator. Writing from the position of an instructor teamed with mentor, I explained: “As my assigned mentor and I were very close in age, we believed that it would be important to deliberately plan the performances of our roles, so that we were sending consistent visual and textual messages, thereby helping students to approach us with greater confidence and to experience the benefits of working with two individuals who occupy different institutional positions” (24). Three ways in which my assigned mentor and I worked to co-construct productive mentoring roles for her included featuring the mentor throughout the syllabus and course website in ways that signaled our relationship to be both collaborative and hierarchical; specifying guidelines for how students should prepare for mentored writing conferences; and requiring some mentored conferences, while also working to create a culture of initiative whereby students would seek the mentor’s help voluntarily (24-25).

Another program-related publication that drew heavily from the literature on mentoring was a co-authored article titled “Course-Embedded Mentoring for First-Year
Students: Melding Academic Subject Support with Role Modeling, Psycho-Social Support, and Goal Setting” (Henry, Bruland, Sano-Franchini). Our primary data for this study consisted of anonymous end-of-semester evaluations completed by over 400 FYC students. We analyzed these students’ written comments on the roles their mentor played in the course and in their lives through four “major domains” of mentoring identified by Amaury Nora and Gloria Crisp. Table 1.3 offers additional details on each of these four domains, based upon a review spanning two decades of literature on mentoring college students conducted by Gloria Crisp and Irene Cruz (“Mentoring”).

Table 1.3
Summary of Crisp and Cruz's Synthesis of Mentoring Literature across the Four Major Domains of Mentoring First Identified by Nora and Crisp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Domain</th>
<th>Description of Domain</th>
<th>Components of the Domain from the Mentoring Literature, as synthesized by Crisp and Cruz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Psychological and emotional support | “Involves a sense of listening, providing moral support, identifying problems and providing encouragement, and establishing a supportive relationship in which there is mutual understanding and linking between the student and the mentor” (538-39). | • “Feedback from the mentor regarding certain fears and other issues on the part of the student” (Kram)  
• “Discussion of fears and uncertainties; emphasis on building a mentee’s(student’s) self-confidence”(Schockett and Haring-Hidore)  
• “Moral support (Levinson et al.)”  
• “Active, empathetic listening and a genuine understanding and acceptance of the mentee’s feelings” (Cohen)  
• “Development of a positive regard conveyed by another” (Kram)  
• “A concept of budding” (A. Miller)  
• “A strong and supportive relationship” (Roberts) |
| Support for setting goals and choosing a career path | “Represents the underlying idea that mentoring includes an assessment of the student’s strengths, weaknesses, and abilities and assistance with setting academic as well as career goals” (539). | • “In-depth review and exploration of interests, abilities, ideas and beliefs” (Cohen)  
• “Stimulation of critical thinking with regard to envisioning the future and developing personal and professional potential”(Cohen)  
• “A reflective process” (Roberts)  
• “Requesting detailed information from and offering specific suggestions to mentees regarding their current plans and progress in achieving personal, educational and career goals” (Cohen)  
• “A respectful challenge of explanations for specific decisions or avoidance of decisions and actions relevant to developing as an adult learner “(Cohen)  
• “Facilitation in the realization of the mentee’s dream” (Levinson et al.) |
Academic subject knowledge

“Centers on advancing student’s knowledge relevant to their chosen field” (539). Involves supporting a student’s academic success both inside and outside the classroom (539).

- “Acquisition of necessary skills and knowledge” (Kram)
- “Educating, evaluating, and challenging the mentee academically” (Schockett and Haring-Hidore)
- “Employing tutoring skills and focusing on subject learning in contrast to mentoring that focuses on life learning” (A. Miller)
- “Establishing a teaching-learning process” (Roberts)
- “Actively nominating the mentee for promotions, taking credit and blame, and intervening for the mentee when necessary” (Kram)
- “Discussing the mentee’s accomplishments with others, nominating them for positions, providing visibility and taking the blame for mentee, shielding him or her from negative publicity” (Schockett and Haring-Hidore)
- “Serv[ing] as a sponsor while also providing support toward the realization of the mentee’s dream” (Levinson et al.)

The existence of a role model

“Concentrates on the ability of the mentee to learn from the mentor’s present and past actions as well as his or her achievements and failures” (540).

- “Sharing, or self-disclosing life experiences and feelings by the mentor to personalize and enrich the relationship between himself/herself and the mentee (or student)” (Cohen; Kram)
- “Serv[ing] as an exemplar and a guide to a new social world” (Levinson et al.)
- “The opportunity to observe the mentor with other leaders or managers, handle conflict, and balance professional and personal demands” (Schockett and Haring-Hidore)

Henry, Sano-Franchini, and my analysis confirmed the presence of all four of these domains in FYC student discourse on their mentors. Fully 79% of students described mentor roles in the domain of academic subject knowledge; 42% in the domain of psychological and emotional support; 10% in role modeling; and 9% in goal setting and career paths. Furthermore, a strong majority of students referenced at least one of these domains (85%), and many simultaneously referenced two or more domains (44%). This research confirmed that our intuitive naming of the third classroom actor as a “writing mentor” did indeed meet the criteria established by the mentoring community: that mentoring must involve “a multi-dimensional support system” (342). We found, however, that a student’s experience of any given domain depended upon numerous factors, not the least of which was the mentee’s willingness to be mentored. As our
article explains, two previous empirical studies had already confirmed three of these mentoring constructs (with the exception of role modeling) as applied to college students: one was conducted at a two-year college and another at Hispanic-Serving Institution (Crisp and Cruz “Confirmatory;” Nora and Crisp). In both cases, students were asked to respond to survey questions based upon any mentor in their lives, be that individual an instructor, college or university staff member, older student, peer, friend, religious leader, or family member. Our study was the first published case in which these mentoring constructs were confirmed within a formal mentoring program involving a pre-assigned mentor embedded in a required academic course.

Although the professional literature generally treats mentoring and tutoring as closely related endeavors, Nora and Crisp’s work can help us to make a few distinctions between the two approaches for the purposes of this dissertation. I would argue that mentoring is “a multi-dimensional support system” (342), whereas tutoring is primarily aimed at only one of the four dimensions Nora and Crisp identify: increasing academic subject knowledge. Although writing mentors approached the position as one of offering multi-dimensional support to students, a percentage of students were reportedly interested in accepting support only in the area of academic subject knowledge. In other words, while mentoring (which included tutoring in college composition) was extended to every student, some students were only willing to receive tutoring. Writing mentors understood philosophically and found empirically that each student writer comes to college with different experiences (or “incomes”) and desires—and that as a result each student can be expected to approach the institutional actor of a writing mentor based in a required first-year composition course quite differently, underscoring the degree to which mentee
engagement inflects mentor performance across the four dimensions identified by Nora and Crisp. As relational, voluntary, and potentially long-term endeavor, mentoring does not lend itself well to standardization. These distinctions between mentoring and tutoring begin to indicate why current outcomes assessments, which are built upon the premise that all students should ultimately be able to demonstrate the same pre-designated learning outcomes after a set period of time, are a poor fit for programs aimed at mentoring writers.

In tracing the origins of the mentor concept within contemporary educational institutions, many authors look no further than the character of Mentor from Homer’s *Odyssey* or the relationship between Phaedrus and Plato in the work of Socrates. To be responsive to the home cultures of its constituents, a study of a mentoring program in Hawai‘i would be remiss not to acknowledge mentoring concepts beyond Europe. For example, UH writing mentor David Uedoi explained that his notions of mentoring were strongly informed by the relationship between senpai (先輩) and kōhai (後輩) in the school club culture of the Japanese education system and in the Japanese business world. In a weekly memo, Uedoi described himself as intentionally performing a “senpai” role vis-à-vis his students:

> Because I am usually in class early I plan to periodically ask students how their dorm life is going, their impressions of Hawaii, how their weekend was, etc. Not only does this build rapport it also invites the student to reflect on their college experiences. Plus, having been a resident of the UH dorms I can offer advice or trade stories, thereby building more rapport in a ‘senpai’ sort of role. (WM 157)

In an article titled, “Can Japanese mentoring enhance understanding of Western mentoring?,” Mark Bright explains the senpai-kōhai relationship as being generally
voluntary and characterized by strong emotional bonds (331). Bright elaborates: “the senpai-kōhai relationship is typically explained in such terms as protection, socialisation, human feelings, frankness, benevolent actions, gratitude, assistance, informality and relaxation,” terms which are largely absent from Western discourses of mentoring within organizational cultures, which tend to emphasize “support, guidance and self-esteem” (332-333). While Uedoi is the only mentor (to my knowledge) to have written explicitly about his work in terms of the senpai-kōhai relationship, it is possible that this relational concept or others like it potentially informs multiple participants’ understandings of mentoring, given that 11% of the mentors and 13% of the students across the 100 sections identified as Japanese (and that an additional 23% of mentors and 22% of students identified as “mixed Asian” or “mixed race”). More importantly in light of today’s era of outcomes assessment, Rohen’s study, Bright’s article, and Uedoi’s mentoring work suggest that the senpai-kōhai relationship offers a model for mentoring within organizations that is approached primarily as a relationship rather than as a success strategy or learning outcome. In Chapter Five, I also discuss in greater depth how writing mentor Marie Alohalani Brown theorized and practiced her mentoring work according to the Native Hawaiian figure of the mo’o deity.

In concluding this review of the mentoring literature, I consider a recent argument for mentoring from the field of composition studies made by Lee-Ann Katsman Breuch in an article titled “Post-Process ‘Pedagogy:’ A Philosophical Exercise.” Bruch’s piece was first published in a 2002 article in The Journal of Advanced Composition, and it has since been anthologized in Victor Villanueva’s widely-assigned Cross-Talk in Comp Theory reader as the concluding entry to the book’s first section on “The Givens in our
Conversation: The Writing Process.” Breuch begins with an analysis of the ways in which the post-process movement has been defined (both fairly and unfairly) in opposition to the process movement, citing Erika Lindeman’s explanation that early work on process offered an invigorating approach to writing not as a “what” but a “how”; not as a noun but a verb; not as a thing to be mastered but as a social activity to be engaged (106). Here, Andy Roberts’ theorization of mentoring as both a “process” and a dynamically “constructed” role meshes well with the historical context of composition’s first explorations of writing processes and later engagement with social constructionism. However, the range and complexity of process scholars’ work became, in Lisa Ede’s words, “co-opted and commodified—by textbooks that oversimplified and rigidified a complex phenomenon, by overzealous language arts coordinators and writing program administrators who assumed that the process approach to teaching could be ‘taught’ in one or two in-service sessions” (qtd. in Breuch 107: 35-36). Or as Barbara Couture poignantly inquires: “How did this emphasis on process, like so many ideas about writing that are derived from scholarship and research, lose so much when applied en masse in our classrooms?” (qtd. in Breuch 106: 30). Breuch explains that post-process pedagogies object to the mastery element of process when approached in a formulaic, factory-like manner. Highlighting the work of post-process scholar Thomas Kent, Brecht claims that post-process perspectives reengage the profession in approaching writing as an “indeterminate activity” that is explicitly “public,” “interpretive,” and “situated” (qtd. in Breuch 110: 1). Following Sidney Dobrin (“Constructing”), Breuch argues that because of their anti-foundationalism, post-process perspectives should not, cannot, and likely will not be translated into “a post-process pedagogy,’ complete with neat, bulleted points
about applying a specific approach to the writing classroom” (117). However, what Breu ch does advocate as “the strongest application of post-process theory” is the one-to-one mentoring of student writers (120). Breuch explains: “To think of teaching as mentoring means spending time and energy on our interactions with students—listening to them, discussing ideas with them, letting them make mistakes, and pointing them in the right direction” (120). (I find it interesting that she does seem to consider there to be a “right direction,” illustrating how even avowedly antifoundational or alternative approaches to mentoring, to invoke Carol Mullen’s terminologies, involve elements of traditional mentoring.) Citing Joan Mullin and others, Breuch claims that post-process perspectives are already apparent in writing center scholarship, and she envisions teacher-student relationships within writing classrooms as an additional site for one-to-one mentoring. However, I see two impediments to locating mentoring in the context of teacher-student relationships in the FYC classroom: (1) In a factory style composition program where instructors are generally overworked adjuncts and/or inexperienced graduate students, it is unlikely that writing teachers will have the time or energy to devote themselves to individualized interactions with students of the nature described by Breuch. (I address some of these national trends in FYC within Chapter Three.) (2) Even if an FYC instructor did have this kind of time and energy, institutional hierarchies and power structures inflect the teacher/first-year student relationship in ways that limit opportunities for alternative mentoring. However, locating the primary responsibility for mentoring in a third classroom actor potentially addresses both of these issues. Furthermore, as this third actor both participates in and observes the activity systems of the classroom, s/he is well-positioned to appreciate the public, interpretive, and situated
nature of students’ writing in the FYC context. Thus, the third actor serves a bridging figure who is uniquely positioned to engage process pedagogies in the responsive spirit in which they were initially proposed, while also embodying post-process perspectives. Subsequent dissertation chapters illustrate further these claims: Chapter Three highlights the flexibility of mentors’ work in relation to time (including the variability seen in conference lengths, stages, and topics); Chapter Four considers the ways in which mentors’ lived positionalities are characterized by indeterminacy and flux; and Chapter Five analyzes mentors work in relation to theories of place.

**Research Questions and Calls**

This dissertation addresses the following three research questions: (1) How do writing mentors within trinary first year-composition configurations depict their work in relation to students, instructors, writing program administrators, the institution, and Hawai‘i? (2) How do writing mentors’ perspectives and performances inflect trinary participants’ experiences of FYC within this context? (3) In what ways are trinary FYC collaborations of value (to program participants, the institution, the profession)? These research questions engage a number calls from both the composition studies and mentoring studies communities, two of which I will highlight here.

In the 2008 special issue of *Across the Disciplines* focused on writing fellows, many of the contributing WPA’s located the third classroom actor in an “in the middle” (Mullin and Schorn), interstitial (Hughes and Hall), or grey (Gladstein) space and theorized that this space serves to disrupt binaries and bring about change. However, as Jill Gladstein pointed out, this scholarship has not engaged the perspectives of the third actor directly or fully enough:
Up to this point the research has not asked what the tutors themselves think about the gray spaces they need to navigate such as the generalist/specialist debate. As directors we may hear of the tension they feel when placed in a WID context, but more research is needed to see how the WAs negotiate these spaces and what can be learned from them. (n.p.)

My research features the perspectives and performances of this third actor, drawing directly upon writing mentor discourse from conference log narratives, weekly reflective memos, anonymous program feedback, and focus group discussions.

Mentoring scholar Helen Colley makes a related call in a 2002 article published in the *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*. Colley lays out the following comprehensive research agenda:

Qualitative empirical research might remove the discussion of mentoring from the abstract level to which it is so often confined, to an experiential level that is typically hidden from view beneath the rose-tinted aura of celebration that usually surrounds it. We need to know more about the specific contexts for mentoring. . . and the ways in which mentors and mentees construct their roles. Finally, such material needs to be brought together with rigorous attempts to theorise it in the context of broader critical analyses of the 21st century society. (270)

This dissertation’s qualitative empirical research addresses mentoring contexts directly, as part both of its ethnographic approach and its focus on mentors’ place-based work. It also qualitatively codes discursive commentary on mentor roles by students, mentors, and instructors across 100 sections of FYC. And it approaches the project through critical theories offered by the fields of performance studies and place-based composition.
As I articulate what I have come to understand as the value of trinary configurations, I am well aware of the tendency to approach work related to mentoring with a “rose-tinted aura of celebration.” I will state unequivocally that this dissertation is built on the premise that classroom trinaries can and frequently do engender rich teaching and learning for all three institutional positions involved and offer a superior alternative to the standardized models that largely drive national FYC curricula. This belief in the merits of the trinary configuration is founded not only upon my own philosophical commitments, personal experiences and auto-ethnographic observations, but also upon extensive multimodal data from the UH Writing Mentors Program. Satisfaction rates, for example, were consistently high across all semesters of the program and all parties of the trinary: over 88% of students, 97% mentors, and 98% instructors claimed to have been “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their experiences.\(^23\) Despite these overwhelmingly positive responses, this dissertation’s contribution would be significantly poorer if I were not to examine rigorously the problematic elements of trinaries. To this end, I am committed to holding up examples that interrupt a narrative of programmatic success, to exploring the range of interpretive possibilities in participants’ circumspect or ambiguous utterances, and to paying attention to silences.\(^24\)

**Chapter Summaries**

CHAPTER TWO, Constructing a Methodology for Research on Writing Mentors, both lays out the dissertation’s methodologies and breaks new ground on methods for studying trinary collaborations. The chapter addresses the study’s epistemological underpinnings and scope, providing stipulative definitions of the “perspectives” and “performances” that this project seeks. I then present and analyze the study’s main
sources of original data, including auto-ethnographic fieldnotes; mentor conference logs and weekly reflective memos; program evaluations by mentors, students, and instructors; participant check roundtable transcripts; demographic surveys; and institutional records. I address how I employ mixed methods in my project design and data analysis, reviewing the relatively short list of precedents for mixing methods in composition studies and surveying the emergence of mixed methods as a rapidly growing field. Finally, I analyze the research ethics that guide this project, addressing my Institutional Review Board (IRB) agreement, the Conference on College Composition and Communication’s (CCCC) Position Statements on Research Ethics, and the responsibilities that come with conducting research in Hawai‘i.

CHAPTER THREE analyzes a number of local and national contexts in which to understand programmatic data on the trinary collaborations that transpired within the University of Hawai‘i Writing Mentors Program. The chapter approaches trinary FYC classrooms as a kind of foil to national scenes of FYC, which are increasingly characterized by “efficiency” models. Narrating the inception of the program, I trace the UHM English Department’s decision to dispense with a longstanding writing placement exam that had been used to determine which FYC students qualified for tutoring in favor of offering mentoring aimed at “helping every UHM student excel in English 100.” The chapter then analyzes several features of the program’s administration for the ways in which WPA approaches shaped mentors’ performances, the program’s culture, and the research presented by this dissertation. And finally, the chapter considers how the fledgling initiative survived an era of deep university-wide budget cuts to become institutionalized, analyzing how WPA’s leveraged quantitative data as evidence of
programmatic “outcomes” while underscoring the program’s broader value to participants and the institution through qualitative research. These accounts serve to remind readers that these data, which now serve as the foundation for my dissertation, must be read in light the environment in which they were produced: a time in which participants’ awareness of the need to justify continued programmatic existence promoted a certain *esprit de corps* and emphasis on programmatic success stories.

CHAPTER FOUR, The Paradoxes of Team Performance: Writing Mentor Researchers’ Institutional Positioning and Lived Positionalities in Trinary Classrooms, draws upon theories of performance arising from the disciplines of theatre studies, sociology, and anthropology. The chapter analyzes how mentors’ job description—which instructed them to “develop rapport with students,” without “undermin[ing] the authority of the instructor”—placed them in the privileged and precarious position of collaborating closely with students and instructors without being perceived as collaborating *against* the other party. I catalogue the mentor roles depicted in end-of-semester surveys by students and instructors, highlighting how accounts of mentors’ work across the three parties both reflect and complicate Erving Goffman’s notions of team performance as involving reciprocal dependence and familiarity. I then take up mentors’ descriptions of the most fulfilling and frustrating elements of their experiences in trinary collaborations, analyzing the unique perspectives that emerged by virtue of the paradoxes this third actor inhabits. Drawing upon theorists such as Marvin Carlson, Richard Schechner, and Jon McKenzie, this chapter also highlights how adding a new social actor to the binary teacher-student configuration shifts the terms of the familiar
FYC *mise-en-scène* in ways that underscore the performativity of the classroom enterprise and that reconfigure teaching and learning.

CHAPTER FIVE, The Place-Based Work of Writing Mentor Researchers, draws upon place-based theories of composing to identify the expanded theories and practices for enacting place-based approaches enabled through trinary configurations. Working with the metaphor of the palimpsest, this chapter considers several layers of mentors’ place-based work, with place defined variously as a site of auto-ethnographic research; as locations of mentor-student writing conferences; as kinds of spaces (i.e. classroom, social, virtual, etc.) in which trinary collaborations occurred; and as Hawaiʻi itself. The chapter specifically considers how Native Hawaiian understandings of the land as ʻāina inflect readings of conference logs and weekly memos composed by a sub-set of mentors who identified with a cultural framework that considers Hawaiʻi to be much more significant and multi-faceted than a kind of Burkean “scene” or backdrop for college students’ educations. Drawing upon Nedra Reynolds’ work on dwelling, this chapter illustrates the ways in which these third classroom actors mentored students on “inhabiting spaces and discourses” in relation to FYC, the university campus, and Hawaiʻi. And it highlights the interstitial nature of the spaces and discourses mentors themselves inhabited, including the different ways mentors deployed their identities to fulfill their own mentoring goals and the demands of the position. These combined layers illustrate not only what trinary collaborations have to offer the University of Hawaiʻi Mānoa, but also what the University of Hawaiʻi Mānoa with its almost-unparalleled demographic diversity and its specific strength in indigenous scholarship has to offer to theories and practices of trinary collaborations and place-based composition.
The CONCLUDING chapter synthesizes perspectives and performances identified in the data chapters, noting the ways in which these “findings” are both place-specific and potentially applicable to trinary classrooms in other settings. The chapter also revisits my earlier arguments that the UHM Writing Mentors Program provides a powerful counter-model to the practices, politics, and epistemologies that increasingly standardize the national scene of FYC at research universities. To support future research involving classroom trinaries, this chapter proposes the creation of a searchable electronic database of program records in which all identities are carefully protected. Such a database would allow writing mentors to more fully occupy the role of “writing mentor researcher,” not only in being able to search previous conference logs for approaches taken to vexing issues but also to envision a more dynamic rhetorical situation for documenting and reflecting on their own work. On that note, I describe a vision of a dynamic research program being undertaken by future writing mentors, and I grant my permission for them to utilize the data I have designed and collected, taking their work in whatever new directions their trinary collaborations lead them.

**Areas of Contribution**

This dissertation represents the first extended study (1) to conceive of the three-party writing classroom configuration as a “trinary;” (2) to present triangulated empirical research on this third classroom actor across a large sampling of trinary FYC classrooms; and (3) to document and conceptualize the performance-related and place-based dimensions of writing mentors’ work in trinary configurations. In addition to applying performance and spatial theories to studies of writers in original ways, this dissertation contributes to a number of conversations in Composition Studies without being confined
exclusively to any one conversational thread. Examples of such conversations include research within the Writing Across the Curriculum community on writing fellows; Writing Center debates about the ideal relationship between the classroom space and the writing center; considerations about how to prepare graduate students as teachers of writing; and analyses of the strengths and limitations of teacher research, including the problem of how teachers’ perspectives of student performance are always inflected by the binary configuration of the traditional composition classroom. This project also speaks back to the enterprise of FYC on a national scale by documenting how a public land-grant university has sustained and enhanced its commitment to prioritizing first-year composition—heeding UH Vice Chancellor Reed Dasenbrock’s challenge not to approach general education as a “cash cow” but as the university’s “core competency”—and doing all of this at a time when short-term efficiency models for the administration of FYC are very much on the rise.

The project also suggests that third classroom actors specifically—and those in Composition and Rhetoric more broadly—have much to contribute to and learn from conversations in other discourse communities, including mixed methods research, mentoring and tutoring studies, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, research on the First-Year Experience, and college student retention and persistence. It is my hope that this project provokes others to more effectively research and pursue forms of trinary teaching, learning, thought, and action in their own institutional contexts.
Notes

1 That the word “trinary” has not reached common parlance is also evident in Microsoft Word’s identification of it as a spelling error and its top two suggested replacement terms of “urinary” and “trinity.”

2 Of course, the lived relations among these six entities are nowhere nearly as symmetrical or static as Figure 1.1 might imply. Each participant in the trinary has her or his own unique set of relations with all other parties, and these relations are best understood as fluid and shifting.

3 Rhetoricians will recognize in the term “actor” a link to Kenneth Burke, and histories of performance studies often depict Burke’s dramatistic pentad as a precursor to the work of Erving Goffman, Victor Turner, Richard Schechner and others, with the exception that Burke’s focus on motives is not generally included in the scope of performance studies (Carlson 14-15; Denzin 28; Fishman et al. 228). I work primarily with the branch of Performance Studies located at the intersection of theatre studies and anthropology, rather than with the branch derived from language philosophy that focuses on speech acts and performative utterances forwarded by such figures as J.L. Austin, John Searle, Jacques Derrida, and Judith Butler. Working with this second branch of performance theory would be an interesting, but different, study than the one I pursue here.

4 Examples of composition scholarship that richly engage technological performance (while illustrating the degree to which technological performances overlap with cultural and organizational performances) include Stuart Selber’s Multiliteracies for a Digital Age; Johndan Johnson-Eilola’s Datacloud: Toward a New Theory of Online Work; Anne Frances Wysocki, Johndan Johnson-Eilola, Cynthia L. Selfe, and Geoffrey Sirc’s Writing New Media: Theory and Applications for Expanding the Teaching of Composition; and Adam Banks’s Race, Rhetoric, and Technology: Searching for Higher Ground.

5 The data on first-generation status for first-year students were drawn from anonymous end-of-semester student surveys, which had a 72% rate of return. Other data were taken from institutional records and demographic surveys completed by mentors and instructors, and they represent 100% of the study’s population.

6 For the purposes of comparison across institutional position, I utilized UHM’s classification system for ethnicity. Such rigid classifications elide the complexity of ethnic identifications represented in mentor and instructor responses to the question on my demographic survey that asked participants, “How would you describe your ethnicity?” For insightful analysis of the problems with UHM’s ethnicity classification system, please see Nordstrom. The numbers in the table represent relative percentages of ethnicities across the 100 mentored sections in my study. Because many mentors and instructors participated in more than one section of the study, I have chosen to present demographics of mentors and instructors according to the hundred sections in the study. For example, mentors across 39% of the total sections self-identified in ways the university would classify as Caucasian; mentors in 15% of the sections self-identified in ways the university would classify as “mixed race;” mentors in 14% of the sections self-identified in ways the university would classify as Hawaiian or Part-Hawaiian; mentors in 11% of the sections self-identified in ways the university would classify as Japanese; and so on. The numbers listed for students represent percentages of the 1,491 total mentored FYC students. I was not able to obtain demographic data for the six students in English
190: First-Year Composition for Transfer Students, so my student percentages represent 99 rather than 100 sections. This missing section should not change the overall trends identified in the table below.

7 In multiple sections, however, mentors were older than their assigned instructors (n=16) or within five years of age (n=13). As one mentor in this inverse-age scenario reported, several students during her intake interviews inquired about the instructor’s credentials and suggested that the mentor teach the course instead, requiring a carefully-articulated explanation and performance of institutional identity in order for students to understand and utilize appropriately both instructor and mentor roles. Another factor that prompted students to inquire about the instructor’s credentials was language. In a handful of pairings, students conveyed to the mentor that they had trouble understanding the instructor’s English and considered the instructor’s perceived accent to indicate a lack of qualification, a scenario in which mentors found opportunities to teach about language variety and the advantages of being conversant in world Englishes.

8 As one professor explained in an anonymous end-of-semester evaluation of the mentoring program: “A single teacher, no matter how experienced, can never be the ideal instructor for every student in the course; there are too many variables such as learning styles, teaching styles, accessibility, gender, etc. Having two instructors [i.e. an instructor and mentor] in the course clearly helps to have as many good matches as possible—particularly if the instructors have different teaching styles, are different genders, and are different in age—and if there is good communication between instructor and mentor. Sorry I don't have time to elaborate for this survey, but the benefits of a team approach to teaching a writing class for freshmen should be quite obvious. Naturally there can be a downside if the instructors and mentors are not well matched, but when instructors and mentors approach the course with clear, shared objectives and good will, mismatches should be infrequent” (IE 117).

9 This catalogue of names for the third classroom actor was drawn from the listing of writing fellows program compiled by Terry Zawacki on the WAC Clearinghouse website, and from Candace Spigelman and Lori Grobman’s edited volume, On Location: Theory and Practice of Classroom-Based Writing Tutoring.

10 From its beginnings as a pilot program in 2005 to its growth to over 20 mentored courses in 2007, the University of Texas Writing Mentors Program was quite popular among UT faculty. Mullin and Schorn explain in a 2007 WAC Journal article, “Serious discussions are now underway across campus at UT Austin about the role mentors could play if more resources were devoted to them, about the most effective size for such a program at an enormous institution like UT Austin, and about how writing mentors contribute to the mission and work of the Undergraduate Writing Center” (“Enlivening” n.p.). However, as announced by a 2008 article in The Daily Texan, the liberal arts dean cut the program’s funding (Bechdel). The article featured commentary from senior English major Adam Avramescu, who compared his work as a writing center tutor with his four semesters as a mentor: "I thought the two would be similar, but I was surprised how much of a difference tracking student progress makes.” (n.p.). Avramescu added, "The writing center is great for meeting with a consultant, but you can't develop a relationship” (n.p.).

11 Included in this WAC Clearinghouse Writing Fellows site is an extensive “Writing Fellows Bibliography,” as compiled by John Lauckner, Brad Hughes and Emily Hall, and expanded by Jill Reglin.
For additional perspectives on this specialist/generalist debate, see Terry Zawacki (“Writing Fellows”), Margot Soven (Curriculum-Based 212), and Mullin and Schorn (“Enlivening”).

In Appendix A, I note that the term “fellow” connotes the male gender whereas the terms “mentor” and tutor do not directly connote a specific gender. While the term “mentor” may represent motives and implications that are more in line with the UHM Writing Mentors Program mission and scope, it is hardly an unproblematic or gender-free term. Feminist readings have analyzed how the goddess Athena’s interventions while disguised as the character of “Mentor” within Homer’s Odyssey reveal “the (all-) powerful mentoring the powerful to ensure the continuation of the nascent patriarchy and suppression of matrilineal forms” (264), whereas contemporary applications of the term “mentor” tend to “promote a stereotype of feminized caring” (Colley 269). A similar argument about the term’s baggage is made by Jenn Fishman and Andrea Lunsford. As for the term “tutor,” the OED date charts indicate English usages as early as 1377, and the examples that follow reveal heavy class and gender biases, as tutoring was generally reserved for male children of well-to-do families (OED online). As Lex Runciman argues in “Defining Ourselves: Do We Really Want to Use the Word Tutor?” the term carries a very different set of connotations to the contemporary American college student’s ear. Runciman explains that American students are generally conditioned by early schooling experiences to perceive of tutors as agents of remedial education: “I remember overhearing my third-grader talking about a fellow student who ‘wasn’t learning very well and had to go to a tutor.’ Third graders know who uses tutors: the so-called slow learners, those needing special help. Third graders know what tutors do: tutors teach; tutors possess knowledge which students need but do not yet have. And unfortunately, third graders also tend to belittle or tease those needing special help” (28). Such a stigma, Runciman argues, persists into college. Both of these contrasting connotations—one of privilege and the other of remediation—are problematic.

For example, although the instructor-tutor-student triads in Corbett’s dissertation were all situated within developmental FYC courses at the University of Washington, tutors’ in-class involvement varied greatly across the four case studies: one attended class daily; another every-other-class; another twice over the semester during group peer review sessions; and other did not step foot into the classroom at all (4).

In his dissertation literature review, Corbett identified my 2006 Praxis article as the first “systematic study of one-to-one tutorial sessions” within the literature on CBT (6). A powerful example of this dynamic is related in the article, “Challenging Our Practices, Supporting Our Theories: Writing Mentors As Change Agents Across Discourse Communities” (Mullin et al.). It occurred in a writing conference in which Rachel Hertz, an MA student in English and writing mentor assigned to an NROTC class on leadership and ethics met with a student named “Lena.” As the article narrates, “Lena broke down and cried during a mentoring session, voicing her concerns about her religious beliefs and her fears about her ability to ‘pull the trigger’ if called upon to do so in the line of duty. In this case the struggle was part of the student's induction into the profession as she sought to articulate her place within the military, her position on the paper under discussion, and her own identity. She was not crying to someone who might or might not understand the military community; she was not crying alone either. She
was instead with Rachel, a newly accepted member of her community who, with her, successfully worked through the position, paper and identity in question, allowing Lena to construct these with/in the authoritative discourse she had chosen to speak” (n.p.). Based upon UHM writing mentors’ reports that students sometimes broached deeply personal issues with them, mentors’ program orientations include a workshop conducted by the University’s Counseling and Student Development Center on active listening, self-care, and recognizing situations in which referrals are appropriate and/or necessary. 17 In Fall 2009, Professor Henry offered a graduate seminar titled “Mentoring Composition” that included readings from both discourse communities. The course website can be viewed at www.english.hawaii.edu/henry/705/2009/home.html. 18 While the term “essential attributes” may sound rather essentialist and reductive to the ear of a humanities reader, Roberts explains that these repeated characteristics of mentoring found in the literature “are not fixed and permanent” but rather “are dependent upon those who perceive the phenomenon of mentoring and the choice of language they deploy to ascribe meaning to their experience” (151). 19 In Mentoring in Schools: A Handbook of Good Practice, Sarah Fletcher observes: “The mentee is as much an agent in bringing about effective mentoring as the mentor and neither can operate in a vacuum” (8). Carol Mullen’s A Graduate Student Guide: Making the Most of Mentoring focuses primarily on the role of the mentee, delineating how graduate students can construct relationships with potential mentors and engage these mentors most effectively. 20 By Homer’s narration, King Odysseus entrusts his friend, Mentor, with keeping his household intact while he is away fighting the Trojan wars, only to return from his long absence to find the household in a state of disarray. As Deborah Colley points out, it is the goddess Athene who actually “assures Odysseus’ return home, prepares his son for their reunion, and assists them to retain the throne of Ithaca from usurpers who have created chaos there” (260). Andy Robert and Anastasia Chernopiskaya explain that the positive attributes of the term “mentor” as are not traceable to the Mentor figure in Homer’s Odyssey but to that of François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon’s 1699 Les Adventures de Télémaque. While serving as the appointed tutor to Louis XIV’s grandson, Fénelon’s re-wrote the classical story from the perspective of Telemachus, portraying the character of Mentor as a source of wisdom, guidance, support, and nurturing (Roberts and Chernopiskaya 87). Within Fénelon’s version, it is the goddess Minerva rather than Athene who cross-dresses, at times, as Mentor (Colley; Fishman and Lunsford). In their article “Educating Jane,” Jenn Fishman and Andrea Lunsford trace the subsequent translation, distribution, and repurposing of Fénelon’s work across Europe, citing one Enlightenment translation that esteemed the work as second only to the Bible in its ability to teach virtue (27). This interest in the one-to-one relationship of Mentor to Telemachus paralleled the rise of universal schooling, a model which offered another means of literacy instruction to that of the tutor-apprentice model long employed within aristocratic circles. As Fishman and Lunsford claim, the feminist reader “would have to read very hard against the grain to find within Telemachus ground for critique, and she would be equally at a loss to find within Fenelon’s story hints or clues about alternative mentoring stories and arrangements” (27). Based upon their feminist historical readings, Fishman and Lundford describe themselves to be “deeply ambivalent about mentorship” and all
the more aware of “how vexed and vexing mentorship can be” (19). Helen Colley also concludes her “A ‘Rough Guide’ to the History of Mentoring from a Feminist Marxist Perspective” with the statement that such readings “reveal that official concepts of mentoring have shifted from dominant groupings reproducing their own power, to subordinate groupings reproducing their own oppression” (257).

Bright presents the findings of a participant-observation study of senpai-kōhai relations in the Uedagin Bank in Japan that identified the following widespread characteristics of the relationship:

1. The senpai is older than his kohai, has worked longer for the bank, and is in a position of power relative to him. This power enables the senpai to assist the kohai in one or more ways. It also means that the senpai is secure and established compared to his kohai.
2. The senpai is beneficially disposed toward the kohai.
3. The kohai accepts the benefits bestowed by the senpai.
4. These acts and related feelings are the basis of the relationship, though no explicit agreement is stated.
5. Ideally, the kohai feels gratitude to the senpai for his beneficence, and this feeling is accompanied by a desire to return the favour along with a commitment to become, in turn, a good senpai for someone younger (qtd in Bright 332: Rohlen 123-124).

In a participant check roundtable, another mentor who had lived in Japan and was quite familiar with the the senpai-kōhai relationship explained that he saw this analogy as limited with respect to the writing mentor and first-year student relationship, given that the kōhai aspires to one day become the senpai within the same organization, and will likely do so, whereas very few FYC students aspire to become graduate students in English or will likely do so.

When I have polled mentors as to whether it would be beneficial to standardize programmatic policies by instituting mandatory conferences and/or by creating a one-hour lab section for mentored classes, the overwhelming sentiment among mentors was that such an approach would compromise the rapport, sense of informality, flexibility, opportunities for modeling and teaching responsible student behaviors within the university, and spirit of volunteerism that made for effective mentor-student relationships within the context of Hawai‘i, qualities which correspond to those of the senpai-kōhai relationship. A one-hour lab would likely solve the number one frustration voiced by mentors in Chapter Four related to the challenges of scheduling conferences with students in the absence of mutual conferencing windows and the difficulties of maintaining a steady stream of conferences in the absence of necessary instructor supports. However, this “solution” was assessed by mentors as not being place-appropriate, a reminder that effective writing program administration must also be place-based. I develop this discussion more in Chapter Three.

In Chapters Two and Three, I analyze in further detail the methodology for arriving at these figures as well as the problematic construct of “participant satisfaction.”

For example, while the rates of response were quite high across all three parties by survey standards (Dillman), it should be noted that 28% of students, 23% of mentors, and 22% of instructors abstained from completing the survey. A variety of factors may have
lead an individual not to complete the evaluation, ranging from the survey request coming at the busiest time of the semester to a fear one participant shared with me that voicing outright critiques of the program would have negative repercussions. I believe that many program participants viewed extreme circumspection and/or silence as the rhetorical modes that were perhaps most appropriate for individuals without job security (i.e. mentors and non-tenured instructors) as well as for any individuals living on an island aware of the likelihood that they would continue to cross professional and personal paths with program participants long after the semester’s end. And so these silences, particularly as they are influenced by institutional position and local cultures, should be taken seriously and interpreted as possible critiques. Chapter Two considers additional problems with survey research, including the lack of opportunity to follow up with anonymous survey respondents for clarification or to probe changes in perspective over time. For example, one mentor explained to me that she had ranked the initiative poorly after her first semester under the direction of a slightly dysfunctional instructor, but after additional mentoring experiences with different instructors she found herself re-revaluating these earlier critiques.
CHAPTER 2: Constructing a Methodology for Place-Based Research on Writing Mentors in Trinary Configurations

Introduction

In my review of recent Composition and Rhetoric dissertations, I found that methodology chapters (or more often methodology sections) frequently began with definitions of “method” and “methodology” from Sandra Harding’s 1987 introduction to *Feminism and Methodology* or from Gesa Kirsch and Patricia Sullivan’s 1992 citation of Harding in their *Introduction to Methods and Methodology in Composition Research*. Harding defines method as “a technique (or way of proceeding in) gathering evidence” and methodology as “a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed” (3). In *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith also cites Harding’s definitions, amplifying them with the following explanation of the significance of methodology for research conducted in indigenous settings:¹

Methodology is important because it frames the questions being asked, determines the set of instruments and methods to be employed and shapes the analyses. Within an indigenous framework, methodological debates are ones concerned with the broader politics and strategic goals of indigenous research. It is at this level that researchers have to clarify and justify their intentions. Methods become the means and procedures through which the central problems of the research are addressed. (143)
While I do not intend to speak for Hawaiians, which would be impossible due to the rich multiplicity of voices and perspectives within Hawaiian politics, culture, and scholarship, I do recognize that one of my primary audiences of Composition and Rhetoric specialists in the continental U.S. will likely be augmenting their knowledge on Hawai‘i through this dissertation, thus heightening my responsibilities as a researcher. Furthermore, because my study of the UH Writing Mentors Program is situated in the colonized indigenous context of Hawai‘i; and because Native Hawaiian mentors, students, and instructors contributed to this project; and because a majority of FYC sections in the study included reading and writing assignments which engaged indigenous issues pertaining to Hawai‘i, it is important that I attempt to listen to indigenous voices in constructing the project’s methodology and methods. To that end, I structure the sections of this chapter according to ways in which Linda Tuhiwai Smith names the importance of research: the questions being asked; instruments and methods employed; data analysis; and research ethics and intentions. I address research ethics in light of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), my own professional community of Composition Studies, and my site of research in Hawai‘i. Conducting research in Hawai‘i has prompted me to critically re-examine a number of methodological issues, ranging from my own positionality as a researcher to the common ethnographic practice of assigning pseudonyms.

My research topic of trinary configurations has also forced me to re-think many methodological issues. For example, a primary source of data for the project consists of standardized logs that mentors were instructed to complete following
every mentor-student writing conference. However, in the context of trinary FYC collaborations the notion of a writing conference as a scheduled event in a set time and place quickly unravels, and mentors found themselves completing conference logs for text messages, hallway conversations, cross-campus walks, personalized library research orientations, and more—with such happenings lasting from seconds to hours. As such, the trinary configurations not only pushed me to ask, “What is a writing conference?” but also, “Is it still appropriate to classify these mentor-student interactions as ‘writing conferences,’ given their degree of variation within the trinary classrooms in my study?” Furthermore, when mentors logged these “writing conferences,” they frequently analyzed not only their own interventions, but also students’ performances in light of instructors’ assignments. This scenario prompted one instructor to suggest that she, too, was a research subject in mentors’ logs. In light of such questions as “For research on writing mentors working within trinary configurations, what constitutes a human subject?” both the head IRB officer (who had occupied the position for a full career) and I found ourselves faced with a suite of new complexities and considerations. Thus, this chapter not only presents my methods and their precedents within qualitative and mixed methods research, but also analyzes the ways in which place-based research on writing mentors in trinary configurations situates a researcher in unprecedented methodological spaces and demands that she construct her own methodologies.

**Research Questions**

This dissertation addresses the following overarching research questions:
(1) How do writing mentors within trinary first year-composition configurations depict their work in relation to students, instructors, writing program administrators, the institution, and Hawai‘i?

(2) How do writing mentors’ perspectives and performances inflect trinary participants’ experiences of FYC within this context?

(3) In what ways are trinary FYC collaborations of value (to program participants, the institution, the profession)?

The research questions I initially proposed in my dissertation prospectus focused equally on all three trinary parties; however, as I undertook the actual analyses and writing, I became increasingly convinced that writing mentors deserved to be the dissertations’ primary focus due to (a) their unique positioning as institutional actors and (b) the complex, varied, and significant work they perform. Furthermore, my own positioning as a graduate writing program administrator and research assistant to the UH Writing Mentors Program from 2007-2011 allowed me the most direct and in-depth access to the perspectives and performances of the mentors, with much more limited access to the perspectives and performances of the other trinary parties. Thus, I devote the most attention in my dissertation to the mentors themselves, utilizing the perspectives of instructors and students primarily to triangulate my interpretations of mentors’ work.

**Epistemological Underpinnings and Scope**

These research questions serve not only to delineate the focus of this study but also its epistemological underpinnings and scope. Within my research questions, I avoided language that implied a search for ultimate cause-effect relationships
between the mentor’s presence and student performances, selecting the verbs “depict” and “inflect” to signal the complexity of trinary configurations. Reading thousands of mentors’ accounts of student performance has raised my awareness of the range of variables influencing student writers—institutional, cultural, geographic, educational, generational, economic, ethnic, gender, familial, interpersonal, religious/spiritual, technological, health-related, disability-related, and more. These variables multiply greatly (and interact unpredictably) in a research project involving trinary configurations, as each classroom scene involves not only students and instructors but also writing mentors, each bringing to the mix different educational agendas, backgrounds, and relationships. Thus, while I employ quantitative evidence as part of my mixed-methods approach elaborated in later this chapter, the project has strongly qualitative underpinnings.

Furthermore, this dissertation involves a study of participants’ perspectives and performances rather than of the trinary classrooms themselves. While an ethnography examining the performances that transpire inside trinary classrooms would be an interesting topic to pursue in future research, it is beyond the scope of my present study. For one, much of my data comes from mentors’ depictions of mentor-students conferences, 96% of which were conducted outside the physical classroom. (That mentors’ conference log narratives so frequently referenced events that took place within the classroom highlights the contingency of the inside/outside binary I enact in my necessary delineation of a research scope.) Beyond the three sections of FYC in which I served as a writing mentor or an instructor paired with a mentor, I had no firsthand access to actual class sessions. Thus, as explained in the
Preface, I approach the project as an auto-ethnography of mentors’ auto-ethnographically inflected institutional reporting on their work in classroom trinaries that seeks to illuminate the perspectives and performances that emerged from this configuration.

**Defining “Perspectives” and “Performances”**

An analysis of “perspectives” and “performances” requires stipulative definitions of both terms. Here, I am reminded of James Clifford’s caution to would-be ethnographers that “the proper referent of any account is not a represented ‘world’; now it is specific instances of discourse” (14). Ultimately, both the perspectives and performances I seek as a researcher are found within and constituted by discourse. Even the most seemingly non-discursive performances such the student’s grade that appears in institutional records is arrived at through many discursive acts and is itself a performative utterance (Austin).

For the purposes of this project, I define participants’ “perspectives” as *not only their stated opinions, rationales, and perceptions of (inter)relations, but also the motivations, beliefs, and attitudes implied in these statements.* As one’s perspective is commonly glossed as “where someone is coming from,” the term summons as a theoretical lens the growing field of place-based composition elaborated in Chapter 5. While I acknowledge that each participant in the study has a perspective that is unique from the rest, I look for patterns that develop within each institutional position of the trinary. As Matthew Miles and Michael Huberman recommend, I seek not only “typical” or “representative” instances, but also “negative” and “exceptional” cases (34; 270-271). I am aware, however, that I do
not have access to many of what would otherwise constitute the best examples of disconfirming instances, as these came from program participants who, for various reasons, are not research participants.\(^5\)

For the purposes of this study, I define “performances” as *the roles, acts, and utterances that are perceived and documented by a given institutional audience.* As performance theorist Richard Schechner suggests, what it means “to perform” can be understood productively in relation to the progression of concepts: “being, doing, showing doing, and explaining showing doing” (22). Shechner explains:

> Being is existence itself. Doing is the activity of all that exists, from quarks to sentient beings to super galactic strings. Showing doing is performing: pointing to, underlining, and displaying doing. Explaining showing doing is the work of performance studies. (22)\(^5\)

My working definition of performance functions as a bridge between “showing doing” and “explaining showing doing.” On one level, Writing Mentors Program archives contain multiple examples of trinary participants depicting themselves and their trinary counterparts doing the work of FYC; in many cases, participants also engage in “explaining showing doing” by reflecting upon their interventions, problematizing other trinary actors’ performances, and theorizing the roles they enact and encounter. This dissertation attempts both to “show doing” by cataloguing actions, roles, and utterances depicted by multiple trinary actors and to “explain showing doing” by grouping these actions, roles, and utterances according to salient themes, by considering these performances in light of various critical theories, and by forwarding an argument about the significance of mentors’ work in trinary collaborations. I construct notions of trinary
“performance” by combining quantitative institutional and programmatic records with participants’ qualitative accounts of actions and interactions within the trinary.6 In mixing these data, I hold in dialogue and tension Jon McKenzie’s categories of organizational, cultural, and technological performance that were elaborated in Chapter One. In my analyses of data for evidence of performance, I focus primarily on mentors’ depictions of their own performances vis-à-vis those of the other trinary actors, all the while acknowledging the ways in which mentors’ depictions are themselves performances.

My data chapters proceed from the premise that mentors’ positioning in the trinary (which includes the fact that mentors do not function as formal evaluators of student performance) enables them to act as a unique kind of audience for students, which in turn allows mentors to perceive and document elements of student and instructor performance unavailable to other institutional actors. In looking for evidence of performances in my data, I catalogue the variety of “stages” through/on which mentors intervene in student performance—both temporally in terms of the development of a piece of writing and spatially in terms of the locations of their interactions. I also code my data for the variety of roles mentors perform, from acting as sounding boards for ideas, to rehearsing writing and research strategies, to posing as critics of an argument. And I document the array of complicating variables mentors account for in theorizing a given student’s performance, including where the student comes from, the other classes a student is taking, personal challenges a student has disclosed, reactions to instructor grades or comments, interactions with other students during class, emotive gestures, and
more. I also address *role confusion* and conflict in trinary performances as depicted in mentors’ logs and participants’ end-of-semester evaluations.

**Instruments and Methods Employed**

The following section provides a description and analysis of the instruments and methods I used to gather my dissertation data. The project draws from eight different data sources which I list in approximate order of weight given: my own auto-ethnographic fieldnotes, mentors’ conference logs, mentors’ weekly memos, end-of-semester evaluation surveys by all three participant groupings, participant check discussions, a large-scale writing assessment, a demographic survey administered to mentors and instructors, and institutional records on first-year students’ backgrounds and subsequent academic performances. The table below offers a brief description of each item in my dataset, including the overall numbers of each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source and Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description of Data and Use in Dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto-ethnographic Fieldnotes (FN)</td>
<td>Observations recorded in pre-semester workshops, bi-weekly mentor roundtables, department meetings, program administrator sessions, and campus lectures. Includes fieldnotes taken across 21 notebooks spanning Fall 2006-Spring 2011. Used as a theoretical lens, narrative voice, and triangulating source across all dissertation chapters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors’ Conference Logs (CL) (Appendices C-G)</td>
<td>Standardized data collection instrument completed by mentors following each student conference. Includes checkboxes on conference attendance and topics discussed, followed by a prompt for mentor narratives that describe and analyze the mentor’s interventions. Collection under analysis includes 6,602 conference logs with mentors’ permission. Employed as a primary source in Chapter Five.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors’ Weekly Memos (WM) (Appendices H-J)</td>
<td>Standardized data collection instrument completed by mentors at the end of each week. Asks for a summary and analysis of the week’s mentoring activities, followed by an exploration of pedagogical implications for future mentoring. Collection includes 653 memos with mentors’ permission. Employed as a primary source in Chapter Five.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
End-of-Semester Evaluation Surveys (SE, ME, IE) (Appendices K-Q)  
Administered to students, mentors, and instructors at the end of each semester. Combines qualitative and quantitative prompts that invite feedback on the mentor’s performance and the program’s overall effectiveness. Collection totals 1,674 surveys with permission to quote, including 89 surveys by mentors, 133 by instructors, and 1,452 by students. Employed as a primary source for Chapters Three and Four.

Participant Check Roundtables (PCR)  
Five hour-long discussions with the 2011-2012 cohort of mentors, moderated by Holly Bruland in the absence of program administrators. Partial drafts of Chapters Four and Five were distributed to mentors prior to each session for their feedback. Discussions were digitally recorded and selectively transcribed. Employed as a primary and triangulating source for Chapters Four and Five.

Large-Scale Writing Assessment (Appendices R-U)  
Large-scale assessment of Foundations in Writing course. Stratified random sampling design allowed for comparison of mentored and non-mentored student writing in areas of content, organization, language & style, mechanics, and quality of reflective meta-commentary. Included 164 scored writing samples, 85 from mentored sections and 79 from non-mentored sections. Employed as a primary source for Chapter Three.

Demographic Surveys to Mentors and Instructors (DS) (Appendices V-W)  
Online survey that solicited demographic information on mentors’ and instructors’ institutional position, place(s) of origin, ethnicity, and more. Results include mentor and instructor responses across all 100 sections. Employed as a triangulating source for Chapters Three, Four, and Five.

Institutional Records  
Institutional records with demographic information on students enrolled in both mentored and non-mentored sections of FYC over a four-year period. Also included are longitudinal tracking of students’ overall GPA, enrollment status, and grades in Writing Intensive courses. Records include 2,461 mentored and 4,373 “non-mentored” students. Employed as a triangulating source for Chapters Three, Four, and Five.

As the table indicates, this dissertation project required unusually large amounts of time and energy devoted to data management. My five main data sources—my own fieldnotes, mentors’ conference logs, and mentors’ weekly memos, participant questionnaires, and recorded participant check roundtable discussions—could all be classified under the umbrella of ethnographic research, although as Miles and Huberman point out, research in the ethnographic tradition tends to rely on “relatively little pre-structured instrumentation” in favor of more open-ended methods for engaging participants and
scenes (8). In *Ethnography Step by Step*, however, educational ethnographer David Fetterman argues that once a researcher has spent some time in the field, standardized instrumentation can be appropriate and useful:

> Checklists and forms help to organize and discipline data collection and analysis. . . However, such lists and forms are not cast in stone; new topics emerge that merit exploration. . . Thus the researcher must continually modify old lists and forms and develop new ones throughout the study. (55-56)

Following Fetterman’s counsel, I endeavored to balance a desire to keep my data collection instruments responsive to emerging topics and programmatic exigencies, while also keeping them consistent enough to provide a longitudinal record. The following sections analyze my research instruments in light of their various precedents, intended purposes, evolutions, strengths and limitations. Whenever possible, instead of summarizing an instrument’s content, I refer readers to the actual instrument within the project’s appendices.

*Auto-Ethnographic Fieldnotes*

As noted in my introductory chapter and in Table 2.1, auto-ethnographic fieldnotes represent not only a source of data, but also invoke a tradition of research and way of knowing that substantially informs this dissertation. My collection of auto-ethnographic fieldnotes spans five years and twenty-one notebooks. I started recording fieldnotes on the pre-pilot sections of the Writing Mentors Program as part of my seminar paper research for Professor Henry’s graduate course titled “Workplace Writing as Cultural Inscription.” Over the next five years, I took fieldnotes during such events as program orientations, bi-weekly mentor roundtables, program administrator sessions, and
department meetings (which I attended regularly in my first three years of graduate school). I generally did not devote a separate notebook exclusively to fieldnotes (as is typically advised) but kept them in a notebook that also included notes from graduate seminars and campus lectures (and especially those on Native Hawaiian issues which I made a point of attending whenever possible), serving as reminder of the rich context that influenced my evolving perceptions, critiques, and theories of trinary classrooms.

As a participant-observer, I generally arrived early at Writing Mentors Program events both to set up the room and to set up my fieldnotes for the day, jotting down the event’s date and agenda, a list of participants, and a drawing or description of the physical space, including my placement and movement within it. I generally organized the remainder of the page by way of a vertical line. The area to the left of the line was designated for action items, including follow-up emails on a mentor’s question that I was not able to satisfactorily respond to on the spot, references mentioned by a speaker that I wanted to look up, and administrative tasks for the program. The space to the right of the line was reserved for a variety of notes, including descriptive details, fragments of dialogue, depictions of participant interactions, and records of my own evolving questions, theories, and critiques. Each year during the roundtable devoted to examining mentors’ own fieldnotes in light of Laurel Richardson’s “Writing: A Method of Inquiry,” I was reminded of the range of fieldnotes ethnographers embrace, including observational, methodological, theoretical, and personal notes (381-382). I tended not to include many personal notes because I was usually positioned spatially in ways that rendered what I was writing visible to others. In mentor roundtables, department meetings, and campus lectures, for example, I generally found myself sitting shoulder-to-
shoulder with other attendees and felt uncomfortable recording the kinds of “uncensored feeling statements” advised by Richardson (382), subverting my fieldworker identity to that of graduate program administrator. Note taking was a common participatory mode of most of my fieldwork scenes, allowing me to occupy the fieldworker role fairly unobtrusively while simultaneously fulfilling my duties as writing program administrator and doctoral student. 

In preparation for writing my first drafts of the dissertation, I arranged my twenty-one notebooks containing fieldnotes in chronological order and re-read all of them. While I do not subject my fieldnotes to coding, I draw upon them frequently in specific narrative moments, for example, when creating “thick descriptions” (as coined by Gilbert Ryle and elaborated by Clifford Geertz) of the Writing Mentors Program’s evolution, when noting details of my interactions with mentors, and in triangulating depictions from other sources. In composing (and composing from) fieldnotes, I was guided by the work of sociologists Robert Emerson, Rachel Fretz, and Linda Shaw who, in *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*, explain that approaching fieldnotes as cultural inscription involves important implications for ethnographic writing:

1. What is observed and ultimately treated as “data” or “findings” is inseparable from the observational process. 2. In writing fieldnotes, the field researcher should give special attention to indigenous meanings and concerns of the people studied. 3. Contemporaneously written fieldnotes are an essential grounding and resource for writing broader, more coherent accounts of others’ lives and concerns. 4. Such fieldnotes should detail the social and interactional processes that make up people’s everyday lives and activities.
The authors’ placement of scare quotes around the terms “data” and “findings” serves as a textual reminder of the ethnographer’s presence, consciously selecting and unconsciously filtering not only what gets written down in fieldnotes, but also what gets written up in a final account. Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw define “indigenous meanings” as the meanings participants in the study assign to their own experiences (12-13). Given the location of this study in Hawai‘i, I cannot help but read another necessary interpretation of Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw’s council on “indigenous meanings,” and I have attempted to present not only participants’ terminologies and metaphors for mentoring more broadly but also Native Hawaiian epistemologies related to mentoring more specifically. For example, one of the most frequently recurring metaphors for the mentor across participant groupings is that of a “bridge,” and at the generous suggestion and sharing of Kanaka Maoli mentor Marie Alohalani Brown, I draw on the Hawaiian concept of mo’o to consider the kinds of generational, geographic, and epistemological bridging mentors perform (see Chapter Five).

Mentors’ Conference Logs

The archive of conference logs spans four years and includes 8,038 total logs, 6,602 of which mentors have given me permission to use in this dissertation. These conference logs are the most rich and extensive of my data sources; as such, my analysis of them here is more elaborate than any other category of data. The conference log overlaps with a number of research instruments used within Composition Studies: attendance database entry forms (Palmquist) and tutor session reports (Jackson “We” and “Beyond”) used by Writing Centers; reflective journals in teacher research (Cochran-Smith and Lytle; Hubbard and Power; Ray); and “observation forms” (Fetterman) and
“contact summary sheets” (Miles and Huberman) from ethnographic fieldwork. Of this list, the mentor conference log most closely resembles the purposes and protocols for contact summary sheets, a standardized data collection instrument that Miles and Huberman recommend for coordinating multi-researcher fieldwork studies (51-54). Intended to be composed after a field contact (which I define as any mentor-student “conference”) and in consultation with the researcher’s contemporaneously-taken fieldnotes, the one-page contact summary sheet invites “a perspective that combines immediacy with a reflective overview of what went on in the contact” (52). As in our programmatic guidelines, Miles and Huberman (following Lofland and Lofland), advise completing these write-ups within a day of the field contact, adding “It’s a good rule, which we aren’t always able to respect” (52), a caveat that validates mentors’ repeated confessions of becoming heavily backlogged at some point in their experience.

As David Fetterman explains in *Ethnography Step By Step*, “after some experience in the field, the fieldworker can develop forms that facilitate data capture” (55). In consultation with the pilot study mentors and Professor Henry, I streamlined the pilot study logs from a more narrative-based format to the more structured data collection instrument used in the full-fledged program (see Appendices C, D, and E). The current conference log was designed to fulfill a number of purposes: Programmatically, the log offered a record of conference attendance and session content that could be used to track mentors’ interventions, to generate data for accreditation purposes, and to justify continued funding. Pedagogically, the instrument was intended to prompt reflection, to help mentors connect theory and praxis, and to serve as a starting point for program administrators to offer formative feedback to mentors. Finally, in terms of my own
research agenda, logs were designed to enhance understandings of mentors’ perspectives and self-reported performances within trinary configurations. 

As displayed in Appendix D, the conference log consists of three sections, beginning with a solicitation of seemingly basic attendance information. Although recording the “what” of conference attendance may seem straightforward, I found it to be surprisingly complex. Due to the nature of trinary configurations, mentors interacted with students not only during formally-scheduled conferences in the designated mentoring space in the undergraduate library— as they would have in a writing center—but also in hallways before and after class; in class during designated class meeting times; when passing one another on campus; and via email, phone, text message, and Instant Messenger (IM). As a program administrator, I fielded numerous mentor queries regarding what “counted” as a log-able conference. For example, should a mentor log an informal dialogue in the hallway before class lasting approximately two-to-three minutes in which the student shared with the mentor her proposed paper title and asked for feedback? How should the mentor account for pairing up with a student during an in-class workshop and offering comments on a draft? Should the mentor log an email exchange in which she coached the student through registration difficulties? Or a lunch meeting with a mentee from the previous semester in which the student asked the mentor for a letter of reference? Or an email reminding a student of an upcoming conference? Given that this range of interactions represented work mentors performed within trinary configurations, my response came to be, “If your interaction with the student involved intentional mentoring on your part, then count it as a ‘conference’ and go ahead and log it.”
The second section of the conference log poses the question, “What elements of the student's performance did your session address?” and offers a checklist of twenty conference topics ranging from understanding the assignment’s requirements, to applying the instructor’s comments for revision, to handling issues of college and personal life not directly related to the course. This list of topics grew over multiple iterations of the instrument and, as Chapter Four demonstrates, could expand indefinitely based upon mentors’ hugely varied roles and experiences. Each year, Professor Henry and I devoted one of the initial bi-weekly roundtables to training, analyzing, and responding to questions on mentors’ conference documentation responsibilities as composition researchers. In order to facilitate shared yet nuanced understandings of the twenty conference topics on the checklist, mentors were asked to brainstorm as wide a range of mentoring activities as possible that could fall under a given category, also enhancing these categories’ heuristic dimensions. In this activity, mentors often identified location-specific applications and oppositional readings of the categories: under the category of “honing grammar, usage, and style,” mentors offered the example of affirming students’ home languages by encouraging strategic uses of Hawai‘i Creole English (HCE). The activity was so rich it could have more than filled an entire roundtable hour, and Professor Henry and I found that we had to carefully manage the time so as to allow for a discussion of the narrative section.

The third part of the log presented mentors with the following prompt: “How did you go about addressing these elements of the student's performance?” Professor Henry and I instructed mentors to devote extended discourse of 250 words or more to only one log narrative per week; all other log entries for the week could be quite brief, with a two-
to-three sentence description sufficing. Mentors were encouraged to choose for elaboration the conference that interested them most, perhaps because it represented a breakthrough, continued to trouble them, or took place with a student writer of interest. For the one elaborated narrative per week, we offered some guidelines from ethnographic theory on writing thick descriptions. For example, Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw address a number of terms that have been proposed to describe ethnographic writing similar to mentors’ depictions of conferences, including “inscription” (Geertz), “transcription” (Clifford), “translation,” “textualization” (Clifford and Marcus), and “narrating” (Richardson) (15-16). Program administrators most frequently referred to this writing as a “narrative” to highlight mentors’ roles as authors. Furthermore, by framing conference log descriptions as “narratives” we hoped to engage mentors who did not identify as Compositionists, resisted the notion of empirical research, or who did not see their work as ethnographic. For example, for the 24% of the writing mentors in my study who claimed Literary Studies as their primary or secondary area of concentration, the term “narrative” would likely call to mind readings or coursework in Narratology or other narrative theories, helping them to think more critically about such elements within their own writing as the narrator or narrators constructed, discourses invoked, and roles assigned to audience members (Henry “Narratological”). Or for the 36% of the mentors who claimed Creative Writing as their primary or secondary area of concentration, the term “narrative” may have signaled the overlaps in sensory detail and authorial voice that make both for effective creative and ethnographic writing. As Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw caution, “not all life experiences are well represented as cohesive stories: a narrative could push open-ended or disjointed interactions into a coherent, interconnected
sequence” (16). Similarly, I found in early conference log narratives a tendency toward happy endings with proclamations of conferencing success. In roundtables and email correspondence, I regularly made a point of advising mentors to apply their knowledge of effective postmodern narratives to the creation of these logs by resisting tidy closures and the kinds of generalizations that an omniscient narrator might make in favor of more operationalized, evidence-based accounts, advice I am now attempting to follow myself in constructing a narrative of mentors’ work.\textsuperscript{11} As a follow-up to this roundtable “norming” session, I provided each mentor with individualized feedback on her or his logs over email during the first month of the semester, once again around the mid-semester mark, and whenever a mentor posed a question in an email or log that indicated the desire for a response. Later in the academic year, Professor Henry and I often conducted another follow-up roundtable in which mentors were asked to photocopy a log (with the student’s name and any identifying information deleted) to share with the group, which exposed mentors to varying conferencing approaches and narrative styles. The session also gave mentors a broader sense of programmatic research endeavors.

From Fall 2006 through Fall of 2008, I administered the conference logs in the form of a Microsoft Word template, and mentors were instructed to email their logs to me as attachments at the end of each week. Furthermore, at the end of each month mentors were instructed to email me with an updated Excel spreadsheet tracking conference attendance across their section. Given the tedious process of downloading and organizing records for a program administrator\textsuperscript{12}—as well as feedback that completing the logs and especially updating the Excel spreadsheets felt too laborious for the mentors—I moved the conference logs to the online data collection tool, Survey Monkey, beginning in
Spring of 2009. On the whole, mentors reported that it was significantly faster to complete the logs on SurveyMonkey, and they especially appreciated not having to keep Excel spreadsheets. The negative, however, was a reduced sense of ownership on the part of mentors over their own conference logs. SurveyMonkey did not allow for mentors to access their own logs (without seeing other mentors’ logs), and so once mentors submitted a log, they could not revisit it. To ameliorate this situation, I endeavored to email mentors with an updated copy of their logs (and eventually their weekly memos) prior to each bi-weekly roundtable. Mentors also developed individualized approaches to record keeping, and a majority of mentors reported that they initially composed their log narratives in word processing software. Many mentors explained that in preparation for an upcoming conference with a given student, they reread their logs from prior conferences with that student, using the logs as a means of refreshing their memory regarding such details as the student’s goals for the course, writing challenges, and previous paper topics.

In the Fall of 2007 and 2008, when I was serving as both a program administrator and an English 100 instructor paired with a mentor, I discovered a potential conflict between these two roles. As a rule, English 100 instructors did not have access to mentors’ logs, as they contained information that students shared in confidence with the mentor. To enable my assigned mentors and students this same confidentiality, I instructed the mentor to email all logs to Professor Henry. Only after final grades were submitted did Professor Henry email me the file of these logs. I also decided not to attend the roundtable slots to which my mentors were assigned in order to allow the mentor space to discuss the students and course outside of my presence.
I draw upon mentors’ conference logs as a primary source for Chapter Five and as a triangulating source for most of the additional chapters. Consonant with the dissertation’s use of performance theory to critically examine trinary performances, the conference logs themselves include the term performance in both the second and third prompts. This language helps to frame mentors’ work (and reflections on their work) *not* as attempts to change student writers, but as interventions aimed at broadening students’ abilities to occupy various writerly roles and to enact those roles in ways that increase their likelihood of being successfully received within classroom and institutional cultures. As such, I approach these conference log narratives as mentors’ reconstructions of their encounters with students, or more accurately as mentors’ self-representations of their interpretations of and interventions in student performances. As such, conference log narratives offer a selective rendering of the mentor-student interaction and should themselves be read as performances. In *The Performance of Self in Student Writing*, Thomas Newkirk draws on Erving Goffman’s notion of “a presentation of self,” to argue that in autobiographical writing “a distinction can be made between a backstage, fragmented, autobiographical self and a ‘better’ more unified version of self that we construct” (6). This concept applies to the “backstage” nature of mentors’ conferences and the versions of those conferences mentors submit for the program archives. These narratives, however, also have the potential to disrupt the more unified snapshots of conferences that can develop from the log’s earlier two sections; as one mentor explained, the narrative portion of the log offered her an opportunity to “talk against” the log’s more quantitative, standardized, and reductive questions (FN).
Mentors’ Weekly Memos

From Fall 2009 though Spring 2011, mentors composed a total of 690 weekly memos, 653 of which I have been granted permission to use in my dissertation. The practice of keeping conceptual memos is a widely-endorsed ethnographic method. (Glaser; Heath and Street; Miles and Huberman; Straus and Corbin)¹⁴ Shirley Brice Heath and Brian Street explain that unlike data logs, which ostensibly are written with the head researcher of a project and/or the team of researchers as the intended audience, memos are a more writer-centered prose composed primarily for the memo writer herself (79). As Matthew Miles and Michael Huberman enumerate, memos can usefully address a variety of topics:

Memos can be written (a) on what is intensely puzzling or surprising about a case, (b) as alternative hypotheses in response to someone else’s memo, (c) to propose a specific new pattern code, (d) to integrate a set of marginal or reflective remarks already made on field notes, (e) when the analyst does not have a clear concept in mind but is struggling to clarify one, and (f) around a general theme or metaphor that pulls together discrete observations. (74)

While the Writing Mentor Program’s use of memoing enacts much of this ethnographic wisdom, the practice was inspired not by qualitative research handbooks but by a mentor in the program’s second year who voluntarily submitted a reflection on her mentoring at the end of each week. As both an administrator and researcher, I was fascinated to observe how this mentor adapted the conference log template to purposes beyond those I had initially envisioned for the instrument. While conference logs generally recorded mentors’ immediate observations and emotions, these reflections offered the mentor an
opportunity to reframe specific mentoring moments in the context of the week’s conferences and class sessions as a whole. She also used these reflections to consider such topics as the disciplinary expectations of writing as they varied across students’ university coursework; issues of space and place as they influence dynamics of teaching and learning; her own positionality as a mentor, and the complexities of trinary collaborations.15 This mentor’s weekly reflections helped me to see the potential of initiating a similar reflective practice for all mentors. In consultation with Professor Henry, I developed a weekly reflection template that was implemented beginning in Fall 2009.

Mentors were instructed to summarize and analyze their work at the end of each week in the format of a memo (see Appendices H, I, and J), which was housed on SurveyMonkey. The first question prompted mentors to provide a summative reflection on the week. Then, following Donald Schön’s notion that reflective teaching involves discerning “in the situation’s back talk a whole new idea, which generates a system of implications for further moves,” a second question prompted mentors to identify some pedagogical implications for future mentoring (64).16 On the whole, mentors reported that they had a more difficult time with this second prompt. I speculate that the difficulty lay in a number of factors: 1) that, as anybody who attempts to mesh theory with praxis has found, critical analysis does not translate easily into concrete, actionable steps; 2) that mentors were being asked to imagine original interventions that were often unprecedented in their previous work as writing center tutors or large-section TA’s; 3) that any follow-up steps would have to fit within the instructor’s vision and policies and might require negotiation prior to their implementation; 4) that the language of the
prompt located the responsibility to act with the mentor, when such responsibility was necessarily shared across all parties of the trinary. An example of this fourth factor can be found in memos following weeks with zero conferences, where mentors expressed frustration at having tried everything they believed possible and concluded that the instructors’ lack of incentives and/or students’ perceived lack of motivation were making it difficult for them to fulfill their job descriptions.

These memos are valuable to my dissertation because they offer a way of getting at mentors’ perspectives and performances that transcend the unit of the individual conference. While conference logs offer thick descriptions of mentor-student interactions, the weekly memos often theorize such interactions within the context of the trinary.17

*End-of-Semester Evaluation Surveys*

The end-of-semester surveys administered to students, mentors, and instructors combine the genres of the ethnographer’s questionnaire and institutional course evaluations. While David Fetterman describes questionnaires as perhaps the most rigid and formal research tool in a spectrum of ethnographic methods, he also believes that they provide a realistic means of gaining a representative sampling across large populations (56). However, as Fetterman explains, because the researcher has no face-to-face contact with questionnaire respondents, she has no means of clarifying confusion surrounding the questions being posed, following up with requests for clarification or elaboration, or factoring into her interpretations other interpersonal cues such as a participant’s gestures or tone of voice (56). Fetterman also cites the tendency for respondents to answer questions in the way they think the question should be answered rather than according in their actual experience, a factor that must be accounted for in
analyzing these survey responses (56), although it may be that the anonymous nature of my surveys led to less idealized responses than Fetterman projects.\textsuperscript{18}

The literature on institutional research within higher education also points to many problems with surveys, whether used for course evaluation, program assessment, or other institutional/commercial purposes. During the four-year window of my study, the phenomenon of online surveys increased exponentially, with online survey software packages such as eSurvey Pro, Question Pro, SurveyMonkey, SurveyGizmo, and Zoomerang making it relatively quick, easy, and inexpensive for novices to design, administer, and analyze a survey.\textsuperscript{19} As a result, students are now faced with unprecedented numbers of survey requests, many of which occur simultaneously and address overlapping topics (Porter). Consequently, institutions are finding that survey response rates are dropping while cynicism toward surveys is rising, a phenomenon known as “survey fatigue” (Adams and Umbach; Dillmam, Smyth, and Christian; Porter, Whitcomb, and Weitzer; Sax, Gilmartin, and Bryant). In response, many institutions “are beginning to view student cooperation with surveys as a scarce and valuable resource that should be used wisely” and to implement institutional survey oversight committees and policies that go beyond IRB review in an attempt to coordinate survey efforts and to address a variety of legal, ethical, and practical concerns regarding survey use and over-use (Porter 5-6).\textsuperscript{20}

This state of survey proliferation certainly applies to the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa, where responses to the Writing Mentors Program surveys demonstrate signs of “survey fatigue” ranging from haste, to sarcasm, to non-participation, to other forms of resistance. For example, one student noted, “Please have shorter fully multiple choice
evals” (SE 670). And in response to a question asking, “Is there anything else we should
know?” one instructor wrote, “Sorry, my mind is closed now. This is a difficult time for me,
filling out this survey. I would rather be (trying to write) my dissertation” (IE 57). In response to
another question asking instructors to theorize on the trinary arrangement, one instructor
wrote: “I don't have time to answer this in the detail you request” (IE 129). Perhaps the most
telling comment came on a department-wide survey conducted in 2010 by the
Foundations in Writing Assessment Committee: “And while I'm at it, death to Survey
Monkey.” As in the case of many cryptic though telling survey responses, I wish I could
follow up and ask for an elaborated explanation, but I suspect the comment was most
likely directed at the Writing Mentors Program, because I was the only member of the
department at that time who regularly used SurveyMonkey.

Despite the many problems with survey questionnaires, in many cases I found
respondents’ commentary to be surprisingly detailed and instructive. Numerous
participants generously devoted several sentences to a paragraph to a given qualitative
prompt. The richness of these responses has enabled co-authorship of two articles with
student and instructor survey discourse as their primary sources (Henry and Bruland;
Henry, Bruland, and Sano-Franchini). In my own dissertation, I code mentor, instructor,
and student commentary on their experiences in the trinary configuration as my primary
data source for Chapter Four, while drawing upon other elements of the survey
questionnaires as a triangulating source in additional chapters.

Student Evaluations

From Fall 2006 to Spring 2011, mentored students submitted a total of 1,765 end-
of-semester evaluations, with an overall survey response rate of 72%. Students granted
me permission to quote anonymously from their discursive comments on 1,452 surveys. I designed the instrument to provide Writing Mentors Program administrators with student perspectives on the program, including suggestions for improvement; a means of assessing individual mentor performances; student comments that could be used in letters of recommendation; and data that could be used to justify the program’s continued existence to upper-level administrators. The survey was also designed to offer mentors summative student feedback on their performances that we hoped would affirm mentors’ strengths, signal areas for growth, and provide compelling data for their teaching portfolios. (Mentors garnered formative student feedback at the mid-semester point using instruments of their own design.) Finally, the survey also functioned as an instrument for my own research, providing me a means of triangulating mentor data with student perspectives on the roles mentors played in their experiences within trinary classrooms.

As displayed in Appendix K, the survey consisted of limited background information, satisfaction rankings, and a handful of discursive prompts. The quantitatively oriented questions remained largely consistent across the four years for longitudinal tracking purposes, while I rotated through a handful of new discursive prompts based upon perceived programmatic needs and the evolution of my research questions. (Appendix L catalogues the full list of survey question prompts.) The length of students’ responses to these prompts ranged from a single word or symbol (such as a smiley face) to a short paragraph.

From Fall 2007 through Spring 2009, surveys were administered in class following department course evaluation protocols: after an explanation of the survey’s purpose, the mentor and instructor left the room, and a student gathered the surveys and
delivered them to the Department office.\textsuperscript{23} Beginning in Fall 2010, due to severe budget cuts department-and-university wide, the program was no longer able to afford photocopies of the program evaluations, and student evaluations were administered online via SurveyMonkey.\textsuperscript{24} As can be expected, the rate of return dropped from paper surveys at 81\% to online surveys at 65\%. This second rate of response is still quite high compared, for example, to a 2003 national un-incentivized online survey administered to approximately 1,500 first-year students across 51 universities and colleges with a response rate of 19.8\% (Sax, Gilmartin, and Bryant). However, the researcher must always account for nonresponse error: missing from my results are students who formally withdrew from the course or informally stopped attending class, rendering the survey an inappropriate instrument to research the perspectives or performances of many students who did not succeed (at least in terms of a final passing grade) within the trinary configuration. I would also conjecture that the change from paper to online surveys most significantly affected response rates of those commuter students from lower income households without Internet access. It could also be hypothesized that those students who felt particularly loyal to (or unhappy with) their mentor were probably more motivated to spend out-of-class time responding to the online survey.

\textit{Mentor Evaluations}

From Fall 2006 to Spring 2011, writing mentors submitted a total of 96 end-of-semester evaluations, with an overall survey response rate of 77\%.\textsuperscript{25} Mentors granted me permission to quote anonymously from their discursive comments on 89 surveys. The mentor surveys were designed with the following goals: to give mentors an anonymous arena in which to inform program administrators of problems and suggest programmatic
improvements; to help WPA’s understand the ways in which mentors’ work aligned with and differed from the job description; to garner feedback on Professor Henry’s and my administration; and to provide mentors with a means of reflection on their experiences from the entire semester, expanding the reflective unit of analysis from that of day-to-day conferences and weekly memos. In the final weeks of each semester, I emailed the mentoring cohort with an explanation of these purposes and a link to the evaluation, which was hosted on SurveyMonkey. As displayed in Appendix M, the survey included questions with multiple choice responses as well as open-ended prompts on a variety of topics. The average response to most of these discursive prompts was a full paragraph: as a fellow graduate student who knew first-hand the amount of other writing that must be composed at the semester’s end, I was particularly struck by the generosity and thoroughness of mentors’ anonymous program feedback.

**Instructor Evaluations**

From Fall 2007 to Spring 2009, FYC instructors paired with mentors were asked to submit one evaluation addressing both the performance of their assigned mentor and their assessment of the Writing Mentors Program. As these surveys necessarily asked for the mentor’s name, they were not anonymous. As I became more aware of institutional hierarchies, departmental politics, and local cultures, I decided to split the instructor survey into two separate evaluations: one of the mentor and the other of the program (see Appendices O and P). Furthermore, an instructor may have valued highly the mentor’s contributions while sustaining reservations about the trinary configuration and/or Professor Henry and my administration of the Writing Mentors Program, or vice versa. Disassociating the two areas of the data collection instrument theoretically allowed
instructors to express such feelings more accurately. Beginning in Fall 2009, instructors’ evaluations of the program became anonymous, with the hopes of garnering more candid and critical assessments. Instructors’ evaluations of their assigned mentors, which I created in consultation with Professor Henry and the current mentors, were designed to provide mentors with feedback on their performance as well as to supply quotations that could be used in teaching portfolios and letters of recommendations. All instructor evaluations were administered online using SurveyMonkey. Across the four years, instructors submitted 137 evaluations: 53 of these evaluations were in the combined mentor and program format, 46 were evaluations of the mentor only, and 38 were anonymous evaluations of the program. These instructor submissions represent a response rate of 78%. Instructors granted me permission to quote from all of these surveys in my dissertation research.

**Participant Check Roundtables**

To triangulate my interpretations of mentors’ conference logs, memos, and end-of-semester evaluations, I conducted five “participant check” discussions (Miles and Huberman, 275-277) with mentors during the 2011-2012 academic year. Program Director Todd Sammonds and Graduate Research Assistant Cornelius Rubsamen graciously allowed me to utilize their bi-weekly roundtable slots for these feedback sessions. Approximately one week prior to a designated roundtable, I emailed the mentors with a ten-to-fifteen page excerpt from my data chapters, accompanied by a cover letter explaining the purpose of the session and requesting that mentors read the draft in advance and come to the session with feedback. (Appendix X includes a cover letter I sent to the mentors). To hopefully allow for more candid feedback, program
administrators agreed to exit the room for the discussion. As I no longer occupied any administrative role in the program, my own positionality as researcher was perhaps less compromised than in previous interactions with mentors, although the dynamic of my being the author of the document for which I was seeking feedback no doubt inflected mentors’ performances.

Roundtables lasted one hour, involved six to eight mentors each (or half of the overall cohort group), and took the form of focus group interviews. I began each session by reviewing my IRB protocols, explaining that I would be digitally recording the discussion, and seeking voluntary consent for permission to cite mentors oral comments’ anonymously. I generally opened the discussion by asking for overall impressions and closed by inquiring about specific passages and research challenges. Otherwise, the main facilitative strategies I enacted were (1) following up on individual mentors’ comments with requests for elaboration and specific examples; (2) checking that I was understanding mentors’ assertions through paraphrases and follow-up questions; (3) making a point of especially thanking speakers for feedback that revealed under-theorized elements of my work or non-conforming instances within larger trends; (4) asking the group, at times, the degree to which an individual observation reflected the experiences of the larger cohort; (5) inviting individual mentors who had not yet spoken to weigh in on issues under discussion; and (6) trying to refrain from speaking enough for mentors to exchange perspectives with one another and come to insights not possible in a tightly controlled interview.

The insights and examples mentors shared at these sessions shaped the two data chapters quite profoundly, and I quote directly from mentors’ transcribed comments in
multiple instances. I recognize, however, that these excerpts of mentors’ oral commentary came within the framework of a multiple-person discussion, representing a very different context than the vast majority of quoted materials within my data chapters, which were selected from written discourse composed by individual mentors. My approach to transcription was guided by Elliot Mishler’s argument in “Representing Discourse: The Rhetoric of Transcription:”

In research on discourse, the decisions concerning how to produce a transcript—what we include as relevant features of speech and how we arrange and display the text—are among the many decisions we make in the course of doing our work. All of them reflect theoretical assumptions about relations between language and meaning, and between method and theory, and are consequential for what we report as findings as well as how we interpret and generalize from those findings. . . The search for a standard system that might be applied to any form of talk for any purpose is a misguided effort. Transcripts are our constructions and making them is one of our central research practices. (317)

Given that I was utilizing mentors’ oral comments both as a supplement to and triangulating perspective on their written work, I did not generally attempt to call attention to such transcriptive details as pauses, intonation, pitch, and overlapping speech. For the most part, however, and reflective of my own discursive mode as an interviewer, mentors spoke in standardized academic English, with the exception of occasional instances in which a few local mentors performatively re-enacted scenes with students in Hawai‘i Creole English. (I did not ultimately cite any examples of these instances in my dissertation.) For my immediate purposes of rendering mentors’ oral comments as
readable as possible for an academic audience, I followed James Gee’s transcription practice of removing from the cited commentary “obvious false starts” as well as fillers such as uh, um, and like (14).

These participant check roundtables not only increased the project’s methodological rigor, but also provided me with an ideal opportunity to discuss my evolving ideas with individuals occupying the very position I was researching. And while I had initially approached them as a form of triangulation, mentors shared such original insights and vivid examples, that I came to regard them as another primary source.

**Large-Scale Writing Assessment**

In spring of 2008 I co-designed with Dr. Erica Reynolds Clayton, a large-scale writing assessment of the first-year composition program. All FYC students were asked to submit the piece of writing that best exemplified the following Foundations in Written Communication Student Learning Outcome: “Students will be able to compose a text that seeks to achieve a specific purpose and responds adeptly to an identifiable audience.” Students were also asked to compose a 30-minute in-class reflection on their essay’s purpose and audience as a means of assessing students’ meta-cognitive understandings of their essay’s rhetorical situation. Scoring rubrics were implemented under the direction of University Assessment officers, Drs. Monica Stitt-Bergh and Marlene Lowe (Appendices R through U). Writing samples were scored independently by two raters along a 4-point scale according to the analytic traits of content, organization, language and style, and mechanics. In-class reflective essays were scored separately on a 4-point holistic scale. Utilizing a stratified random sampling design recommended by UHM Professor of Educational Psychology Shuqiang Zhang, 80 essays were selected from mentored
sections and 82 and non-mentored sections. Results and implications of this writing assessment are discussed in Chapter Three.

**Demographic Surveys**

Additional triangulating data are the online demographic surveys (see Appendices V and W) that were completed by mentors and instructors across the hundred sections. I designed these surveys in order characterize the variety of mentor-instructor combinations and to document the ways in which trinary configurations offered students access to individuals of different institutional positions, academic concentrations, ages, educational backgrounds, language fluencies, geographic origins, familiarity with Hawai‘i, and ethnicities. Some of this demographic information is summarized in Table 1.1.

**Institutional Records**

Demographic information on mentored students was drawn from institutional records. These records include data on students enrolled in both mentored and non-mentored sections of FYC from Fall 2007 through Spring 2011. Final data were pulled in Spring 2012, rendering a longitudinal portrait of both mentored and “un-mentored” student populations. However, as these populations exhibit substantial dissimilarities (as discussed further in Chapter Three), control group comparisons are not methodologically appropriate. In my dissertation, I generally present student data in aggregate, drawing upon these records to summarize student demographics (including gender, age, ethnicity, high school location, and standardized writing scores) as well as student performances from an institutional perspective (in the form of FYC grades, semesters and grades of subsequent writing intensive courses, cumulative GPA, and enrollment/graduation
status). Following a few mentors’ descriptions of their work with a particular student, I offer a triangulating footnote or a brief in-text gloss on the student’s longitudinal performance. In each of these instances, students have been assigned pseudonyms, and no information that could potentially identify individuals is included in the account.

Data Analysis: Mixed Methods Analysis

To analyze the various types of data presented in the previous section, I employ a mixed methods approach. While definitions of mixed methods research are contested and continuously developing, there exists a kind of general consensus that at a most basic level, mixed methods studies combine at least one quantitative and qualitative element within a given research project or program. (Bergman; Cresswell and Plano-Clark, 2007; Teddlie and Tashakkori). I subject my dissertation data to mixed methods analysis for the following four reasons: (1) Research Questions: My research questions call for an analysis of participant “performances,” a concept which in some discourse communities invites narratives, and in others numbers, and in others both. (2) Audience: I intend for my research to reach audiences across a range of discourse communities, including those in Composition Studies, Writing Program Administration, and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). I hope, for example, that a Writing Program Administrator (WPA) might one day take my research to her or his Dean in hopes of securing funding for trinary collaborations in her or his own institution. (3) Existing Dataset: I have collected programmatic data with the dual purposes of addressing both WPA exigencies and my own research questions, so I now have access to an extensive dataset that includes significant quantitative and qualitative dimensions.29 I see this characteristic as a particular strength of my dataset. (4) Added Rigor: It is my belief that
complementing qualitative themes and examples with quantitative program-wide data forces me to be more accountable to the dataset as a whole, curbing the tendency to cherry-pick only those examples that further my own developing theories.

**Mixed Methods in Composition Studies**

While the use of mixed methods research is currently quite popular (some, such as Alan Bryman, argue too popular) in the social sciences, it is somewhat less common in Composition Studies. One of the earliest and most compelling calls for mixing methods within Composition Studies research came from Gesa Kirsch, whose 1992 book chapter, “Methodological Pluralism: Epistemological Issues,” drew upon feminist theory to challenge Steven North’s argument for methodological incommensurability in *The Making of Knowledge in Composition*. Kirsh argues that so long as multimethod composition research is approached with a critical awareness of both the self and the epistemological issues involved in the methods employed, it is not only possible but promising (248). Kirsch lays out the following vision for the mixing of methods within Composition Studies:

> I suggest that methodological pluralism demands a rethinking of *all* methodologies and new ways of conducting and interpreting research. New approaches to research will not necessarily produce a coherent or unified body of knowledge, but, instead may reveal contradictions, fissures, and gaps in our current knowledge of composition. The strength of new approaches will lie in the ability to invite new questions, to encourage dialogue and inquiry, and to define knowledge making as a continuously changing enterprise. (248)
Another strong argument for the compatibility of qualitative and quantitative approaches is Davida Charney’s 1996 CCC’s article, “Empiricism is Not a Four-Letter Word.”
Charney addresses the ways in which the fields of technical and professional communication specifically, and Composition Studies generally, have erected a false binary between qualitative and quantitative methods that serves to idealize ethnographers as caring, inclusive, and reflexive and to demonize experimentalists as manipulative, unethical, and simplistic. Charney argues for a more methodologically-inclusive field:

> To promote the growth of a complex and inter-connected framework of knowledge and methods, we need both qualitative and quantitative empirical methods. Surely we only hamstring ourselves by demanding that every encounter between researchers and participants involve intense personal interaction, by sniffing for traces of objectivism in qualitative studies, and by imposing ideological and epistemological preconditions. (590-591)

That these visions of methodological pluralism were not widely embraced is evidenced by Cindy Johanek’s argument for empirical research in her 2000 monograph, Composing Research: A Contextualist Paradigm for Rhetoric and Composition. Here, Johanek makes what is perhaps the field’s most extended case for combining numbers and narratives in composition research, arguing that the next generation of Compositionists needs to be trained in both qualitative research methods and in basic statistics in order to reach wider array of audiences. She offers a mini-control group study of multimodal research that analyzes student survey results to probe the composition lore that teachers’ use of red-colored ink is discouraging and even violent, finding that many students actually preferred their teachers’ comments to be inked in red. (Since Johanek advocates
approaches to research that mix qualitative and quantitative methods, I find it puzzling that nowhere in her book does she cite any publications from the emerging field of mixed methods research itself.) That mixed methods research has not since taken a strong hold in Composition Studies can be further evidenced by CompPile’s sparse listings under key phrases related to mixed methods research in books and articles from 2000-2010: “mixed method” (n=2); “multimethod” (n=7); “quantitative and qualitative” (n=4); and “qualitative and quantitative” (n=1). Given that one of the intended contributions of this dissertation is to address what I see as a gap in the field of Composition Studies with regards to mixed methods studies, I will briefly survey mixed methods research as a field, including its inception and current status, its professed epistemological underpinnings, and criteria for classifying research designs and data analyses that commonly fall under the umbrella of mixed methods research.

**Survey of Mixed Methods as an Emerging Field**

In their narrative of the field’s history, John Cresswell and Vicki Plano Clark classify the 1950’s-1980’s as a “formative period” for mixed methods research, marked by initial interest and experimentation in combining quantitative and qualitative approaches (15). They label the 1970’s-1980’s as a period of “paradigm debate” over the tenability of mixing of quantitative and qualitative approaches, with qualitative researchers such as Lincoln and Guba (1985) adamantly arguing for their incompatibility based upon foundational epistemological differences (15). While these paradigm debates continue to the present, according to Creswell and Plano Clark, researchers’ attention began to shift toward a focus on how one might most appropriately design a mixed methods study, marking the 1980’s and 1990’s as a period of “procedural developments”
(15-16). Creswell and Plano Clark classify the period following the turn of the millennium as a time of greatly increased interest in mixed methods research, citing workshops to train researchers in mixed-methods approaches held by the National Health Institute (1999), National Research Council (2002), and National Science Foundation (2004); the first international conference held specifically on the topic of mixed methods research (2005); and the inception of The Journal of Mixed Methods Research (2007). (16-18). Mixed methods are also being increasingly utilized in institutional research within higher education: in Fall 2011, for example, the Journal of New Directions for Institutional Research devoted a special issue to the topic of “Using Mixed-Methods Approaches to Study Intersectionality in Higher Education.” In his chapter, “Why do researchers Integrate/Combine/Mesh/Bend/Mix/Merge/Fuse Quantitative and Qualitative Research?” Alan Bryman presents a cautionary voice amongst what he characterizes as this “wave of enthusiasm” (88). His interviews of twenty researchers who employ mixed methods, Bryman found as a common theme the concern that mixed methods approaches have become so popular that they are now understood to be the obligatory methodological choice for professional advancement, a situation that one interviewee called a “fetishism” (96). I offer this analysis to indicate that I approach mixed methods research with a healthy dose of skepticism and in hopes that my dissertation will not be seen as another under-theorized adoption of a methodological fad.

Although leading mixed methods practitioners proclaim their field as the future of social sciences research, they generally look to the past for their philosophical foundations, tracing its intellectual origins to the school of pragmatism and to such figures as John Dewey, William James, Charles Saunders Pierce, and Margaret Meade. In
his chapter, “Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained: Methodological Implications of Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods,” David Morgan argues for a version of pragmatism that rejects the privileging of ontology and defines itself in opposition to Lincoln and Guba’s classifications of research into two incommensurate paradigms of positivism and constructivism (as well as Lincoln and Guba’s later additions of critical theory, post-positivism, participatory research). Advocates of mixed-methods research generally argue that the research question itself should lead to the selection of research methods, while acknowledging to varying degrees the influence of the researcher’s worldview on the questions being asked and on the interpretation of results. (Cresswell and Plano Clark; Johnson and Onwuegbuzie; Morgan; Teddlie and Tashakkori)34

David Morgan offers the following conceptual table of the ways in which pragmatism as a philosophical foundation transcends the qualitative/quantitative binary and offers a third epistemological orientation for mixed-methods research:

Table 2.2
Replica of David Morgan's “Pragmatic Alternative to the Key Issues in Social Science Research Methodology” Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Approach</th>
<th>Quantitative Approach</th>
<th>Pragmatic Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connection of theory and data</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>Deduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to research process</td>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference from data</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Generality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Morgan’s model, pragmatism is offered as a kind of third option that combines the strengths of the previous two sides of the methodological divide. Such pragmatic approaches use abductive reasoning to move recursively between theory and data, drawing upon theory to account for observation and observation to produce, inform, and complicate theory (58-59). While Morgan classifies deductive reasoning as part of quantitative research, I see it also as part of the humanities tradition, particularly
scholarship which forefronts various “grand Theories” to explicate elements of culture or works of literature. My processes for arriving at this dissertation’s theoretical frameworks of auto-ethnography, place-based composition, and performance studies were more abductive: I selected these lenses because I believe them to be compelling in light of the data I have collected and the place in which my research is situated. Although I do not follow the exact protocols for producing grounded theory, in interpreting my data I shift frequently between “grounded” approaches that build knowledge inductively from what the data are “telling” me (Glaser and Strauss; Hammersley and Atkinson; Miles and Huberman; Neff) and more deductive approaches that draw upon established theoretical frameworks that account for material and ideological structures that already inevitably shape my data and my interpretations of it.

Secondly, Morgan explains that instead of professing either subjectivity or objectivity, mixed-methods approaches aim for intersubjectivity, focusing on the joint actions and processes of communication that lead to the construction of shared meaning (Morgan 59-60). This project aims for an intersubjective methodology that gives voice to mentors’ concerns and identifies areas of shared and divergent meaning across participant groupings in the trinary, while also acknowledging the ways in my own positionality and interpretive processes shape the account. As elaborated previously, one specific method I employed in pursuit of intersubjectivity was engaging mentors in reading selections from my data chapters in order to check the degree to which my interpretations were shared by the mentors.

Finally, Morgan explains that pragmatic mixed-methods approaches probe the transferability of findings by acknowledging the context-specific nature of the data while
also exploring the extent of their applications to other actors in other settings and circumstances (Morgan 60). In my data analysis, I attempt to highlight both the ways in which my findings are unique to this program and to its situatedness in Hawai‘i and the ways in which project findings could inform the teaching of FYC and the administration of trinary configurations in other institutions. For example, in my chapter on mentors’ place-based work, I address several particular pedagogical challenges that arise from UHM’s institutional and classroom cultures, while also noting the ways in which the roles mentors played in this situation could enhance any themed course in which students (accurately or inaccurately) perceive the instructor to be committed to a particular political or pedagogical agenda.

*Situating my Data Collection and Analyses Among Mixed Methods Approaches*

Researchers mix qualitative and quantitative methods to varying degrees and approaches, and scholars have proposed a number of different classification schemes for mixed methods designs (see Cresswell and Plano Clark)\(^36\) as well as for mixed methods data analysis (see Teddlie and Tashakkori).\(^37\) My study does not fit neatly into any one of these proposed categories but draws upon elements of several, including the Embedded Design, Sequential Mixed Data Analysis, and the Triangulation Design.\(^38\) Ultimately, however, I believe labeling my research to be less important than enumerating and analyzing the ways in which it engages mixed methods. To accomplish this latter goal, I consider Kimberly Griffin and Samuel Museus’ syntheses of the various classification systems according to four key areas of consideration, which I briefly address in light of my project.
Griffin and Museus’s first category of consideration in their synthesis of mixed methods designs and analyses is the relative degree of emphasis placed on quantitative and qualitative components of the study (21). Although the Writing Mentors Program archives contain data that would enable me to apportion equal weight to both quantitative and qualitative elements, I assign a significantly higher degree of emphasis to the qualitative. If I had to quantify the relative degree of emphasis on each, I would estimate my research to be 10-20% quantitative and 80-90% qualitative. Quantitative data and approaches allow me to characterize the Writing Mentors Program’s breadth of participation and to situate specific examples within larger trends. Qualitative data and approaches enable me to explore the work of mentors in greater depth; to illustrate mentor, student, and instructor performances through their own words; to situate myself in the study as a program administrator and researcher with auto-ethnographic description; and to probe findings through the lenses of various critical theories.

A second area of consideration is the methods used to integrate the data, ranging from merging quantitative and qualitative datasets together, to connecting datasets in such a way that one set builds upon the other, to embedding one dataset within another (Griffin and Museus 21). In my dissertation prospectus, I envisioned creating a single database that integrated mentors’ conference logs, institutional records, background surveys of mentors and instructors, and writing assessment scores. As I undertook this project, I quickly found this goal to be far more complicated and time-consuming than I had anticipated, requiring a team of researchers instead of a single doctoral student. Furthermore, although my plan to create this integrated database was approved by the IRB on the condition that the identifying information needed to link datasets would be
erased once such links were established, I began to question the ethics of interlinking so much information on students unbeknownst to the students themselves, an issue I address further in my section on research ethics. For the purposes of this dissertation, my various datasets exist in distinct formats: conference logs, weekly memos, participant surveys, and institutional records are stored as Excel spreadsheets; my field notebooks are housed in a large file; and my participant check roundtable discussions are stored as digital recordings. However, the individual datasets of logs, memos, and participant surveys each already include a combination of quantitative and qualitative elements.

A third area of consideration is the sequencing of quantitative and qualitative elements of the research, including whether to collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data concurrently or sequentially (Griffin and Museus 21). For the most part, I collected both types of data concurrently but analyzed them sequentially. By way of example, the mentor conference log (which I earlier presented and analyzed) consists of quantitative information on conference attendance and conference topics in checkbox format, followed by a qualitative section for the mentor’s narrative. In order to work with these conference logs as my primary data source in Chapters Four and Five, I first converted their contents into an Excel spreadsheet for the purposes of summing, sorting, and selecting. The spreadsheet format and tools enabled me to gain a large-scale picture of the overall programmatic history of documented conferences: how long they lasted, where they were held, at what stages of a writing assignment they occurred, and what topics were addressed. Based upon this quantitative overview, questions emerged for further qualitative analysis drawing from mentors’ narratives: In what ways did mentors approach the topic of “handling peer-to-peer issues,” in the 7% of conferences in which
that checkbox was identified, and what can such conference narratives contribute to an understanding of mentors’ place-based work in navigating classroom cultures within trinary configurations? What qualitative differences (if any) are present in mentor narratives from conferences occurring in the classroom, in the designated mentor meeting space, and in other less official campus spaces, and what can these findings contribute to understandings of spatial composing practices? Once I sorted my spreadsheet data according to these queries and identified a subset for further research, I submitted the corresponding log narratives to qualitative coding. As Juliet Corbin explains, coding is a form of analysis that entails “examining data line by line or paragraph by paragraph. . . for significant events, experiences, feelings, and so on, that are then denoted as concepts” or “codes” (528). After codes in my data were established, I then selected key illustrations from mentors’ own words. As a means of triangulation, I (a) returned to programmatic totals to compare specific examples to the larger programmatic findings; and (b) turned to student and instructor data for examples that would both affirm and complicate mentors’ perspectives.

A fourth and final area of consideration in selecting a mixed methods design is the rationale for mixing, whether it be for one method to validate, inform, elaborate, or counterbalance the other— or simply to increase the likelihood that the research will identify a constructive insight on the problem under examination. (Griffin and Museus 21-22). As elaborated earlier, my rationale for mixing emerged from the nature of my research question; my range of intended audiences across disciplines; the size, scope, and variety of data within the Writing Mentors Program archives; and my belief that mixing methods increases the rigor of the work. In the case of my dissertation, I regularly
accompany my qualitative findings with quantitative data primarily as a means of triangulation. Thus, my triangulations take the form not only of presenting multiple institutional perspectives within the trinary (including those of mentors, instructors, students, program administrators) but also of leveraging multiple forms of data and employing multiple modes of analysis. The goal of these triangulations, however, is not to arrive at positivist conclusions about the ultimate learning outcomes of trinary collaborations, but to represent classroom trinaries and their participants in as multifaceted and ethical of terms possible.

Research Ethics and Intentions

In this section, I address the subject of research ethics from three perspectives: (1) the University of Hawai‘i Institutional Review Board (IRB), operated through the federal mandate of the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) in the United States Department of Health and Human Services; (2) my professional scholarly community of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC); and (3) the location of this study in Hawai‘i, including guidelines and warnings by indigenous scholars for research involving indigenous places and peoples. I argue that these categories present increasingly challenging models for research ethics: whereas I am able to profess strict compliance with my IRB agreements and general adherence to the guidelines and ethos of the CCCC’s statements, when it comes to conducting ethical research in Hawai‘i, I can state my intention to act with respect and care, and can present and problematize my decisions as a researcher, but can ultimately not escape the enduring colonial structures which to a large degree script this research.
Institutional Review Board (IRB) Agreement

A significant step in conducting ethical research includes undergoing approval by an Institutional Review Board (IRB).\textsuperscript{42} The University of Hawai‘i Committee on Human Subjects approved my project, titled “An Evaluation of the UH Writing Mentors Program” as CHS\# 15948 on March 11, 2008 for five year’s duration (see Appendix Y). My application was classified as “exempt” under the Department of Health and Human Services regulations under section 46.101(b)(1): “(1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.”\textsuperscript{43} In my application, I explained that I would be working mostly with existing educational data from the UH Writing Mentors Program and from institutional records, and I guaranteed that all data would be “recorded anonymously (so that participants cannot be identified, either directly or through identifiers linked to them)” (UHM IRB Application for Exempt Status). The Committee on Human Subjects determined that I would need to seek informed consent from mentors for the use of their conference logs and weekly memos; from mentors who participated in participant check roundtables; and from mentors and instructors who completed the demographic survey (See Appendices Z and AA). Since the end-of-semester evaluations would be anonymous, my IRB agreement stipulates that I simply needed to include a “yes/no” checkbox asking permission to quote from the survey in program-related publications and research.
As my dissertation was the first study of a trinary college classroom that the IRB officers at UHM had encountered, I met with the head IRB compliance officer face-to-face on three occasions (once with Professor Henry) and followed up with several phone calls in order to work through issues of participation and consent made more complex by the trinary configuration. Throughout the dissertation, I quote or paraphrase participants’ written statements only with explicit permission. However, situations in which a consenting participant’s written statements included descriptions of other individuals involved in the trinary proved trickier. The issue came to my attention following a program orientation in which I was leading a workshop for the mentors on conducting intake interviews and Professor Henry was leading a workshop for the instructors on collaborating with mentors. As Professor Henry later reported to me, upon explaining mentors’ roles as “writing mentor-researchers,” one of the instructors insisted that we would need to seek informed consent from her in order to use her assigned mentor’s logs and her students’ evaluations of the mentor in formal research. The instructor contended that because these materials involved her writing assignments directly and her classroom and teaching indirectly, the instructor’s permission was necessary. Following the orientation, Professor Henry and I placed a telephone call to the head IRB compliance officer regarding this instructor’s query. The IRB officer ruled that because the conference log narratives represented mentors’ perspectives of students’ negotiations of instructors’ assignments, both instructor and student consent were irrelevant from an IRB perspective.44

This instructor’s concern highlights the ways in which collaborating with a “writing mentor-researcher” opens one’s pedagogical practices not only to the mentor’s
eyes, but also to the eyes of the program administrators. Although Professor Henry and I explicitly noted that mentors should not mention names of students or instructors during roundtable discussions or offer critiques of instructors’ pedagogies or assignments—and although our roles as administrators did not involve the element of formally evaluating instructors—the trinary configuration and our administration of it prompted at least two instructors to note that they were experiencing a surrender of pedagogical privacy that was unsettling. (Another way to view this situation is that the trinary configuration challenged the fiction of a hermetically-sealed classroom in order to more explicitly connect those in the classroom with the intersecting ecosystems of various institutional resources and actors.) However, the potential that this project left instructors feeling as though they were research subjects, even if not considered such by IRB definitions, prompted me to exceed the rigors of my IRB agreement in determining what data should actually be included in the dissertation. I have thus included for analysis in this dissertation only those conference logs, weekly memos, and student evaluations from sections of the Writing Mentors Program in which both the mentor and instructor gave informed consent via the explanation of the research project’s goals in the demographic survey and in which the mentor gave permission for use of her/his records. In retrospect, if I had the project to do over again, I would also solicit informed consent from students for mentors’ logs about conferences in which they participated to be included in the dissertation, even though such a measure is not mandated by the IRB.

*Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Position Statements on Research Ethics*

In addition to complying with terms of my IRB agreement, I intend to follow as closely as possible the guidelines in the Conference on College Composition and
Communication’s (CCCC) two position statements on research ethics: “Guidelines for the Ethical Treatment of Students and Student Writing in Composition Studies,” ratified in 2000, and its 2003 extension to broadened research situations, “CCCC Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Research in Composition Studies.” There exists a large degree of overlap between much of the CCCC’s guidelines and those of the IRB in the areas of seeking informed consent, guaranteeing that participation is indeed voluntary, and protecting the identities of those involved in the study. It seems as though a major goal of the CCCC’s document is to raise awareness within the profession of the need for IRB compliance. In fact, the CCCC’s position statements repeatedly defer to the IRB, as in the following disclaimer, which appears in both position statements: “When composition specialists have used a consent process approved by an IRB or similar committee, they have obtained the necessary permission.”

Several differences between the terms of my IRB agreement and the CCCC’s position statements deserve consideration. Many composition scholars have already pointed to problems with the IRB review process for research in composition and rhetoric, given that it was originally designed for biomedical studies (Anderson; Barton; McKee; Mountford and Hansberger; Wallace). As such, the IRB application and approval forms are legalistic in nature, citing federal laws, enumerating content that must appear on consent forms, stating protocols that must be adhered to, defining risks, and delineating areas of exemption. This approach implies that ethical research consists of adherence to requirements set by an external body and can be assessed simply based upon observable behaviors. While the CCCC’s position statements also include legalistic discourse (i.e., in their lists of do’s and don’ts), the statements also involve strong appeals
to the researcher’s ethos. Instead of setting observable behaviors as the benchmark of ethics, the CCCC’s statements enumerate attitudes and values to which the researcher should aspire such as accuracy, faithfulness to intention, sensitivity, fairness, and seriousness. Perhaps not surprisingly, the CCCC’s position statement goes beyond the scope of the IRB in its focus on the treatment of spoken and written language, including the importance of seeking written permission to quote or paraphrase others’ words and of interpreting those words in ways that are accurate and offer sufficient context. Take the following example:

Composition specialists report written and spoken statements accurately. They interpret the statements in ways that are faithful to the writer’s or speaker’s intentions, and they provide contextual information that will enable others to understand the statements the way the writer intended. When in doubt, composition specialists check the accuracy of their reports and interpretations with the writer or speaker. They are especially sensitive to the need to check their interpretations when the writer or speaker is from a cultural, ethnic, or other group different than their own. When discussing the statements they quote, paraphrase, or otherwise report, composition specialists do so in ways that are fair and serious and cause no harm. (n.p.)

Given that a strong majority of mentors came from “cultural, ethic, and other groups” different from mine, I especially appreciated these guideline and went out of my way to check my interpretations of mentors’ discourse with the source whenever possible. I also appreciate the ways in which the CCCC’s statement accounts for how a researcher’s institutional position might decrease the ethos of voluntary participation, cautioning:
“When conducting studies with individuals such as subordinates or others whose well-being depends on the composition specialist’s opinions, decisions, or actions, the composition specialist takes special care to protect prospective participants from adverse consequences of declining or withdrawing from participation” (CCCC). At the end of each semester, I reviewed with mentors my project goals and IRB agreement, presented them with voluntary consent forms, and invited them to discontinue participation at any time without negative consequences. Given that mentors frequently requested letters of recommendation from Professor Henry, in order to underscore the voluntary nature of their participation, I did not share the list of participating mentors with Professor Henry until he no longer occupied the Director position.

I also appreciate the additional guidelines offered by the CCCC’s positions statements regarding matters of confidentiality and anonymity. As the CCCC’s position statement explains, “Composition specialists always honor participants’ requests that reports contain no personally identifiable information including information that would make them identifiable to persons familiar with the research site.” The UH Writing Mentors Program participants and the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa as an institution have entrusted me with personal information that I have promised to keep confidential, and this is a responsibility that I take seriously. In my presentation and analysis of data, I take up the challenge of ensuring that the participants’ identities remain anonymous, even to one another. As one goal of mentoring is to build rapport with students by getting to know them individually, many of the conference logs contain descriptions with high degrees of identifying information. Throughout the dissertation, I place such information in brackets: for example, “[name of high school],” “[name of hometown],” “[name of
club].” “[name of instructor],” etc. Furthermore, each log and evaluation has been assigned a number for tracking purposes, but the order has been randomized (rather than listed alphabetically or chronologically) in order to protect anonymity. In several cases, mentors granted me permission to cite their names in order to credit their original ideas regarding the position of writing mentor. In all of these cases, I emailed mentors with those excerpts associated with their name and asked for their feedback and approval.

Finally, the preamble to both CCCC’s position statements ends with the following invitation: “Composition specialists are encouraged to seek additional ways beyond those identified in these guidelines to assure that they treat other people ethically in their research.” I take this statement as an invitation to discuss what I see as some ethical imperatives of conducting research in Hawai‘i.

**Responsibilities of Conducting Research in Hawai‘i**

Living and conducting research in Hawai‘i is a privilege—and one that comes with heightened responsibilities. In *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Linda Tuhiwai Smith implores researchers working in indigenous colonized settings to take seriously the ethics of interpretation and the political nature of any research “findings”:

Researchers are in receipt of privileged information. They may interpret it within an overt theoretical framework, but also in terms of a covert ideological framework. They have the power to distort, to make invisible, to overlook, to exaggerate and draw conclusions, based not on factual data, but on assumptions, hidden value judgments, and often downright misunderstandings. They have the potential to extend knowledge or to perpetuate ignorance. (176)
Given my intention for this dissertation to be read by audiences outside of Hawai‘i, I especially acknowledge my responsibility to “extend knowledge” about a place which history textbooks, popular culture, and the US government tend to “perpetuate ignorance.” This responsibility is underscored by the fact that many of the mentors whose work I am representing approached the position with strong commitments to Hawaiian knowledge, culture, and sovereignty. In granting me permission to analyze their conference logs and weekly memos, these mentors have entrusted me with “privileged information.” To help ensure that my analyses of their work in Chapter Five were not proceeding from misunderstandings of Hawaiian culture, I specifically approached a few of the Kanaka Maoli mentors with drafts and questions, all the while feeling conflicted about the ways in which my requests problematically singled out these mentors as representatives of Hawaiian culture and obliged them take time away from their own important scholarship in order to assist a non-indigenous researcher. Particularly after reading a memo in which one Kanaka Maoli mentor explained that in response to a culturally insensitive question posed in front of the class by her instructor, she nevertheless believed that “as a Hawaiian, it was my kuleana to answer respectfully and comprehensively” (WM 316)⁴⁵, I worried that my own questions may have taken advantage of these mentors’ generosity and placed them in similarly obligatory situations. Such an example underscores the ways in which attempting to resolve one problem (i.e. that of avoiding cultural misunderstandings) within an indigenous colonized context only raises new sets of problems (i.e. taking advantage of “native informants”).

In the following section, I address what I believe to be two of my most important responsibilities as a non-indigenous researcher in this setting: (1) exercising reflexivity
and (2) listening to and honoring the warnings and guidelines of indigenous scholars. After a discussion of reflexivity, I turn to Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples, a book that is addressed primarily to indigenous researchers conducting studies in their own indigenous communities, but is interwoven with a few significant guidelines for non-indigenous researchers such as myself. Specifically, I consider three projects from the book’s list of "twenty-five indigenous research projects" in which Tuhiwai Smith invokes non-indigenous researchers. I first consider Tuhiwai Smith's guidelines for "representing" indigenous peoples as distinct from other minorities in light of Haunani-Kay Trask's arguments about the term "local." I then discuss my dissertation in light of Tuhiwai Smith's guidelines about "intervening" projects, noting Tuhiwai Smith's directive that these projects should be aimed at changing institutions rather than changing indigenous peoples and that such research should be invited by the indigenous communities themselves. And finally, I reflect on Tuhiwai Smith's advice that research projects should "connect in humanizing ways" with indigenous peoples in light of the importance of naming within Hawaiian culture and the problems with standard Western ethnographic practices of assigning pseudonyms to research subjects. Reviewing how Kanaka Maoli scholars Manulani Aluli Meyer, Ty P. Kawika Tengan, Julie Kaomea, and Mary Kawena Pukui have approached the naming of research participants in their own qualitative studies, I present my deliberations and decisions about how to handle names of trinary participants in this study.

One of the most significant responsibilities I face in conducting research in Hawai‘i is to exercise constant reflexivity. As Shirley Brice Heath and Brian Street
explain, reflexivity "enables ethnographers to see their research within historical and structural constraints that result from asymmetrical power distributions" (123), making it critical to any research endeavor, but particularly important within indigenous colonized contexts such as Hawai‘i, where research can never be apolitical. Reflexivity also serves as a means of reducing ethnocentrism, which David Fetterman warns is “a fatal error of ethnography” (24). I have addressed researcher reflexivity in greater depth in the Preface per my discussion of the ways in which I am deploying auto-ethnography. There, I analyze some of the ways in which my positionality as a relative insider to the UHM Writing Mentors Program and a relative outsider to Hawai‘i inflects my research. Instead, however, of treating reflexivity as a methodological moment in which one confesses to influences and biases and then proceeds with the “results,” my goal is to treat reflexivity as an ethical commitment and analytical mode, reminding readers throughout the dissertation of the presence of a limited and partial narrator who is still learning about place. For example, in Chapter Five when I cite a mentor’s weekly memo titled “a white/mainland mentor in Hawai‘i,” I note how the mentor’s misuse of Hawaiian diacriticals (in the spelling the word Hawaiian as “Hawai‘ian”) parallels my own educational journey, including my struggles and at times failures to perform in culturally appropriate and respectful ways in Hawai‘i. Such reflexive accounts remind readers that the data I am presenting are inflected by my own relationship to the mentors and by my own negotiations of what it means as a haole to live and conduct research in Hawai‘i.

As this project includes representations of Native Hawaiian instructors, mentors, and students, I turn next to Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s guidelines for “representing” indigenous peoples. Tuhiwai Smith cautions, “indigenous communities are often ‘thrown
in’ with all other minorities as one voice amongst many,” whereas “The politics of sovereignty and self-determination have been about resisting being thrown in with every other minority group by making claims on the basis of prior rights” (150-151). Tuhiwai Smith’s explanations indicate some of the problems with applying the category of “minority” to Hawai‘i, a binary term that has gained some traction within the field of Composition and Rhetoric, generating 625 hits on CompPile. In Hawai‘i, the word “local” has also been used as a kind of catch-all term that lumps Native Hawaiians with other settler groups who also claim belonging in Hawai‘i. As Haunani-Kay Trask explains in “Settlers of Color and ‘Immigrant’ Hegemony: ‘Locals’ in Hawai‘i,” the term “local” ignores the importance of the genealogical relationship Native Hawaiians claim to the land and equates their two-thousand-year history on the islands with the two hundred year history of other non-Hawaiian settler groups (45-56). Trask argues:

Today, modern Hawai‘i, like its colonial parent the United States, is a settler society. Our Native people and territories have been overrun by non-Natives, including Asians. Calling themselves “local,” the children of Asian settlers greatly outnumber us. They claim Hawai‘i as their own, denying indigenous history, their long collaboration in our continued dispossession, and the benefits therefrom. (46)

And later in this chapter, Trask writes:

The issues before Hawaiians are those of indigenous land and cultural rights, and survival as a people. In contrast, the issues before “locals” have merely to do with finding a comfortable fit in Hawai‘i that guarantees a rising income, upward mobility, and the general accouterments of a middle-class “American” way of life. (61)
Following Trask, I place square quotes around my use of the term “local” to signal the tensions and problems outlined above. I also resist, whenever possible, the binary classification of mentors as local/non-local, a grouping which lumps Native Hawaiian mentors together with all other mentors who graduated from high schools in Hawai‘i. In my chapter on mentors’ place-based work I treat Native Hawaiian mentors as their own distinct group in order to analyze the ways in which they mentor in relation to Hawai‘i, drawing upon explanations of Hawai‘i as ‘āina by ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui, Mary Kawena Pukui, and Manulani Aluli Meyer. However, such strategic groupings can also be dangerously essentialist, imposing a kind of artificial uniformity on the diversity of cultural identifications and political alignments across Native Hawaiians.

Projects that involve elements of “intervening,” Tuhiwai Smith explains, should be aimed “at changing institutions which deal with indigenous peoples and not changing indigenous peoples to fit the structures” (147), a guideline I took to heart in my administrative work for the Writing Mentors Program. Furthermore, my dissertation is less interested in tracking the ways in which UH Writing mentors purportedly changed individual students as it is in accounting for how the presence of writing mentors made the FYC course and university more responsive to students as individuals. The program and this project follow to a much lesser extent Tuhiwai Smith’s specification that “the community itself invites the project in and sets out its parameters” (147). The program itself was initiated by Professor Henry and Department Chair Cristina Bacchilega, but a number of Kanaka Maoli instructors have since requested mentors for their FYC courses. Furthermore, my chapter on mentors’ place-based work was inspired by an extended discussion with writing mentor Marie Alohalani Brown in which she shared insights on
the parallels between Hawaiian mo’o or lizard deities and the bridging work enacted by writing mentors. Following this discussion, Alohalani generously encouraged me to connect my work on mentoring to this Hawaiian knowledge and granted me permission to write about our conversation within my dissertation. In writing this chapter, however, I wondered on several occasions how I should most appropriately proceed in research involving Native Hawaiian topics. In these situations, I attempted to follow the cultural protocols I learned from outrigger canoe paddling: to ask permission by listening, observing, seeking out appropriate sources, praying, and waiting for signs on whether and how to proceed.

Finally, on the project of “connecting” Tuhiwai Smith writes: “Researchers, policy makers, educators, and social service providers who work with or whose work impacts on indigenous communities need to have a critical conscience about ensuring that their activities connect in humanizing ways with indigenous communities” (150). One significant way in which people are humanized is through their names. As Mary Kawena Pukui, E.W. Haertig, and Catherine A. Lee explain in volume one of Nānā I Ke Kumu, the inoa or personal name is a person’s most prized possession and carries the utmost significance in Hawaiian culture:

One’s inoa was both owned property and a kind of force in its own right. Once spoken, an inoa took on an existence, invisible, intangible, but real. An inoa could be a causative agent, capable of marshaling mystic elements to help or hurt the bearer of the name. . . Obviously, the inoa for a new child must be chosen only after careful thought, family consultations, and, ideally, with the supernatural advice of the family aumakua (ancestor god). (94-95)
Pukui, Haertig, and Lee’s account of Hawaiian naming practices extends twelve pages, indicating the subject’s complexity and importance. The authors explain that in certain cases a person’s name can be removed, or “‘oik’d,” but this process must be undertaken with the proper sacrificial offerings and prayers (100). Furthermore, the authors explain that Christian foreigners objected to the fact that Hawaiian personal names were not patrilineal or gender-specific and pressed for the Act to Regulate Names, which was signed into effect in 1860 and not repealed until 1967 (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 98-99; Wood 10). The act stipulated: “All children born in wedlock shall have their father’s name as a family name. They shall, besides, have a Christian name suitable to their sex. . . All illegitimate children shall have their mother’s name as a family name. They shall, besides, have a Christian name suitable to their sex” (Laws). As scholars have argued this law not only “attacked and undermined those very aspects of Hawaiian culture which offered Hawaiian women some measure of autonomy in their own system” (Grimshaw 156), but also “abraded one central way Hawaiians honored and remained connected with their past,” weakening their ability to resist colonization (Wood 11). In light of this history, as a researcher I faced the dilemma of how to represent Hawaiian participants’ names (which were generally their first names only). My IRB application, which I wrote in my first years at UHM before learning much of what I know now about Hawaiian culture and colonial processes, specifies that I assign pseudonyms to guarantee participants’ anonymity. For the researcher to select and substitute names reflective of participants’ gender and ethnicity is a standard Western ethnographic practice (Fetterman 146-147; Henry Writing xiii). However, as Frantz Fanon, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o, Haunani-Kay Trask, and others have argued, the act of re-naming indigenous peoples and places is
also central to the imperial, colonial legacy—a legacy I cannot avoid also but one I hope not to blindly perpetuate. In looking to Native Hawaiian scholars who have published ethnographic or other qualitative research, I found a range of approaches to this issue of referencing participants’ names: In her interviews with twenty Hawaiian educational leaders, Manulani Aluli Meyer always followed quotations from her interviewees (whom she called “mentors”) with a parenthetical reference noting the speaker’s first, last, and sometime middle names and the date of the interaction (“Our Own Liberation”). In his ethnography Native Men Remade: Gender and Nation in Contemporary Hawai‘i, Ty P. Kāwika Tengan generally refers to Hale Mua group members by name, except in the case of one participant which he keeps anonymous, explaining that “some of the things I wrote in an earlier draft, though never intended to harm, hurt one individual so deeply that he was prepared to fight” (27). Tengan discusses this incident at length in his article “Unsettling Ethnography: Tales of an ‘Oiwi in the Anthropological Slot,” where he assigns this individual the anonym of Punia, but does not indicate the process whereby he arrived at this assigned name. While I see Meyer’s and Tengan’s approaches as ideal for many kinds of research, they were not a good fit for the sensitive nature of what was shared with me about other trinary participants in mentors’ logs and memos or in my participant check roundtables with mentors. Educational researcher Julie Kaomea offers a different model in her chapter “Dilemmas of an Indigenous Academic,” in which she analyzes the dehumanization and mistreatment of kūpuna (Hawaiian elders) who assist in delivering the State of Hawaii’s Hawaiian studies curriculum. Here, Kaomea refers to the individuals in her study by their institutional position within this curriculum as administrators, teachers, students, and kūpuna. I employed this naming strategy in early
drafts of my dissertation, replacing students’ names in mentors’ logs with the generic, “[student].” Not only did this substitution make the narratives less readable, but it stripped students of any name in order to render them stock institutional actors, a strategy that compliments Kaomea’s thesis effectively but that runs counter to the very ethos of mentors’ work. I ultimately found what I perceived to be the least problematic way to proceed in a methodological note left by Pukui, Haertig, and Lee: “In all current casework examples, Hawaiian names are not used. Rough translations of name meanings are substituted when possible. English names are fictitious” (99). In treating Hawaiian names, Pukui, Haertig and Lee list the first letter of the name, followed by a line, as in the example, “K______.” This approach enables them to preserve anonymity without changing Hawaiian names. I have followed Pukui, Haertig and Lee’s lead in adopting this practice of listing the first letter only for all Hawaiian names and offering pseudonyms for all non-Hawaiian names. For these non-Hawaiian names, I selected pseudonyms within the same language: English names for English names, Japanese names for Japanese names, and so forth. Of course, some Hawaiian students did not have Hawaiian names; and other Hawaiian students did have a Hawaiian name but used an English name in the context of the FYC course and/or their relationship with the mentor; and yet other non-Hawaiian students had or were called by Hawaiian names. As such, my use of the first letter only to refer to a Hawaiian name does not necessarily indicate that the individual is ethnically Hawaiian, but simply that the name the mentor called the student in the context of the Writing Mentors Program archives comes from the Hawaiian language.
**Researcher Intentions**

I am grateful for the generosity and trust of so many students, instructors, and especially mentors in allowing me the privilege of working with their words, experiences, and hard-won insights. I am benefitting greatly from this research by earning a doctoral degree, and while I do not claim to enact complete reciprocity by any means, it is my sincere intention that this research benefits others. As elaborated in Chapter Three, I originally designed the data collection instruments with the goal not only of understanding better the workings of classroom trinaries, but also of ensuring the survival of the UH Writing Mentors program beyond its initial 3-year window of guaranteed funding. I believe that my efforts over a five-year period at maintaining thorough programmatic documentation and synthesizing these findings in numerous reports and presentations have contributed substantially toward the program’s successful institutionalization.

Within UHM, I hope that this dissertation stands as a resource that future WPA’s, mentors, and instructors can mine for theoretical insights, professional development, and their own research agendas. In honoring the remarkable work that past UHM mentors have performed on behalf of their trinary counterparts, the FYC program, the university, and the profession, I hope this dissertation inspires future generations of writing mentors to approach the position with the same level of dedication, maturity, and commitment to problematizing initial impressions of student writers, writing instruction, and the university itself. At least a dozen graduates of the UH writing mentors program have gone on to teach writing at community colleges in Hawai‘i, and several have been advocating and working towards implementing writing mentors programs at their
institutions. I hope that this dissertation provides arguments and evidence that these mentors can use to support this worthy goal.

However, I also intend for this research to speak to audiences outside of Hawai‘i, calling the attention of the larger composition and rhetoric profession to the significance of trinary collaborations and offering writing program administrators and composition researchers at other institutions data-driven arguments for enacting their own versions of classroom trinaries. This study presents an example of an English Department and public university, which in a time of unprecedented budget cuts, committed substantial resources toward supporting such trinaries across its first-year composition program. As such, this research offers an important counter-example to the model of FYC instruction profiled within Jessica Restaino’s 2012 NCTE-sponsored ethnography, wherein first-semester graduate students are offered three days of training, a syllabus, textbook and thrust into the classroom. I hope my project encourages all of us in higher education to resist the pull of factory models of first-year composition that boast short-term efficiencies but are lacking in so many other important ways that the following chapters highlight.

Finally, I hope this dissertation will help to spur generations of future research on writing mentors and trinary collaborations. (For a list of the peer-reviewed presentations and publications that have come out of the UHM Writing Mentors Program to date, see Appendices AB and AC.) With this goal in mind, I offer to future researchers 56 appendices spanning nearly 100 pages that synthesize and highlight the UH Writing Mentors Program’s extensive archives. I also propose, in my Conclusions chapter, the creation of an electronic database of mentor logs, memos, and other programmatic
resources that could support dozens of future masters’ theses, dissertations, and scholarship.
Notes

1 Although Linda Tuhiwai Smith is writing from a Maori rather than a Hawaiian framework, she draws a number of parallels between Maori and Hawaiian concepts, to the degree that Native Hawaiian educational researcher Julie Kaomea and ethnographer Ty Kawika Tengan use her work to inform their own research projects in Hawaiian communities. As Georganne Nordstrom argues in her dissertation examining composition classrooms at the University of Hawai‘i, the theoretical frame posed by Tuhiwai Smith “does specifically address the concerns of my research site due to the familial relationship between the Hawaiian and Maori culture and their similarities as Pacific Island people who have been colonized” (48).

2 To inflect, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) is “to bend inwards; to bend into a curve or angle;” and “to bend, incline, dispose” (*OED*, 2a and 2b).

3 What limited access I do have to the events that transpired within trinary classrooms comes primarily by way of participants’ anonymous end-of-semester evaluations. These generally brief, retrospective accounts of how mentors functioned during class are a far cry from thick ethnographic descriptions. While the mentors did keep fieldnotes that included detailed observations of classroom sessions, those fieldnotes were designed exclusively for the mentors’ use in gaining familiarity with class content, identifying ways to individualize their work with students, recording insights for their own future teaching, practicing fieldwork methodologies, and modeling engagement for first-year students who may not be accustomed to taking notes. Furthermore, as mentors’ fieldnotes were not formally part of my dataset for this dissertation research, I did not solicit informed consent from the instructors and students who were the subjects of mentors’ informal observations. (I believe that many instructors would have objected to these fieldnotes becoming part of the formal research agenda, a point I elaborate in the section on research ethics.)

4 According to the OED, the word “perspective” has its earliest uses in optics (in reference to the physical sense of vision and to instruments designed to enhance vision, such as the telescope) and in geometry (as a set of rules for representing three-dimensional objects in two-dimensional spaces). These definitions indicate the term’s positivist underpinnings stemming from the kinds of visual epistemologies deconstructed by feminist geographers (for a useful discussion of this issue, see Nedra Reynolds 59-63). Two OED definitions, however, indicate a kind of productive tension between researching those points of view held by individuals and those points of view accessible to classes of actors (such as writing mentors): “The relation or proportion in which the parts of a subject are viewed by the mind; the aspect of a subject or matter, as perceived from a particular mental point of view. Now only: a particular attitude towards or way of regarding something; an individual point of view” (9a) and “A picture or figure designed to appear distorted or confused except when viewed from a certain position, or presenting totally different aspects from different positions” (2b).

5 Examples include the three mentored sections that dissolved due to administrative and interpersonal reasons; the students who officially or unofficially withdrew from FYC and thus were not in class when the end-of-semester evaluations were distributed; the mentors and instructors who did not complete end-of-semester
evaluations or IRB consent forms for any variety of reasons, including a
dissatisfaction with the trinary arrangement and/or its administration.

6 I want to acknowledge here that certain elements of performance are rendered invisible
within an institutional framework and that some performances may be visible to but not
documented by institutional actors, including mentors. I am not claiming to account for
all performances, but only for those that are documented in program archives.

7 I debated whether to record my observations electronically or by hand. Recording my
fieldnotes on a laptop would have allowed me to capture more detail given the faster rate
of typing and to avoid the occasional problem of illegibility as I raced to keep up with an
exciting idea or piece of dialogue. In the end, however, I opted to use the medium of pen
and paper, as I believed the approach to be less obtrusive in the contexts of my research.
On those occasions when I used my laptop, I was conscious of the clicking keys and the
feeling that the large screen was creating physical (and perhaps also economic) barrier
between the mentors and me, as a majority of the mentors used pen and paper in
roundtables and workshops. Furthermore, the paper notebook allowed me to take notes
during program orientations while moving around the room.

8 Miles and Huberman delineate the following purposes for the contact summary form,
many of which parallel programmatic and pedagogical intentions of conference logs: “(a)
to guide planning for the next contact, (b) to suggest new or revised codes, (c) to help
with coordination when more than one field-worker is involved in the study, (d) to
reorient yourself to the contact when returning to the write-up, and (e) to help with
further data analysis (the summary sheets for a number of contacts can themselves be
coded and analyzed)” (52).

9 I initially identified fifteen conferencing topics by coding recurring themes in the thick
descriptions from the 114 conference logs completed during the two Fall 2006 pilot
sections. I then confirmed, elaborated, and refined these topics based upon the four
Spring 2007 pilot sections to arrive at the eighteen topics listed in the Fall 2007-Fall 2008
conference logs. In Spring of 2009, I added the nineteenth category of “developing
critical reading strategies” based upon repeated roundtable comments in which mentors
described strategies for helping students to engage with assigned readings and research
materials. Beginning in Spring 2010, I added the twentieth and final topic of “Getting to
know one another; building rapport” based upon a Fall 2009 end-of-semester program
evaluation in which a student checked the box for “other” in response to the question on
conference topics and wrote, “Getting to know mentor.” This student comment alerted
me to the fact that the element of rapport building had been a significant part of mentors’
work since the program’s inception, and upon further examination, I found that I had
overlooked its presence in the pilot section logs. One limitation of these topics is the
assumption of a traditional paper-based essay assignment (as in “Generating ideas for the
paper's content;” “Clarifying the paper's purpose and/or audience;” “Organizing the paper
more effectively”). While this assumption fits the assignments depicted in conference
logs fairly well, it also evidences limited and outdated notions of the compositions that
can occur in a FYC course, including digital media and oral presentations.

10 In a focus group interview, mentors reported that they spent anywhere from a few
minutes to over an hour completing a given conference log; they claimed that on average
a “typical” conference log took approximately 10 minutes and the one weekly log for elaboration took approximately 20 to 30 minutes (FN).

11 I specifically challenged the mentors to suspend judgments such as “the student was lazy” or “I think the student felt better about her paper” in favor of operationalized, nonjudgmental descriptions and to resist tidy closures, such as “overall, it was a successful conference” in favor of probing those elements of the conference about which the mentor remained ambivalent or conflicted. Furthermore, I asked mentors to question any uses of phrase “we discussed” (which in my own pedagogical reflections could more accurately be stated as “I lectured”) in favor of a depiction of who actually said what.

12 In Spring of 2008, Jennifer Sano-Franchini was hired to assist me with my research assistant duties. I am grateful for her assistance in managing the voluminous programmatic data for this particular semester, including downloading and archiving the conference logs and digitizing all student evaluations.

13 This multiple-hour process involved downloading the entire set of logs from SurveyMonkey; formatting them within an Excel spreadsheet, manually adjusting column width and headings to make the spreadsheet readable; sorting, cutting, and saving a separate version of the spreadsheet with each mentor’s logs; and carefully emailing the individualized spreadsheets to the mentors and Professor Henry.

14 There exists across this list of researchers quite a variety of approaches to memoing. For example, Shirley Brice Heath and Brian Street recommend that memos be “written each week in connection with logs of recorded data” and structured by “problems and setbacks,” “overview,” “and patterns, insights, and breakthroughs” (79-80). Matthew Miles and Michael Huberman, drawing on the work of Barney Glaser, Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin, advise the ethnographer not to employ a standardized memo instrument across a research study or to memo at pre-set intervals of time, but rather to memo whenever an idea strikes and in whatever format engages the researcher’s imagination (74).

15 Incidentally, by both her instructor’s and students’ accounts, this individual’s mentoring was enormously successful.

16 The directions specified that mentors should compose “approximately one paragraph of discourse,” and average response length to the summary question was 162 words, whereas the average response length to the pedagogical implications question was 135 words. The range on a given response was 0 to 1,145 words.

17 I also observed Ph.D. student mentors utilizing the memos as a way of recording ideas for the next semester when they would be teaching their own class; in future work, I hope to draw upon these memos to analyze mentoring in trinary classrooms as an avenue for graduate teacher preparation.

18 Based upon these limitations, Fetterman recommends the survey as a supporting rather than primary data collection technique for ethnographers (58-59).

19 During the pilot phase of the initiative, I had the opportunity to attend a one-day survey methods workshop conducted by expert Don Dillman.

20 From Fall 2009 on, the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa administered its course evaluations online using an instrument known as the “eCAFE.” With the previous paper model, time was set aside in class to complete course evaluations; now, unless the instructor has access to a computer lab, students must take time outside of class to
complete the eCAFE. Furthermore, any sections of FYC that utilized the library workshops were asked by the library to administer surveys. A student taking a course load of 15 hours, for example, would be faced at arguably the busiest and most stressful times of the semester with at least nine survey requests, including five eCAFE’s, a library workshop assessment survey, the Writing Mentors Program survey, and in Spring semester the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). This list does not include other survey requests by additional campus offices or commercial requests. These surveys problematically positioned students as consumers. While undergraduate students may be the most highly-targeted survey population, the phenomenon also applies to the graduate student mentors and FYC instructors in my study. As part of my own (auto)ethnographic practice, throughout the course of my dissertation research I have responded to almost every, if not every, survey request that has entered my Inbox from members of my university and professional communities: this practice has enriched my understanding of the contexts in which participants completed these surveys, exposed me to a variety of survey designs and protocols, and enabled me to enact some degree of systemic survey-related reciprocity.

While information on students’ place(s) of origin and ethnicities would have been useful for research purposes, I decided to prioritize my administrative responsibilities and limit the background questions in order to guarantee that student identities would remain anonymous when the evaluations were returned to mentors.

These prompts were rotated once I determined that saturation had been reached or the exigency that led to their use was no longer present. For example, in the year before the program’s initial funding expired, program administrators included a question that asked students to take a position on whether the program’s funding should be continued, offering comments to the Chancellor. Once funding was no longer the most critical administrative issue, I traded this question for one soliciting comments on the mentor to future employers.

Following survey completion, I coordinated making photocopies of each survey for program archives and then emailed each mentor with a reminder to pick completed surveys once final grades had been posted. In Fall 2007, I individually transcribed each survey from a handwritten to a digitized format; in Spring 2008, MA student Jennifer Sano was hired to complete this task. And in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009, mentors were asked to digitize their own evaluations and email them to me for programmatic compilation. I created a transcription protocol that included being as faithful as possible to such elements of student responses as punctuations, spellings, and emoticons. With the exception of approximately ten sections during the program’s second year that I transcribed myself, mentors generally transcribed their own evaluations.

While some instructors reserved the computer lab to complete the evaluation or made computers with the survey link available to students during class, others emailed the link to the students and relied upon their good will and access to technology to complete the survey outside of class. Drawing upon strategies identified by John Norris and Cynthia Conn for increasing responses to online course evaluations, Professor Henry and I encouraged instructors to approach the students with the survey announcement well in advance of the semester’s end; to explain to students the value of the student’s feedback for the mentor and the overall program; and to issue multiple oral and written follow-up
reminders to the students (26-27). Over the final weeks of the semester, I also emailed instructors and mentors two-to-three updates with the number of surveys completed for their sections.

This rate of response was calculated by subtracting the number of instances in which mentors were concurrently assigned to two sections (n=3) from the total number of mentored sections (n=127), which includes the two sections of Composition II with mentors, since these sections could not be separated out from the group due to the anonymous nature of the survey. The 96 actual responses divided by 124 possible responses gives a response rate of 77%.

Compared to the student evaluations, the questions on the mentor evaluations remained relatively consistent across the four years. Appendix N displays the full range of open-ended prompts, including the semesters those prompts were employed and the number of responses for each question.

At the mentors’ request, I also added a question that asked directly for areas of improvement.

This rate of response was calculated by subtracting the number of instances in which instructors were concurrently assigned to two sections (n=7) from the sum of the number of mentored sections (n=127), which represents the total number of possible program evaluations, and the total number of mentored sections from Fall 2009 through Spring 2011 (55), which represents the possible number of additional mentor evaluations. (The total number of mentored sections includes the two sections of Composition II with mentors.) The 137 actual responses divided by 175 possible responses gives a response rate of 78%.

These programmatic exigencies most frequently called for quantitative data, including descriptive and inferential statistics on such topics as student attendance, retention, and demonstrated learning achieved on writing assessment.

Earlier, Charney articulates a more specific vision of methodological compatibility:

“The diametric opposition that is sometimes drawn between qualitative and quantitative methods is difficult to sustain. It is more productive to view these methods as complementary or even as overlapping. Qualitative methods-- including ethnographies-- can produce more or less objective categorical data that often may be (and sometimes are) analyzed quantitatively. Many social sciences (such as cognitive psychology and sociology) use both methodologies-and even combine them in a single study-to pursue a broader range of questions. . . Quantitative studies are especially useful for checking the prevalence of some natural phenomena, for testing the relevance of contextual factors, and for tracing trends” (582).

In his book review of Composing Research, Brad Lucas argues that Johanek makes more of the supposed qualitative-quantitative methodological rift than is actually the case and in doing so offers an unfair caricature of a field that is actually much more open to empirical methods than she portrays it to be.

Such narratives of progress are common among mixed methods textbooks and readers (see for example, the title, Advances in Mixed Methods Research), and such renderings are hardly disinterested. For example, inside the back flap of the 2007 edition of John Creswell and Vicki Plano Clark’s textbook, Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research, is a glossy postcard that advertises, “Sign up today for your free online access
to volume one of *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*” and “Win an iPod©! Sign up for Free email Alerts.” Not only Creswell and Plano-Clark’s textbook, but also the advertised journal (edited by Creswell and Tashakkori) are sponsored by Sage Publications. The same can be said for almost all book-length resources bearing the title “mixed-methods.” To be fair, however, I should note that the *Journal of New Directions for Institutional Research* is not sponsored by Sage Publications.

Even in my own dissertation research, I have found the dozen or so books on mixed methods research within the UH Library System published in the last decade to be in constant use: these books almost always required a recall, often placing me second or third on a waiting list, and were re-recalled immediately upon receipt, a phenomenon I did not experience with any other groupings of texts in my works cited.

Creswell and Plano-Clark argue that while pragmatism is the philosophical foundation most cited for mixed-methods research, there is not one best paradigm for the field (26). Furthermore, Tashakkori and Teddlie also identify the “transformative-emancipatory paradigm” as an appropriate philosophical basis for mixed methods.

I should note here that none of these terms originated from mixed methods research. As Heath and Street explain, abductive reasoning is central, for example, to ethnography: “Ethnographic work is a dialogic between existing explanations and judgments (whether held by scholars, outsiders, or insiders) and ongoing data collection and analysis” (57). And “intersubjectivity” is a key concept in such fields as anthropology, folklore, oral history research, philosophy, psychology, and sociology.

John Creswell and Vicki Plano Clark enumerate the following four categories of mixed methods research designs: (1) The *Triangulation Design*, whose purpose is “to obtain different but complementary data on the same topic” (62; qtd in Morse 122); (2) The *Embedded Design*, in which “one data set provides a supportive, secondary role in a study based primarily on the other data type” (67); (3) The *Explanatory Design*, in which the first phase of research identifies a quantitative phenomenon and the second phase of research uses qualitative data to explain the initial quantitative findings (71); and (4) The *Exploratory Design*, which reverses the order of the explanatory design to begin with qualitative inquiry and then use those findings to inform the development a quantitative data collection instrument (75).

Charles Teddlie and Abbas Tashakkori identify five types of mixed methods designs, each with corresponding form of analysis: (1) Parallel mixed methods analysis involves independent analyses of quantitative and qualitative datasets, with separate statistical and thematic analyses each contributing to the final report (341). (2) Sequential mixed data analysis treats quantitative and qualitative analyses as chronological steps, with the findings from a given quantitative analysis shaping the next step of qualitative inquiry, or vice versa (334). (3) Conversion mixed data analysis transforms quantitative data into qualitative formats such as narratives (“qualitizing”) for the purposes of analysis and qualitative data into numbers (“quantitizing”) (332). (4) Multilevel mixed data analysis works across different scales of a study, conducting qualitative and/or quantitative analyses at different levels of aggregation (340). (5) Fully integrated mixed methods data analysis come out of designs that integrate quantitative and qualitative approaches across every phase of the research, treating the two as mutually-informing and interdependent (335).
If I were to use relative emphasis as my criteria for classification, then this study could be seen as an “Embedded Design,” given my placement of qualitative data in a primary role and of quantitative data in a secondary, supporting role. If, on the other hand, I were to use sequencing of quantitative and qualitative elements as my criteria for classification, then my treatment of data could be seen as following a Sequential Mixed Data Analysis model, as I use quantitative measures to identify a dataset for qualitative coding, and then return to descriptive statistics to portray the representativeness of qualitative findings. However, if the rationale for use of mixed methods were given primacy as the criterion for classification, then my research might best be identified with the “Triangulation Design,” which is the most common mixed methods design. Citing Michael Patton, John Creswell and Plano Clark explain that the goal of the triangulation design is to combine the strengths of quantitative methods (such as large sample sizes and an ability to depict trends across a data set) with the strengths of qualitative methods (such as in-depth examination of particular cases and attention to detail) (62).

In his study of 232 peer-reviewed articles published between 1994-2003 from the fields of sociology; social psychology; human, social, and cultural geography; management and organizational behavior; and media and cultural studies that identified mixed methods as in their title or keywords, Alan Bryman identified sixteen stated reasons for using mixed-methods approaches. The most popular rationales were to enhance one’s qualitative finding’s through additional quantitative data, or vice versa (31.5%); to arrive at a more complete or comprehensive account of the phenomenon under study by combining both quantitative and qualitative research (13%); to increase the study’s validity by triangulating or mutually corroborating findings (12.5%); and to facilitate sampling, for example by inviting survey respondents to participate in focus group interviews (13.4%) (92). Interestingly, in 26.7% of these articles, no rationale for the use of mixed-methods was provided. When these same articles were coded according to how methods were actually combined, Bryman found a high degree of discrepancy between justification and application (94). For example, Bryman found “triangulation” and “illustration” to be considerably more likely to occur as practices than as rationales, perhaps because “when faced with two (or in a small number of cases more than two) sets of data, some researchers find it hard to resist making allusions to the consistency or otherwise between their findings” (94). Bryman’s content analysis of articles also found that a handful of articles employed what he termed a Gatling gun, or a “more is better,” approach, either the level of rationale or much more frequently at the level of practice (94). Bryman explains that these various inconsistencies in the mixed methods articles indicated not only the field is “something of a moveable feast” (94) but also that “when quantitative and qualitative components are viewed together, interesting but unanticipated insights are thrown up” (95).

However, unlike Bryman’s understanding of triangulation (92), I do not expect qualitative and quantitative findings to always necessarily work in complementary ways, particularly in the ways in which they lead to portrayals of performance. For example, institutional records may depict a student performance in terms of a low grade, whereas the mentor’s logs reveal improvement over the course of the semester in rhetorical awareness or in overall responsibility toward the student’s education.
Drawing upon the 1978 classifications of Norman Denzin, Miles and Huberman explain that triangulation can occur by utilizing multiple data sources, methods, researchers, theories, and data types (276). As this dissertation project evolved from a seminar paper during my first semester of Ph.D. coursework, to a semester-long pilot study involving four sections arranged according to a trinary configuration, to my actual dissertation research, I filed three different proposals with the University of Hawai‘i Institutional Review Board. The first application, CHS 14823, was titled “English 100 Tutoring/Mentoring Initiative” and was approved on November 28, 2006 as Exempt under DHHS 46.101(b)(2). My second application, CHS 14967, was titled “English 100 Mentoring Pilots” and was approved February 7, 2007 as Exempt under DHHS 46.101.b1. While research conducted under the first two IRB applications informed changes in program administration, deepened my own understanding of trinary configurations, honed my research questions, and led to two initial publications on the Writing Mentors Program, the research presented in this dissertation comes almost exclusively from data gathered under the third IRB application, “An Evaluation of the UH Writing Mentors Program.”

My IRB application included ten appendices: the first seven represent key data collection instruments used in my dissertation research and the final three represent forms used to solicit informed consent from research subjects. When changes were made to the project, such as implementing online surveys and adding a demographic survey for mentors and instructors, I submitted status report forms to the university’s Committee on Human Subjects, which are on file with the original application.

I later learned that although IRB guidelines do not address this grey area, the CCCC’s position statement does explain that its guidelines apply not only to the discourse produced by students but also to any “studies that discuss students” (CCCC). Kuleana is defined in part by Pukui and Elbert as “Right, privilege, concern, responsibility” (179).

Fetterman defines ethnocentric behavior as “the imposition of one culture’s values and standards on another culture, with that assumption that one is superior to the other” (24). In his conclusions to “Unsettling Ethnography: Tales of an ‘Oiwi in the Anthropological Slot,” Ty P. Kāwika Tengan offers the following “final lesson” from his exchanges with a research participant: “He asked me if I had prayed when writing my dissertation. I was caught off guard, for, though I wrote about our ceremonies and rituals, I had not enacted them in my writing. He said that, if I were to make the offerings and prayers we used, my writing would also have the mana of all the other men and of all my kūpuna (ancestors)” (254). For more on Hawaiian notions of prayer or pule, see Pukui, Haertig, and Lee’s Nānā I Ke Kumu volume two, pages 141-144.

For example, when determining which of the fourteen sections of first-year composition with Kanaka Maoli mentors to include in my study of Kanaka Maoli mentors’ work in relation to Hawai‘i, I wondered about whether or not to include the work of one mentor in particular. While the mentor had granted me permission to use his conference logs, I did not know this mentor nearly as well as the others in my analysis, and I did not want to be reading into this person’s conference log narratives meanings in relation to Hawai‘i that were not intended. Furthermore, I had not seen this mentor in a couple of years and was not sure how to make contact. My dad happened to be visiting at
the time I was writing this section, and while he and I were out on an errand, I mentioned to him that I was facing a bit of a dilemma in my research and was pausing and listening for how to proceed. I then looked up and saw this very mentor approaching us. After introductions, the mentor asked how my work on the Writing Mentors Program was going, and I explained about my current research on *Kanaka Maoli* mentors and inquired whether he would be comfortable being included anonymously in the grouping of sections under study. The mentor responded enthusiastically, stating that he was happy for his logs to be regarded as mentoring students in relation to Hawai‘i as ‘āina. While the potential certainly exists that I was over-interpreting happenstance events to suit my own agenda, experiences like this one occurred frequently enough while writing the place-based chapter that I felt the work was appropriate for me to pursue, despite the limitations of my positionality.
CHAPTER 3: Contexts of the UH Writing Mentors Program

Introduction

This chapter analyzes a number of contexts in which this study of trinary collaborations in FYC can be usefully understood. I begin by depicting a handful of significant pre-study conditions, most notably the UHM English Department’s longstanding commitment to having all full-time faculty teach FYC on a regular basis, a model that contrasts dramatically with findings from a 2007 survey by the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Staffing that only 2.1% of FYC courses at research universities nationally are taught by full-time tenured and tenure-track professors (Table 10). In order to understand what kinds of FYC courses become possible when tenured professors regularly teach the course over a career’s duration, I cite published accounts of FYC instruction by UHM Professors Cristina Bacchilega, Cindy Franklin, and ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui, analyzing the ways in which their unique scholarly work informed and energized their FYC instruction, and vice versa. I also illustrate how this departmental context offered the Writing Mentors Program a cohort of experienced instructors who were committed to the institution and interested in collaborating with writing mentors.

I then narrate the English Department’s decision to dispense with a writing placement exam that had previously been used to determine which students qualified for tutoring in favor of offering mentoring aimed at “helping every UHM student excel in English 100.” In order to provide context for my analyses of mentors’ perspectives and performances in Chapters Four and Five, I analyze several administrative features of the program designed to support mentors’ work, including official job descriptions, program
orientations, bi-weekly mentor roundtables, and “eHarmentoring” instruments used to match mentors and instructors. And finally, I analyze how this fledgling initiative survived an era of deep university budget cuts in order to become an institutionalized program, arguing for the importance of systematic programmatic data collection, particularly given the nation’s fixation with narrowly defined evidence of student outcomes assessment and student retention, or what Jon McKenzie has termed “organizational performances.” I also illustrate how WPAs leveraged participants’ qualitative perspectives to illustrate the value of additional kinds of performances facilitated by trinary collaborations. This final section also serves as a reminder that Writing Mentors Program data must be read in light of the context in which they were produced: a time in which participants’ awareness of the need to justify continued programmatic existence promoted a certain *esprit de corps* in which mentoring success stories were emphasized, and sometimes at the expense of other important complicating narratives which later chapters of this dissertation address.

**Scenes of First-Year Composition**

First-Year Composition is, I would argue, one of the most (if not *the* most) difficult college-level courses to teach effectively. FYC instructors find themselves in a room of incoming university students who most likely will not major in English but are nonetheless compelled to take the course in order to graduate, creating a challenge for engagement. Within a single classroom also exist large discrepancies in students’ writing abilities, high school preparations, proficiencies in standardized English, and understandings of composition. Providing the necessary levels of differentiated instruction and individualized feedback to help each student writer progress is extremely
labor intensive. And faculty across the university tend to hold FYC instructors responsible for preparing students for the research and writing skills needed in later coursework. Furthermore, due to the affective nature of writing and the dramatically smaller size of FYC compared to many other first-year courses, the literature on teaching composition indicates that students more frequently disclose personal information (such as struggles with homesickness, breakups with significant others, histories of abuse, thoughts of suicide, or involvement in illegal activities) to FYC instructors than they may to other faculty members. These disclosures can involve emotional burdens for FYC instructors and in some cases require follow up with institutional and/or legal authorities. The research on attrition shows the first year to be the most critical time in determining whether or not students will persist at the university (Grant-Vallone et al.; Nicpon et al.; Pascarella & Terenzini; Tinto; Upcraft, Gardner, and Barefoot), making FYC particularly important from the perspective of student retention.

Given the challenging nature of teaching FYC, the importance of the research and writing skills addressed in the course, the high degree of personalized contact FYC instructors have with their students, and critical significance of retaining first-year students, it seems logical that universities would staff the course with the most qualified instructors possible from their ranks, providing these instructors with generous access to institutional resources and instructional supports. However, as illustrated by the quantitative and qualitative profiles of FYC presented in the next section, such is hardly the case. Despite numerous dissenting voices within the profession, FYC on a national scale operates largely according to logics of short-term efficiency, resembling at many institutions a kind of factory-like model.
National Trends in First-Year Composition

First-Year Composition is arguably the most widely-taken course in U.S. higher education today, required of almost every incoming community college, college, and university student. According to a 2001 *College Composition and Communication* survey, 97% of four-year colleges and universities in the U.S. had a specific first-year writing requirement (Moghtader et al. 464). A 2007 study by Modern Language Association and chaired by composition scholar David Bartholomae found that in 88% of reporting institutions, English departments took full responsibility for staffing and administering first-year writing. Administering FYC through departments of English was most common in public institutions (93.8%), whereas private and Carnegie Baccalaureate institutions tended more frequently to take alternative approaches to FYC, such as a “freshman experience” with a writing focus or writing-intensive seminars (ADE 8). This same survey reported that nearly 70% of FYC courses nationally were staffed by contingent instructors (ADE). This model is most extreme in Ph.D-granting departments, where a 2007 MLA study concluded that “institutions’ rationing of tenure-track positions and increasing reliance on less expensive types of instructional appointments have over time led to a situation where the direct instructional role of [tenured and tenure-track] faculty members in the first-year writing course has been reduced almost to zero” (ADE 15-16).

From FYC’s designation as Harvard’s first required course in 1885 to its nearly-ubiquitous adoption across the American higher education landscape, the history of FYC and the effects of its increasing “industrialization” have been analyzed by multiple composition scholars. While numerous exceptions exist to these larger trends, FYC as an
industry is more often dictated by short-term budgetary exigencies than by research findings. Furthermore, as the 2004 edited collection *Tenured Bosses and Disposable Teachers: Writing Instruction in the Managed University* illustrates, first-year writing programs tend to be highly Taylorist in their organizational structures, led by a Writing Program Administrator who acts as a middle manager for a multitude of adjunct and graduate student laborers. In his critical introduction to the anthology, Marc Bousquet depicts the state of writing teachers nationally in the following dismal terms:

> Writing teachers are commonly paid less than seventeen thousand dollars a year for a 4-4 load, frequently denied such basic classroom autonomies as choosing their own texts, assignments and pedagogies (hence the good food served up by publishers to rhet-comp managers at CCCC), often fired without cause, rarely enjoy health insurance, and are “generously” relieved of service obligations by managers who acknowledge that their workers are “paid too poorly to spend the time on campus participating in governance.” Although rhet-comp’s official discourse acknowledges that these professorial freedoms and protections are desirable for writing teachers (or at least that many writing teachers desire them, which isn’t quite the same thing), the “professionalization” of the field has gained them only for management. (4)

In her 2012 ethnography set in a public university FYC program, Jessica Restaino focuses on the challenges facing a particular demographic of this FYC instructional workforce: first-semester graduate students. Restaino analyzes how this liminally-positioned class of workers—after being “given” three days of training, a syllabus, and a textbook—frequently struggled at adjusting simultaneously to their own graduate-level
coursework and to teaching for the first time. Although twenty-five years have elapsed since the historic passage of the Wyoming Resolution demanding improvement in the status and working conditions of contingent instructors in the profession, Mike Palmquist and Sue Doe explain that “little progress” has actually been made in many of the resolution’s critical arenas (353).

Ironically, whereas the administration and teaching of FYC have become increasingly Taylorized in 21st century institutions of higher education, most other sectors of the U.S. economy have abandoned 20th century manufacturing models. In Workplace Writing Cultures, Jim Henry analyzes the implications of this shift from “high-volume to high value production” for workplace writers, citing U.S. Secretary of Labor Robert Reich’s explanation that in this new economic model “profits derive not from scale and volume but from the continuous discovery of new linkages between solutions and needs” (qtd. in Henry Workplace 5: 85). As this dissertation illustrates, a trinary classroom actor is well-positioned to perceive and discover linkages between solutions and needs of first-year students, instructors, WPAs, the institution. Thus, a flexibly positioned, technologically literate, and culturally savvy third classroom actor performs as a kind of 21st-century knowledge worker envisioned by Reich, offering a means of re-structuring FYC to be more reflective of and responsive to 21st century exigencies. (Of course, UHM writing mentors envisioned their knowledge work serving various interests, and as illustrated in Chapter Five, multiple writing mentors brought to the position a commitment to resisting U.S. hegemony and global capitalism.)

The MLA’s 2007 “Education in the Balance” report invites the English profession to re-think Taylorist FYC models, questioning specifically the accuracy of “the
assumption that the employment of non-tenure-track faculty members, both full- and part-time, saves money for the institution” (ADE 17). The report recommends that departments undertake systematic cost-benefit analyses of non-tenure-track staffing, taking into account the “transactional costs of administering a constantly changing workforce: advertising and searching for, interviewing, deploying, reviewing, rehiring” (17-18). The report also suggests that such analyses consider what first-year students miss out on when they are taught by adjuncts who are too institutionally transient and overworked to advise students, write letters of recommendation, or participate in many other duties of the professorate (18). While the UHM’s English Department has lost a considerable number of full-time faculty lines in the past decade, it nevertheless offers a productive counter-example to national FYC norms that is worthy of further analysis.

The University of Hawai‘i Mānoa’s Approach to FYC

In order to graduate from The University of Hawai‘i Mānoa, students must pass a three-semester hour Foundations in Written Communications course that is administered primarily by the English Department, followed by five additional Writing-Intensive (WI) courses, which are administered by the Mānoa Writing Program. All full-time faculty in the English Department teach the university’s Foundations in Written Communications course once every four semesters. Additional sections of FYC are staffed by Ph.D. students who have taken a graduate-level course on teaching composition and apprenticed for one semester under a full-time faculty member, an experience that involves observing class, holding writing conferences with students, and eventually teaching a unit—all with frequent pedagogical discussions and feedback from the instructor of record. The remaining sections of FYC, which are often not determined until
enrollment numbers are confirmed, are taught by a handful of lecturers who have earned a Master’s degree and in many cases a Ph.D. Unlike virtually all of UHM’s peer institutions, no sections are taught by current MA students.

The degree to which UHM’s model constitutes a departure from national norms is illustrated in the figure below. Based upon a survey of 135 institutions, the MLA created a national staffing profile for First-Year Composition courses taught in Fall 2006,\(^4\) which I have combined with the corresponding statistics for UHM’s staffing of its 39 sections of FYC in Fall 2006:

Table 3.1
Comparison of Staffing of FYC Nationally Across Carnegie Classifications and at UHM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnegie Institutional Classification</th>
<th>Full-time tenured &amp; tenure-track</th>
<th>Full-time non-tenure-track</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Graduate student TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of Hawai‘i Mānoa (n=39)</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research (n=42)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s (n=47)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate (n=46)</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The percentage of FYC sections taught by full-time tenure-track instructors at UHM at 35.9% contrasts strikingly with the 2.1% of FYC sections taught by full-time tenure-track professors at Doctoral/Research institutions nationally. In fact, UHM’s percentage of full-time tenure-track instructors teaching FYC in Fall of 2006 was very close to that of the Baccalaureate institutions. And UHM was far below any institutional category in terms of part-time faculty at 5.1%. Furthermore, the 35.9% of UHM sections taught by graduate teaching assistants included Ph.D. students only. Unfortunately, the ADE Staffing Survey’s category of “Graduate student TA” does not distinguish between Master’s and
Ph.D. candidates, as this distinction would offer a clearer picture of national instruction and would further differentiate UHM’s program.

Given that tenured professors from the English Department’s four tracks (Composition and Rhetoric, Creative Writing, Cultural Studies in Asia/Pacific, and Literary Studies in English) teach the course, there is a great deal of variation in approaches and assignments across sections. All instructors, however, must teach the course in a way that fulfills five shared Foundations in Written Communications Hallmarks (see Appendix AD): these hallmarks address such established composition practices as writing for various audiences and purposes; taking a processed approach that involves multiple drafts; revising based upon peer and instructor feedback; developing information literacy strategies; and utilizing sources in order to express the writer’s ideas.

An FYC program staffed largely by tenure-line English professors carries with it certain disadvantages, some of which can be addressed by adding a writing mentor to the classroom. Some faculty nearing retirement have voiced a concern that they feel increasingly disconnected from and unable to engage their FYC students, lacking shared cultural references and/or the technological aptitude to teach the course in ways that take into account the demands that are and will be placed upon their students to compose in digital environments or participate in social media. Requiring all full-time faculty to teach FYC also means that a number of sections will inevitably be taught by faculty without training in or affinity toward basic tenets of Composition and Rhetoric. As such, a few sections will be taught in a current-traditional vein, focusing heavily on grammar instruction in isolation from larger writing tasks and/or working primarily in the mode of literary analysis or creative writing. Furthermore, from a short–term budgetary
perspective, it would be less expensive to open the teaching of FYC to the large pool of current MA students in the program, some of whom have complained that they are less competitive for teaching positions upon graduating than their peers at other institutions who taught their own FYC sections.

The advantages, however, of a FYC program in which all full-time faculty teach are many. First-year students have the opportunity of working in a small classroom setting with faculty members who are experts in their own fields and bring to the teaching of FYC a wealth of discursive experience, a commitment to the institution, and pedagogies that are often distinctly place-based. These courses often illustrate Reed Way Dasenbrock’s argument in his 2011 *Profession* article, “Undergraduate Education: Cash Cow or Core Competency?,” that institutions of higher education which value undergraduate student learning as their core purpose should emphasize “ways of connecting faculty research to student learning” (210-11). Furthermore, tenure-line faculty members at UHM carry a two-three teaching load, interfacing with far fewer overall student writers than their FYC instructional counterparts nationally, and enabling them to provide ample written commentary and individualized instruction to FYC students. Because these faculty members are familiar with the institution and its graduation requirements (expertise gained by serving as academic advisors to English majors), they can provide useful direction to first-year students. And finally, FYC is matter of department-wide interest rather than the domain of a single Writing Program Director or a few Compositionists, leading to broader ownership and dialogue surrounding the course.
Published Accounts of FYC Classrooms at UHM: Professors Bacchilega, Franklin, and ho‘omanawanui

To illustrate some of these advantages, I turn to three published depictions of FYC by UHM English Department faculty: Professor Cristina Bacchilega’s 2007 Legendary Hawai‘i and the Politics of Place, Professor Cynthia Franklin’s 1997 Women’s Writing Communities: The Politics and Poetics of Contemporary Multi-Genre Anthologies, and Assistant Professor ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui’s “‘Ike ʻĀina: Native Hawaiian Culturally Based Indigenous Literacy.” These professors come to FYC with primary expertise in fields other than Composition and Rhetoric, representing their areas of interest on the departmental website as follows: Bacchilega in “fairy-tale studies, folklore studies and literature, gender and fairy tales, translation studies, narratology, feminist theory and literature, folkloristics and colonialism, and Hawaiian mo‘olelo in translation”; Franklin in “contemporary women’s literature, ethnic U.S. literatures, life writing, disability studies, feminist theory and cultural studies”; and ho‘omanawanui in “Hawaiian folklore, mythology, Oceanic literature, and indigenous perspectives on literacy” (UHM Department of English Faculty). All three have taught FYC regularly over their careers, integrating the teaching of FYC explicitly into their scholarly agendas, and I cite each of their published texts (1) as counter-narratives to the standardized curricula so common in the FYC landscape today, and (2) as illustrations of how intellectually rich a place-based FYC course can be when taught by a professor who has revisited the course regularly across a career.

In her introduction Legendary Hawai‘i and the Politics of Place, Professor Bacchilega offers a specific writing assignment from her own FYC class:
One of the small ways I intervene is to devise a course assignment for first-year writing students that pursues the same goal as this book: “rethinking the roles that traditional narratives play in our lives and especially in our lives in Hawai‘i.” Students are to write an essay that seeks to understand how a place-centered “legend” or “myth” works within the contemporary culture in Hawai‘i. Some students select stories about “haunted” places; others focus on Hawaiian stories about the origin of an area’s distinctive physical features. The students do research at the library, talk with family members, exchange stories with friends. They learn about the stories and history of a specific place that could be a cliff, a building, the dorm they are in. The focus of their inquiry, I explain, should not be simply what these stories say, but what they do. (24)

The assignment specifically addresses the FW Hallmarks of teaching “information literacy” through traditional library research while also encouraging students to engage with Hawai‘i-specific sources. I am struck in this description by how seamlessly Bacchilega’s goals as an instructor of FYC intersect with her larger goals as a scholar. Bacchilega acknowledges the political nature of teaching in Hawai‘i and affirms her own political and ethical commitments without demanding that students arrive at the same conclusions she has. (Note that the assignment asks students to “seek to understand” and requires “inquiry.”) Reflecting upon a career of teaching FYC, Bacchilega writes:

When I first started teaching in Hawai‘i in the early 1980s, I assumed that my students would know Native Hawaiian things best of all: generally speaking I was wrong, and have had to rethink my pedagogy from the understanding that their common ground or the given was colonial education and immigrant acculturation.
I still learned and learn a tremendous amount from Hawaiian and “local” students, but their lack of self-confidence within the academy brought another lesson home. At present—and this was not the case in the classroom twenty years ago—many of the Hawaiian students do know Hawaiian language and traditions thanks to the growing influence of Hawaiian Language and Hawaiian Studies programs, but this knowledge is often ghettoized in the larger academy. (24)

Note the depth of understanding exhibited here about the university’s students, the longitudinal perspective attained by teaching at the same institution for almost thirty years, and yet the simultaneous willingness to continue to learn from one’s students.

Dr. Cindy Franklin narrates her experience of teaching FYC at the University of Hawai‘i from the perspective of a then-Assistant Professor who had lived in Hawai‘i for a relatively short time. After devoting nearly two hundred pages to theorizing and analyzing contemporary multi-genre anthologies, Dr. Franklin closes her book with a description of how such anthologies figure into her own teaching. Franklin writes:

At the University of Hawai‘i, I have structured several of my freshman composition and sophomore writing-intensive literature courses around the reading and making of anthologies. I ask students—whether or not they consider themselves Local—to contribute, then organize and structure, writing and art that in some way expresses their relationship to Hawai‘i. My aim is to involve students in a project that they can claim and care about, and to enable them to become part of a lasting writing community. These anthologies, and the processes involved in their making, serve as intense sites of negotiation wherein students
define themselves in their relation to Hawai‘i, the university, one another, and me. (194)

Like Bacchilega, Franklin’s FYC course meshes with her own scholarly interests in ways that not only meet the FW Hallmarks but also provide a uniquely rich discursive experience for students. In her analysis of students’ responses to the anthology assignment, Franklin particularly notes the value of the collaborative processes it demanded while also focusing on the value of final product of a shared material artifact that goes above and beyond the FW Hallmarks’ demand for “finished prose.” While the field of composition studies has sometimes lost sight of the significance of such products in emphasis on process, Franklin’s field of cultural studies has given more attention to material production. In the penultimate paragraph of her book, Franklin reflects:

In writing this conclusion, and in turning through the pages of the student anthologies, I have realized that, as much as participating in the making of the anthologies, the effort of narrating and reflecting upon this process consolidates and sustains a sense of coalition-building and community. Throughout Writing Women’s Communities, I have been insisting on the importance of the process of anthology-making, an importance impressed upon me by reading anthology editors’ and contributors’ accounts of this process. Paradoxically, however, it was not until I engaged in this process with my students, and began reflecting upon it, that I realized the importance of the product, of the material reality of the book itself, and the narratives it engenders. (198)

Were Franklin a contingent instructor teaching a heavy course-load across multiple institutions, she most likely would not have had the luxury to “turn through the pages of
student anthologies” in a reflective frame of mind, plumbing them for insights and lessons. Franklin’s closing analyses highlight to me the advantages of asking scholars—who must themselves engage in the continual job of reflecting, researching, theorizing, and writing—to invest in teaching FYC.

Unlike Professors Bacchilega and Franklin, Dr. kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui was born and raised in Hawaiʻi; furthermore, she is the first Native Hawaiian scholar to be hired in a tenure-track position in the English Department. Although Composition Studies is not her primary area, her work frequently crosses disciplinary lines, and she was an invited presenter at the 2010 Conference on College Composition and Communication, where she was also honored as a Scholar of the Dream. When I was a first-year Ph.D. student, I remember listening to Dr. hoʻomanawanui job talk, in which she addressed in depth her approach to FYC and impressively articulated how that approach was integral to her larger scholarly agenda. She later published the following analysis of her English 100 course:

As a graduate student, lecturer, and now assistant professor assigned to teach ENG 100 at UHM, the flagship campus bearing the Hawaiʻi name, I felt it important to utilize a Hawaiian cultural foundation in my English courses whenever possible, in part because acknowledgment of Native Hawaiian culture and practice has recently been affirmed by the UHM educational strategic plan. It was also an opportunity to demonstrate to my students, peers, and colleagues that Hawaiian cultural knowledge and perspectives were not limited to the Hawaiian Studies or Hawaiian language classroom and did not need to be sectioned off in a
particular course unit; it could be incorporated across the entire classroom experience. (218)

Like Bacchilega, ho’omanawanui leverages FYC to combat the university’s ghettoization of Hawaiian culture. Situating her teaching within the university’s larger strategic plan, Dr. ho’omanawanui proceeds to describe an entire FYC course grounded in Hawaiian epistemology, basing her teaching philosophy and sequencing of writing assignments on the Hawaiian proverb, “He ’Ili ’ili Au,” which she translates as “I am a pebble” (218). Integrating her scholarship with her FYC theme, ho’omanawanui explains:

‘Ili‘ili pōhaku is an appropriate cultural metaphor, as “stones form the foundation of our culture” (ho’omanawanui, 2008, p. 153). Pōhaku (stones) connect us to Papahānaumoku (Mother Earth), and are born from her as we are; kalo (taro) the offspring of Hāloa, our collective ancestor, is grown in lepo (soil), a relative of pōhaku; they are the relations of Pele, our Hawaiian volcano goddess and ancestor. (219)

Ho’omanawanui metaphorically compares the student to a pebble dropped into the water that “sends ripples out to the world, touching things beyond its immediate grasp” (218); she offers a detailed sequence of reading and writing assignments that move outward from the self, to the community, and then beyond (220), frequently utilizing Hawaiian terminologies to depict the various assignments’ genres. In ho’omanawanui’s experience, locating Hawaiian culture and practice at the course’s center not only increases local students’ levels of engagement with the course materials but also empowers them to “educate their peers in class who are not from Hawai‘i but who are often very interested
in learning more,” shifting the class dynamics toward a peer-mentored learning environment (221).

Across research universities, sections like these taught by tenure-line appointments are increasingly a rarity. These three examples illustrate the advantages of a FYC program without, in the words of Dr. ho’omanawanui, “a forced standardization of what or how instructors teach or design their ENG 100 courses” (218). Each of the three profiled courses were tailored specifically to UHM and its students, challenging first-year students to deepen their connection to place through writing and research. And yet, each section drew so extensively upon the professors’ expertise that it could not be replicated exactly by another instructor or at another institution. The department’s archive of English 100 course descriptions reveals a dramatic variety of approaches among which UHM students can choose. In this departmental culture, many professors who are technically outside the Composition Studies concentration take FYC very seriously, investing time, energy, and imagination in their own first-year writing classrooms and participating in program-wide dialogue and governance. Following these publications, each of the featured instructors has requested to work with a writing mentor, and each has reported that these trinary collaborations have enriched their FYC courses, which were clearly already rich to begin with.

Inception and Administration of the UH Writing Mentors Program

This section offers context on the first four years of the UH Writing Mentors Program: it narrates the details of the program’s inception out of a tutoring program for designated students who performed poorly on a standardized placement exam; to pilot sections where tutors held individual conferences with all students enrolled in the course;
to a full-fledged program requiring distinct administrative supports in order to facilitate successful trinary collaborations.

A one-paragraph overview of the program across the four-year window of my study reads as follows: From Fall 2007 through Spring 2011, the English Department offered 125 mentored sections of FYC, averaging 20 students per section and serving a total of 2,461 UHM undergraduates. Mentored sections represented 35% of the total FYC sections taught during this four-year window and included a variety of course designations: “ENG 100: First-Year Composition” (115 mentored sections); “ENG 100A: Honors First-Year Composition” (9 mentored sections), and “ENG 190: First-Year Composition for Transfer Students” (1 mentored section). Program funding came from the Vice Chancellor’s office (88 sections), the Department of English (32 sections), and the National Education Association (5 sections). The program was administered by one full-time faculty member and one graduate student assistant, positions which Professor Jim Henry and I occupied across the program’s first four years.

**From Placement Exam to Pilot Sections**

The Writing Mentors Program evolved out of a system in which all incoming first-year students to UHM (beginning in 1987 and extending through 2008) were required to take a writing placement exam. Students who performed well were placed into a three-hour section of English 100, and students who performed poorly were required to take English 100 in addition to a 1-hour lab section conducted by an undergraduate tutor and comprised of a required weekly group tutoring session and individual writing conference. Tutors were required to take an upper-division course on Teaching Composition and were expected to attend FYC regularly so as to be familiar
with the course context. Under this system, many FYC sections were composed of fifteen students who had passed the placement exam and five “101L” students who had not. The instructor would be given two separate rosters but was to conduct the course with the same expectations for both populations.¹²

Problems with this system were four-fold: 1) As a “one-shot,” high-pressure writing experience administered during students’ senior year or immediately prior to matriculation, the placement exam was inconsistent in identifying which writers were most in need of tutoring help. Instructors found that writers who scored well on the exam sometimes needed more assistance than writers who scored poorly, but they were hampered by a system in which the tutor was allowed to work with only the five pre-designated 101L students.¹³ 2) The exam took the decision of which students needed additional help out of the hands of instructors and placed it into the hands of assessors. 3) The one-hour lab was a specious credit, as it counted toward qualifying a student for full-time status, but it did not count toward graduation. Every semester, the Director of Composition fielded a handful of questions as to why the 101L credit did not appear on students’ transcripts. 4) Philosophically, the program enacted a deficit model of tutoring. In other words, tutoring was conceptualized as a means of bringing deficient writers up to college standards but not as an activity that could equally benefit already-strong writers. As Anis Bawarshi and Stephanie Pelkowski have argued, remediation models that posit tutoring as a one-way transfer from tutor to tutee compromise the subject positions available to all parties involved.

When Dr. Jim Henry became the Director of Composition and Rhetoric in Fall 2006, he decided to implement a pilot study of tutoring all twenty students in the course,
rather than only a designated few. At the time, I was in my first semester of the Ph.D. program and was assigned to Professor Henry’s FYC course as a Ph.D. apprentice. Another FYC section whose 101L roster under-enrolled agreed to join us in this experiment. The two instructors and tutors (as we were then called) met at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester to discuss observations and to formalize a data collection instrument. Findings from these first pilot sections were eventually published in the article, “Accomplishing Intellectual Work: An Investigation of the Re-Locations Enacted Through On-Location Tutoring” (Bruland).

Based on our promising findings, in the Spring of 2007 Department Chair Cristina Bacchilega decided to support four additional pilot sections of instructors teamed with MA students who were to assist all enrolled student writers. Professor Henry invited me to serve in a volunteer advisory role to the MA students and to facilitate ongoing data collection. These data resulted in the eventual publication of “Mentoring in First-Year Composition: Tapping Role Construction to Teach” (Henry, Bruland, Omizo). While the second set of pilots were underway, Professors Henry and Bacchilega approached the Vice Chancellor with a proposal to expand the mentoring pilots to a full-fledged program aimed at enriching students’ first-year experience. The Vice Chancellor’s office pledged funding to staff twelve sections of English 100 with MA-level writing mentors each semester over the next three years, and Bacchilega committed the department to funding four additional sections per semester. Jim Henry also secured a “Leadership and Learning” grant from the National Education Association (NEA) to place five undergraduate mentors in English 100 classrooms during the Fall of 2007.
After a successful first year of the Writing Mentors Program, the English Department (with the support of the Mānoa Writing Program) voted to eliminate the placement exam that had been in effect for over two decades and to replace it with directed self-placement into mentored and tutored sections of FYC. The Department agreed to dissolve the one-hour lab classification only with the assurance that the university was committed to equipping FYC instructors either with a graduate writing mentor affiliated with the Writing Mentors Program or an undergraduate tutor taking “English 405: Teaching Composition” who could work with writers who needed individual assistance beyond what the instructor reasonably could provide.\textsuperscript{14}

\textit{Launching a Program: Job Description, Logo, Mission Statement, and Website}

To transition from pilot sections to a full-fledged program, Professor Henry and I set about to formalize a programmatic job description, logo, mission statement, and website. The position summary of the formal writing mentors job description is enumerated as follows:

Mentors are assigned to sections of English 100 to assist faculty primarily by holding regular individual conferences with students, first to get to know them and then to seek ways to enhance their writing prowess. Other work entails regularly attending classes and helping the instructor in such tasks as facilitating peer review. Our program, unique in the U.S., seeks to provide English 100 students with valuable support in the form of your expertise as a writer and as a UH Mānoa student. We also seek to help you hone your skills and knowledge as a writing consultant in the tradition of composition and rhetoric. Your ten hours of weekly work include three hours per week attending class, six hours holding
individual conferences and documenting this work (though these hours may vary per week), and an hour per week divided among the following: conferring with
the course instructor, reading and/or preparing for bi-weekly roundtables of
mentors, and making entries in your Composition log book.

The job description, which can be viewed in full in Appendix AF, goes on to enumerate
six principal responsibilities and duties: “1. Attend all classes and collaborate closely
with the instructor. . . ; 2. Meet regularly with students. . . ; 3. Document your work. . . ;
4. Attend mentoring roundtables and workshops. . . ; 5. Communicate extenuating
circumstances. . . ; and 6. Wonder. . . ” The final element of mentors’ formal job
description, “wondering” about student performance, came directly from the various
kinds of productive wondering Professor Henry, Ryan Omizo and I found throughout the
pilot mentors’ logs in conducting research for our co-authored article, illustrating one of
the ways in which programmatic research informed administration at nearly every turn.

While I took the lead on designing and refining the program’s data collection
instruments, Professor Henry took the lead on constructing a mission statement, logo and
website. These steps were intended to help create programmatic identity, increase
Department and campus-wide visibility, and ultimately promote programmatic
sustainability. The program’s mission reads: “The English Department’s Commitment to
Helping Every UHM Student Excel in English 100.” In aiming to mentor “every” first-
year student writer, the program mission offers a model of writing support that contrasts
with deficit models of tutoring as aimed only at “remedial” populations of students. And
the stated desire to help every student “excel” presents a philosophy that speaks against
gatekeeper notions of first-year courses as places where those students who are college-
worthy “swim” while the others “sink.” (However, subsequent analyses of student
evaluations and focus group interviews have led me to conclude that not “every” student
may want to “excel” in English 100, as the mission statement assumes.15) Professor
Henry also implemented an elaborate program website that he maintained throughout the
program’s first four years (www.english.hawaii.edu/mentors). This website offers a rich
repository of the program’s history and accomplishments, including links to all program-
related workshops, colloquia, poster sessions, publications, and presentations; an
extensive list of professional and university resources for mentors; and biographies of the
mentors and administrators.

Program Orientations

The week prior to the start of Fall 2007 classes, Professor Henry and I led the
program’s first orientation, lasting one and a half days. Day one was set aside for the
mentors and included background on the initiative; a review of the job description; an
orientation to the working tools and space; a panel of all four pilot mentors from the
previous semester; and an orientation to the assigned readings from programmatic
scholarship. At the beginning of the day, Professor Henry ceremoniously handed each
mentor a specialized pen, purchased with funds from the NEA grant, bearing the Writing
Mentors Program logo. Professor Henry explained that the pen’s green ink symbolized
UH Mānoa’s institutional color, sustainability, and the composition lore that green
symbolizes “go” and thus encourages writing. Seizing the performative moment, he then
unscrewed the top of the pen to reveal a USB storage device loaded with the job
description, data collection instruments, assigned readings, a list of campus services for
first-year students, and a handful of other mentoring-related resources. Professor Henry
also presented each mentor with a low-tech working tool, a traditional lined composition notebook, which he explained was to be used for keeping in-class fieldnotes in the role of “composition researcher of student performance” and for modeling the art of in-class note-taking. He explained that while conference logs were to be submitted to the Program Assistant, the fieldnotes were the mentors’ exclusive property. Throughout the orientation, Professor Henry continually emphasized to mentors their triple positioning (1) as composition practitioners in their classrooms and student conferences, (2) as grounded theorists wondering about students’ composing challenges and opportunities, and (3) as researchers collecting and interpreting data in the form of logs and fieldnotes.

Day two of the orientation included both mentors and instructors. During the first two hours, Professor Henry led an orientation for instructors, while I facilitated an interactive session for the mentors on recognizing professional limits, making referrals to campus resources, and conducting successful “intake interviews” with students (see Appendix AG). The orientation ended with time for mentor-instructor pairings to prepare for their upcoming collaborations. For the next hour, the room buzzed with pairs of instructors and mentors huddled together over FYC syllabi, sharing personal histories and teaching philosophies, exchanging contact information, discussing expectations, reviewing writing assignments, and co-authoring policies for mentor conferences.

Over the next four years, Professor Henry and I facilitated a total of eleven orientations: four in August lasting 1.5 days each, four in December each lasting approximately two hours, and three in May each lasting approximately two hours. Prior to each orientation, Professor Henry emailed participants with a link to the program website which included an agenda with hyperlinks to referenced campus resources,
readings, and supporting documents. (For a sample 1.5-day orientation agenda, see Appendix AH.) Based upon participant feedback and programmatic research, we added on-location workshops at three campus services to future August orientations: 1) Hamilton Library to orient mentors to the suite of library resource workshops designed specifically for FYC; 2) the KOKUA Program for students with disabilities to sensitize mentors to the ways in which a disability may impact writing; and 3) the University Counseling and Student Development Center for a workshop on self care, active listening strategies, and referral making. In order to facilitate instructor and mentor collaborations, Professor Henry developed a document in May of 2008 titled “Fifty Ways to Add Your Mentor” that included a growing collection of ideas for integrating mentors into the course (Appendix AI). In August 2010, based upon mentors’ feedback that more directive guidelines were needed for instructors who were new to the program, I developed a support document titled “Key Mentor-Supportive Practices” (Appendix AJ). Drawing upon three years of research, the document specified the following practices to be critical on the part of instructors:

(1) Require an intake interview with the mentor for all students. (2) Require/reward consequent writing conferences with the mentor throughout the semester. (3) Think hard about conferencing cycles so that mentors experience a steady stream of students rather than a boom/bust scenario. (4) Make your grading practices and expectations for assignments as transparent and explicit as possible. (5) Build in regular meta-discourse with the mentor. (6) Consider giving your mentor a teaching role.
The sixth point on this list came with the explicit caveat that MA-level mentors should lead no more than one full week of class and should not at any point grade (or be perceived as grading) student work. We hesitated to implement anything more prescriptive than these guidelines, recognizing the diversity of pedagogical approaches instructors brought to FYC and the importance of honoring their intellectual space.

**Bi-Weekly Mentor Roundtables**

From Fall 2007 through Spring 2011, Professor Henry and I co-conducted almost one hundred bi-weekly mentor roundtables, which served as professional development and support sessions. Most semesters, the mentoring cohort was split into two groups consisting of six-to-eight mentors each. Although each roundtable had a formal agenda, time was always set aside for sharing victories and troubleshooting challenges. At the beginning of each semester, Professor Henry established a premise that roundtables were meant to help mentors improve the quality of their own mentoring and their students’ performances, but not to critique the performances of instructors. (If something truly problematic were happening in class, mentors were encouraged to approach Professor Henry and me privately.) Furthermore, mentors were instructed to avoid using names of students or instructors in order to preserve confidentiality. Although these roundtables generally had a relaxed and informal atmosphere, mentors approached them with professionalism and collegiality. As one mentor described in an anonymous program evaluation, “The bi-weekly roundtables were helpful as a kind of support group where we not only share our bewilderment, successes, woes, and discoveries, but also help each other feel less alone—especially the new mentors— in the process of finding our feet in this program and the semester's ENG 100 section” (ME 30). Yearly roundtable topics (in rough chronological
order) included discussions of intake interviews; analyses of the conference log data collection instrument; a workshop on taking fieldnotes as a participant observer; the creation of individualized mid-semester formative feedback mechanisms; discussions of potential adjustments to mentoring approaches based upon mid-semester student and instructor feedback; proposals of potential mentoring-related presentation topics for the college’s annual peer-reviewed graduate student conference; visits from guest speakers; and discussions of special topics (often by mentors’ request) such as listening effectively, mentoring small groups, mentoring advanced writers, and constructing an e-portfolio. The final roundtable of the year was reserved for a digitally-recorded focus group interview in which mentors were asked to reflect on their entire experiences to date in the Writing Mentors Program. In years one and two of the program, focus groups were also conducted with students and instructors, with separate sessions for each institutional position.

*Mentor-Instructor Pairings Through “eHarmentoring” Surveys*

The literature on writing fellows indicates that recruitment and placement of collaborating faculty and third classroom actors ranks among the most significant elements of WPAs’ roles (Soven “Curriculum” 68; Zawacki “Change Agents”). Professor Henry and I learned this trinary wisdom first-hand in the program’s first semester, as one mentor-instructor pairing barely survived and another fell apart completely by mid-semester, requiring multiple emails and meetings with the various parties and indicating fundamental incompatibilities that may have been preventable. In preparation for the second semester’s pairings, I devised a mechanism to aid Professor Henry and me in the critical task of matching instructors and mentors. Hoping for some levity, I named it the
“eHarmentoring survey” (see Appendices AK and AL). To determine matches, Professor Henry and I compared mentors’ and instructors’ stated teaching and tutoring philosophies, intellectual interests, desired degrees of participation on the part of the mentor, and scheduling constraints. For the most part, we made every effort to honor requests made by instructors to work with specific mentors and vice versa. Mentors and instructors commonly justified these requests in their eHarmentoring forms on the basis of shared experiences in prior classes or mentor roundtables, affinity for the instructor’s course description, or acquaintance through departmental functions. Whenever possible, we attempted to pair instructors who were new to the island with “local” mentors who could serve as both institutional and cultural guides. We also tried to give mentors serving across multiple semesters the opportunity to work with instructors occupying a range of institutional positions.

The survey also served a secondary rhetorical purpose of prompting instructors to consider and commit to pedagogical and logistical shifts needed to run a successful trinary classroom. For example, instructors were posed the question, “What kinds of support for mentor conferences would you be willing to enact?,“ followed by a checklist of suggested supports. In semesters with more requests for mentors than mentors available, survey responses allowed administrators to determine those instructors who were most likely to utilize the mentor’s presence and potential the fullest degree.

Although the task of administering these surveys and carefully matching instructors and mentors proved complex and time consuming, Professor Henry and I determined it to be well worth the effort, not only in preventing future administrative headaches but also in promoting positive collaborations. Across the program’s first four years, 122 of 125 (or
97.6%) of the original mentor-instructor matches endured through the semester’s end. Furthermore, in their end-of-semester evaluations, 90% of instructors claimed to be “very satisfied” with their assigned mentor’s performance; 10% to be “satisfied,” 0 “unsatisfied;” or “very unsatisfied.” Such results, of course, are a testament not only to good matches but also to good mentors, good instructors, and good will.

**Coordination with Programs and Resources University-Wide**

Another important part of establishing the program was coordinating services with various entities across campus serving first-year students. Perhaps the most significant of these collaborations was with the Student Success Center in Sinclair Library. In the program’s first year, the designated meeting space for mentor-student conferences was an oversized office on the seventh floor English Department. By both mentor and student accounts, the space was difficult for students to find, and the Internet connection, despite repeated IT interventions, was woefully unreliable. In times of low meeting volume, several female mentors reported that the space felt a bit unsafe and eerily quiet, whereas in peak meeting times the space quickly became hot, overcrowded, and noisy. Ultimately, program administrators concluded that this location conveyed the message that writing was the exclusive province of the English Department and rendered the mentors’ work invisible to the larger university at a time when visibility was critical for the program’s survival. Beginning in the program’s second year, the designated meeting space was relocated to the newly renovated Student Success Center of Sinclair Library:
Fig. 3.1. Photograph of the Writing Mentors Program conferencing space in Sinclair Library. The back right corner of photo, marked by the row of three chairs and the planter box, is the UHM Writing Center.

Student Success Center Director Gregg Geary agreed to designate for the Writing Mentors Program a space in the Sinclair “Commons” area with two large wooden tables with six chairs each, as well as two cubicles with side-by-side chairs. One cubicle was equipped with a password-protected computer. Bordering the Writing Mentors’ space was the UHM Writing Center, whose director offered to share with writing mentors any resources not in use by the Center’s writing tutors. Writing Center and Writing Mentors Program administrators agreed that it would be ideal to have first-year students meet with mentors in the spaces surrounding the Writing Center, hopefully getting students comfortable with the idea of utilizing the Writing Center in future Writing Intensive courses.17

Additional programmatic collaborations were prompted by the dissolution of the placement exam and the subsequent discontinuation of 1-hour non-credit lab sections
with individual tutoring for those writers deemed in need of additional support. In the wake of these changes, it was important for programs supporting “at-risk” populations of students to be made aware of the individualized support now offered through the Writing Mentors Program. And yet other collaborations were initiated by mentor feedback indicating that mentors would benefit from orientations to campus resources offering dimensions of support beyond mentors’ professional purviews.

In sum, the list of campus entities with which the Writing Mentors Program coordinated services included the following: the Student Success Center, Hamilton Library, the Access to College Excellence (A.C.E.) Program for first-year student learning communities, the College Opportunities Program (C.O.P.) for Hawai‘i residents from under-served communities, the Manawa Kūpono scholarship program supporting Native Hawaiian students, the Sustainability Council, the Honors Program, the KOKUA Program for students with disabilities, the Center for Counseling and Student Development, the Mānoa Writing Program, the Assessment Office, and the General Education office. These collaborations not only helped direct first-year students to the Writing Mentors Program, but also helped the Writing Mentors Program gain visibility and support campus wide. And in making a case for continued funding, we were able to enlist the support of these allies, arguing how integral the program had become to the broader university community.

**Surviving in an Era of Outcomes Assessment**

Another context for the development of the UH Writing Mentors Program was the university’s (and nation’s) drive toward assessment. This next section addresses both the ways in which (a) program administrators deployed programmatic data collection and
research for survival within this context; and (b) these overarching programmatic records speak to the kinds of work accomplished by trinary configurations. Thus, in addition to continuing my narration of the program’s evolution, I employ the data in this section to begin addressing my second research question, which analyzes how mentors’ perspectives and performances inflect trinary participants experiences of FYC. Evidence of some of these inflections can be seen in the results of a large-scale writing assessment; in students’ comments about how mentors helped them in their transitions to the university; in conference attendance records indicating the varying degrees to which students engaged with their mentors; in the range of topics addressed in writing conferences; and in participants’ rankings of the program and explanations of the reasons behind their professed “satisfaction.” To some degree, this section introduces the “what” of these inflections, whereas the next two data chapters develop this “what” in ways that probe the “how.”

My introduction to outcomes assessment came before I entered the Ph.D. program, while I was teaching secondary English. During this time, I attended a workshop led by Anne Ruggles Gere and Kelli Sassi on the new timed writing exam that had recently been added to the SAT. While addressing how to help students perform within this context, Professor Gere largely focused on the problematic ways in which this exam would no doubt influence writing instruction and the kinds of advocacy needed by secondary teachers at this critical national juncture. Upon entering the Ph.D. program, I soon found that the mandate to objectively quantify student learning (often through scored writing) was now facing universities. In Fall 2007, as a requirement for institutional re-accreditation, UHM brought in Dr. Mary Allen, a consultant on
assessment and accreditation in higher education and a member of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Educational Effectiveness Resource Group, to present on outcomes-based approaches to teaching, learning, and assessment. As a follow-up to her university-wide seminar, unit heads associated with the various General Education Foundations requirements were invited to participate in a day-long workshop led by Dr. Allen in order to create Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s) for their respective Foundations areas. As the graduate student representative to the Composition/Rhetoric Committee, I was allowed to attend the workshops in an observer’s capacity, taking fieldnotes on the processes by which the Foundations in Written Communication Hallmarks were reduced to a set of observable, testable student learning outcomes. This experience introduced me to the mindset and priorities of the audience of university administrators and WASC accreditors to whom the Writing Mentors Program would be reporting at the end of the program’s three years funding, and in my position as Graduate Research Assistant I designed and oversaw the systematic collection of programmatic data with these audiences in mind.

Results of a Large-Scale Writing Assessment

Following Dr. Allen’s workshops, I volunteered to assist Dr. Erica Reynolds Clayton in designing and implementing a large-scale assessment of student writing across the entire FW program, albeit with some skepticism as to the behaviorist underpinnings of the entire undertaking. All Spring 2008 FW students were asked to submit the piece of writing composed over the course of the semester that best exemplified the Student Learning Outcome: “Students will be able to compose a text that seeks to achieve a specific purpose and responds adeptly to an identifiable audience” (Appendix R).
Students were also asked to compose a 30-minute in-class reflection on their essay’s purpose and audience as a means of assessing meta-cognitive understandings of the essay’s rhetorical situation (Appendix T).

Dr. Clayton graciously agreed to conduct the assessment in such a way that mentored versus non-mentored students’ performances could be compared. This comparison was methodologically appropriate since mentored sections were not yet advertised, and students happened into them by luck of the administrative draw rather than at an advisor’s recommendation or out of a proclivity toward mentoring. Furthermore, there were no significant differences between the mentored and non-mentored populations in incoming SAT, ACT, or AP scores. At the recommendation of College of Education Professor Dr. Shuqiang Zhang, we employed a stratified random sampling design in which 25% of the submitted essays in each FW category were selected for blind scoring. In sum, 82 essays were scored from non-mentored sections and 80 from mentored sections. Scoring rubrics were implemented under the direction of Drs. Monica Stitt-Bergh and Marlene Lowe from the newly-formed UHM Office of Assessment. Writing samples were scored independently by two raters along a 4-point scale according to the analytic traits of content, organization, language and style, and mechanics (Appendix S). In-class reflective essays were scored separately on a 4-point holistic scale (Appendix U).

Students in mentored sections out-performed their non-mentored counterparts in all categories. With the assistance of Dr. John Norris from the Department of Second Language Studies, the five dependent variables (content, language, organization, mechanics, and reflection) were all entered into a single multivariate analysis of variance
(MANOVA), with the alpha level set at 0.05 (i.e., a 95% confidence level). The MANOVA test indicated an overall statistically significant difference between the two groups (Wilks’ Lambda $F_{5, 158} = 5.67, p < 0.001$). In order to identify which individual dependent variable comparisons contributed to the overall statistically significant differences, additional comparisons were made for each of the five assessment scores.

The following table shows the significance tests for each of the five scores.

Table 3.2
Statistical Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for a Large-Scale Assessment Comparing the Five Scores Assigned to Mentored versus Non-Mentored FYC Students’ Writing Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Deg. of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>16.386</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.386</td>
<td>11.169</td>
<td><strong>0.001</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>26.538</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.538</td>
<td>17.955</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Style</td>
<td>7.833</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.833</td>
<td>5.354</td>
<td><strong>0.022</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>26.449</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.449</td>
<td>8.957</td>
<td><strong>0.003</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>237.663</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>239.438</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Style</td>
<td>237.015</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>251.297</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>478.398</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistical analyses conducted by Professor John Norris.

The final column displays the significance test, indicating that all but one of the scores led to statistically significant differences between the two groups. The only category that did not show a statistically significant difference was “mechanics” ($p = 0.580$). As a compositionist, I was most interested in the mentored students’ higher scores on their reflective letters, especially as Lee Ann Carroll’s longitudinal studies of college writers indicate meta-cognitive awareness and rhetorical fluency to be critical factors in students’ long-term writing development. It seems logical that mentored students would write with greater complexity and employ more sophisticated rhetorical vocabularies, given the amount of time students had spent talking about their writing with their mentors and the
fact that a majority of mentored students (66%) claimed that their conferences with writing mentors had directly addressed issues of purpose and audience (SE; Spring 2008 only). These assessment findings were met with strong interest by upper-level university administrators and the WASC accreditation team, who were particularly enthusiastic about their overall statistical significance. While I appreciated the ways in which such results potentially increased programmatic visibility and longevity, I remained cautious about the overall logical positivism of the assessment enterprise, both for the ways in which subsequent numerical results not in the program’s favor could have the opposite effect and for the ways in which such numbers greatly reduced the richness of the undertaking and overshadowed the program’s extensive qualitative research.  

The “R”-word: Accounting for the Program’s Role in Student Retention

Upon presenting the writing assessment results at the 2009 UHM Assessment in Action Poster Session, the 2009 Association of American Colleges and Universities Annual Meeting, and visits with members of various WASC accreditation teams, the follow-up question I would almost invariably receive was whether the mentored students were being retained at higher rates than their non-mentored counterparts. I was even directly asked “the retention question” by the university Chancellor. The Spring 2008 mentored and non-mentored cohorts featured in the large-scale assessment had nearly identical rates of retention, both in their rates of enrollment from the freshman to sophomore years and in rates of graduation four years later. Upon the heels of this statement, I frequently invoked the professional literature on student persistence, noting the myriad of factors (academic, financial, bureaucratic, racial, cultural, psychological, personal, and more) that figure into a student’s persistence (Bean; Reason). Based upon
these studies, I argued that it would be nearly impossible to attribute ultimate causation to a single institutional actor or to judge a program’s worth on a percentage of students retained by the institution.

However, qualitative evidence demonstrated that mentors were addressing a number of issues that the literature on student persistence has identified as key elements of retention. These studies indicated that becoming engaged with the college or university increases students’ likelihood of persistence, whether that engagement be understood in terms of Vincent Tinto’s earliest theoretical models of integration into the academic and social systems of the university or in terms of more recent studies of the importance of subjectively feeling a sense of belonging in classes and on campus (Hoffman et al.; Nicpon et al.). Rich illustrations of the Writing Mentors Program addressing these facets of persistence exist in first-year students’ own words. When asked “Did your mentor help your transition to college?,” fully 71% of mentored students across the four years claimed “yes” (SE). The table below features excerpts from forty students’ follow-up responses to this question. These comments describe mentors’ assistance across a range of transitional challenges, from helping students to feel less intimidated by FYC to encouraging students to get involved in campus clubs and activities. All comments cited in Table 3.3 were written by first-generation college students.
Table 3.3  
Dimensions of Transitional Assistance offered by Writing Mentors to First-Generation FYC Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of transitional assistance</th>
<th>First-generation student comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping students to perform more successfully in FYC</td>
<td>• Being my first year in college I felt that [Mentor’s name] helped encourage me in my Eng.100 class. When I had questions about the prompt or anything we did in class she always answered in a way that I could understand. With her help I was able to go from C+ papers to A papers. (SE 1242)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Decreasing the intimidation level of FYC | • I was quite worried about taking this class the first day, and didn’t know how the mentoring process went, but when we were required to meet with a mentor, it made me calm and felt more better about taking this class. (SE 1435)  
• She made the papers seem less intimidating. (SE 1446)  
• My mentor helped decrease my level of “overwhelmed-ness.” I was worried that my English class would assign too many papers for me to handle, and I would initially think that the assignments were very difficult. She helped me see the more simple side of the assignment and it was easier to understand. (SE 1449)  
• This was my first English class in college and she made me feel much better and more confident in the class. It was great to know she was always there to help me. She made the class better and easier. (SE 945) |
| Increasing student self-efficacy and confidence in asking for help | • He made me more confident in my writing and also less afraid to ask for help. (SE 1392)  
• She listened to my ideas and gave feedback. Whenever I talked with her I did not feel inferior or too embarrassed to share my ideas. I guess she helped me to open up and to reach my full potential as a writer. (SE 1685)  
• She made me feel confident in my writing and I always felt excited about writing after our meetings. She never made me feel out of place or stupid. She is aware and sensitive. (SE 895) |
| Helping students adjust to the new pace, quantity, and level of work in FYC | • He introduced me to college writing. (SE 742)  
• By guiding me through the usually-fast-paced-college-class rhythm; like an older brother (SE 1117)  
• She helped me with all my English assignments, which is quite a lot because a majority of my assignments are from English class. This on it’s own helped me transition because I am not used to having so many essays. (SE 1247)  
• She helped me adjust to turning in college quality work, rather than high school quality work. (SE 1700)  
• She helped me realize that college requires more work and more elaborate sources. (SE 1336) |
| Helping students interpret and approach their FYC instructors and other university professors | • Helped me to feel more comfortable talking to her/instructor, as well as my other instructors (SE 697)  
• My mentor explained exactly what the teacher wanted out of the course and explained that I needed to prepare for an abundant amount of work and assignments. He somewhat mentally prepared me for this course by telling me what was expected from this course and how many assignments the teacher was going to give. (SE 1425)  
• He told me what professors expect when they are grading a paper and how I should construct my papers. (SE 1261) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of transitional assistance</th>
<th>First-generation student comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Preparing students for their future writing in the university | • My mentor helped me prepare for the future in the university by stating the significance of writing. (SE 966)  
• She helped me with writing that will be useful throughout college (SE 978)  
• My mentor helped improve my writing skills greatly and gave me a pretty good idea of the kinds of writing that I would have to do as a college student. (SE 1362) |
| Assisting students in establishing time management and personal organization habits needed to succeed academically in college | • She gave me ways to help me use my time better and she gave me examples of her personal life that I could relate to and helped me overcome obstacles I went through. (SE 1729)  
• He told how to be organized and what to expect when mid-terms come along. (SE 1164)  
• Help me managed the time to do the work from class. (SE 1162) |
| Offering individualized attention and psycho-social support | • She got to know us, and always helped with any problems I had. She was wonderful! (SE 569)  
• She helped me to feel welcomed by asking about my life, then slowly transitioned into talking about English and helping me better my skills. (SE 1011)  
• I could talk to her about anything. (SE 570)  
• Be more comfortable around unknown people and working with different sources (SE 1386)  
• Coming from Ohio transition was sometimes difficult but she was able to talk me trough problems and relate to me. (SE 1617) |
| Encouraging students to become “affiliated” with the university through campus clubs and other forms of social integration | • He was awesome! He helped me with my writing but also just with getting affiliated with the college campus. (SE 923)  
• She made sure that as a freshman, I would try everything in my power to get involved in not only my English class but, in clubs as well. (SE 1220)  
• She helped me explore different campus clubs and organizations that interested me to help with my transition into college. (SE 1226) |
| Sharing about the mentor’s own college transition experiences, including advice first-generation students were likely not able to obtain from a parent | • He gave us his experience as a new freshman and told us things that we should & shouldn’t do. (SE 755)  
• Explained personal life and discussed their own transition into college as well; was very supportive as a person to speak and listen to; knew much about the way the campus works and all of the resources on campus. (SE 1722) |
| Explaining the workings of the university and preparing students for what to expect from their college careers | • She told me the reality of how college really is and I feel that from this, I can anticipate things in my future years in college. (SE 1172)  
• Helped me with trying to make a schedule, pick a major, and general college advice (SE 798)  
• I thought I would have to rely on just friends to help me. However, I was wrong! UHM provides good quality services, and the one I love the most is the service in which your class comes with a mentor! (SE 1483) |
| Increasing students’ overall sense of belonging at the university | • Helped me get over the fear of being in college. (SE 602)  
• She made me more comfortable of my surroundings (SE 1212)  
• Welcomed us to college well (SE 1136) |
| Assisting students in discovering a sense of purpose and direction for college | • She helped me find out what I wanted to do in college and helped me find a reason and purpose for why I am here. (SE 1662)  
• My mentor helped me realize that college is very important and that it takes a lot of dedication and time to produce quality work. (SE 1485) |
It is hard to imagine another class of employee within the university performing this range of transitional assistance for first-year students. First-generation students in particular wrote of the ways they benefitted from having an individual who was willing to share her or his own transitional struggles and pointers for navigating the university, as these students did not likely grow up hearing such stories and advice from their own parents. That first-generation students face heightened challenges in transitioning to the university has been well documented through both autobiographies (Lara; Rodriguez; Rose; Villanueva) and large-scale empirical studies (Choy; Pike and Kuh; Terenzini et al.; Warburton, Bugarin, and Nunez). While researchers have repeatedly identified relationships between students’ sense of belonging at the university and their overall levels of success and persistence, they have also found that financial and cultural barriers faced by first-generation students make them less likely to socially and academically engage in the institution (Braxton; Museus and Quaye; Pike and Kuh; Tinto). As Pike and Kuh explain, this lack of engagement can become a sort of self-perpetuating cycle:

Another reason first-generation students may be less engaged is because they know less about the importance of engagement and about how to become engaged. That is, compared to second-generation college students, they have less tacit knowledge of and fewer experiences with college campuses and related activities, behaviors, and role models. . . This is especially problematic for students attending institutions where the predominant social, ethnic, or religious culture differs from their own and where they may encounter a unique set of adjustment challenges (Allen). (290)
Comments by first-generation students frequently addressed ways in mentors supported their engagement with the university, from helping one student become “less afraid to ask for help” (SE 392), to encouraging another student to get “affiliated with the college campus” (SE 923), to guiding another student to “find a reason and purpose for why I am here” (SE 1662). Program records indicate that engagement is, to a large degree, a mentor-able perspective and performance— and one that UH writing mentors frequently documented and discussed. During the four-year window of my study, I also observed the Chancellor’s talking points shift from a primary focus on “student retention” to a focus on making Mānoa “a destination of choice.” While this language problematically echoes that of the tourism industry, it also points to the place-based nature of students’ college decisions and the fact that the Writing Mentors Program is a distinguishing feature and potential “selling point” for UHM.21

The following is a brief addendum the topic of student retention that I did not pursue with university-level administrators during the program’s “survival” phase, but which seems worthwhile to offer in this present context. In a 2009 CCC’s article titled “Retention and Writing Instruction: Implications for Access and Pedagogy,” Pegeen Reichert Powell reviews the rapidly-growing body of retention literature, encouraging compositionists to draw upon our “disciplinary history of institutional critique and discourse analysis” in order to approach retention efforts with “a healthy skepticism” (670). Powell questions the degree to which administrators’ goals of improving retention rates are motivated by a desire to keep students’ tuition dollars within the institution, considering the ways in which this goal may run counter, at times, to composition instructors’ pedagogical goals. Along with Powell, I believe that second always to
enhancing student learning, the goal of improving rates of persistence (or helping students to complete a college degree, regardless of the institution) is worthier than that of increasing rates of retention (or keeping students at the same college or university in which they initially enroll through their graduation) (679-680). In light of the retention literature that indicates approximately half the first-year students at many institutions will never graduate, Powell encourages FYC teachers to ask ourselves how we might change our instruction to better serve this non-graduating population of students beyond their university lives. Drawing upon the work of Richard Fulkerson, Powell challenges composition teachers not only to help students become “more successful insiders” at the university but also “more articulate critical outsiders” should they exit the university, for any myriad of factors, without a degree (qtd. in Powell 677: 679). My research indicates that a third classroom actor who takes a “mentoring” approach is well positioned to participate in this broadened agenda envisioned by Powell. For example, multiple conference log narratives depict mentors coaching students on pursuing their stated goals of transferring to another four-year institution. Mentors in roundtables also spoke about helping students who were planning to drop out of UHM exit in ways that left as many doors as possible open to future re-entry. Another mentor persuaded a student to enroll at a community college rather than dropping out of college altogether. And in many other cases, mentors spoke or wrote about their disappointment at having a student in the course stop attending, and despite the mentor’s repeated attempts to reach out, never hearing from that student again. These writing mentors witnessed first-hand dimensions of student performance that most retention researchers will never access. Given mentors’ awareness of the many activity systems in which students participate and the ways in
which various circumstances may be affecting student performance, they may be better poised than almost any other institutional actor to help the retention community understand in greater qualitative detail the complexity of this topic, potentially shifting all of our questions about student retention and persistence in more productive directions.

**Documentation of Conference Totals, Stages, and Topics**

In offering evidence to upper-level administrators of what mentors “actually did,” I drew extensively from program records of conference attendance. Of the total conferences logged, 92% could be considered “individual conferences” involving one mentor with one student; 7% paired or small group conferences involving two-to-five students; and 1% sessions involving the entire class of FYC students. On average, students in mentored sections participated in 4 out-of-class conferences with their mentors, although conference attendance ranged from 0-15 total meetings. Figure 3.2, below, displays the distribution of conference attendance across the hundred sections in my study:
In many sections, instructors required students to meet 3-4 times with their assigned mentor, deeming any additional meetings as voluntary. Generalizing these criteria across the program, it could be said that approximately 25% of students under-utilized the mentor’s services, meeting 2 or fewer times; whereas approximately 46% of students met with mentors the expected 3 to 4 times; whereas approximately 25% of students voluntarily exceeded conferencing requirements, meeting with their mentors 5 or more times. Based upon students’ self-reporting, first-generation students averaged a slightly higher number of conferences (n=3.755) than their non-first-generation student counterparts (n=3.623). This is a promising finding, given that (semi)voluntary programs such as this are not always well utilized by populations of students deemed “at risk.”

The table below further disaggregates these data:
Table 3.4
Average Number of Writing Conferences Attended, as Disaggregated by First-Generation Status and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Student</th>
<th>Total Students Reporting</th>
<th>Range of Conferences Attended</th>
<th>Average Conferences Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation Male</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>3.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation Female</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>3.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-First Generation Male</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>3.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-First Generation Female</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>3.568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the next table offers a portrait of conference attendance by section type:

Table 3.5.
Average Number of Writing Conferences Attended as Disaggregated FYC Section Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Student</th>
<th>Total Students Reporting</th>
<th>Range of Conferences Attended</th>
<th>Average Conferences Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FYC for Transfer Students (ENG 190)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Sections (ENG 100A)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Honors Sections (ENG 100)</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That students of many backgrounds and skill levels utilized the Writing Mentors Program at very similar rates of conference attendance (while still allowing for great flexibility at the individual level) suggests the broader applicability of “mentoring” over “tutoring” approaches. Program administrators leveraged these attendance data to argue that writing mentors interacted with a significant percentage of UHM’s first-year student population, providing first-year students who are often reticent to seek out institutional resources with easily accessible writing assistance in the form of someone they interact with in class on a regular basis.

Across the 6,602 total conference logs submitted for the 100 FYC sections in my dissertation study, mentors recorded a total of 3,250 hours spent conferencing with students. Conference lengths ranged from less than one minute to three hours, with an
average duration of exactly 30 minutes. Figure 3.3 displays the distribution of conference lengths:

Fig. 3.3. Distribution of mentor-student conferences by length.

These variations in conference length indicated a high degree of flexibility, as mentors were kairotically able to seize teachable opportunities of variable durations, ranging from a quick exchange before class to more in-depth discussions. (Although program administrators are currently considering the option of re-configuring mentoring as a 1-hour designated lab slot, I would argue against this move, in part, because it would shift writing conferences away from this more *kairos*-inflected framework in which conferencing times are largely flexible and variable, to a more *chronos*-oriented approach in which conferencing time is generally pre-set and uniform.)

Perhaps one of the more pedagogically interesting trends is that writing conferences took place fairly evenly across the various stages of students’ assignments, with the most conferences occurring early in the process and decreasing as the assignment deadline neared and then passed. This overall distribution of conferences by temporal stage is displayed in the pie chart below:
Fig. 3.4. Percentage of overall student-mentor conferences at various stages of writing assignments.

Source: Mentor Conference Logs.

Triangulating evidence is offered in the table below, which displays the percentages of students who claimed to have experienced a mentored writing conference at various points in their assignments.

Table 3.6
Percentages of FYC Students who Conducted Writing Conferences with their Mentors at Various Stages of the Writing Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages in writing assignments at which conferences occurred</th>
<th>Total number of student responses</th>
<th>Percentage of mentored FYC students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the beginning</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near the end</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After an assignment’s initial grade</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Anonymous end-of-semester student evaluations.

These findings indicate that mentors in trinary configurations were actively supporting the FYC program’s second student learning outcome, which addresses guiding students through a processed approach to writing. The highest percentage of first-year students (72%) claimed to have attended writing conferences with their mentors during the
beginning stages of assignments, and the highest percentage of overall conferences across the program also took place early in students’ writing processes (36%). Mentors often found conferences in the early stages of an assignment’s development to be the most pedagogically productive, as students were more willing to explore big ideas, discuss writing processes, and consider new methods of research. Conversely, a much lower percentage of first-year students claimed to have attended writing conferences with their mentors during the final stages of an assignment (56%), and the percentage of overall conferences that took place near the assignment’s end (27%) was among the lowest of the stages. The 8% of conferences that took place after an initial grade had been assigned generally occurred in courses where instructors offered students an opportunity to substantially revise already-graded work for a potentially higher grade and/or implemented an end-of-semester portfolio system requiring additional rounds of revision. Mentors found such instructor approaches to be especially supportive of their work, generally resulting in a steadier stream of students coming to the mentor and curbing the drought/deluge conferencing cycles driven by paper deadlines.

This major programmatic finding—that mentored conferences were most heavily concentrated at the beginning of assignments—is particularly noteworthy in light of writing center scholarship, which evidences a long and frustrating struggle with students and instructors reducing their services to last-minute editing. In her keynote address to the 2010 CCCC’s Research Network Forum, writing center pioneer Muriel Harris called this battle to correct such misperceptions “the perennial problem that writing centers face.” Evidence of writing centers’ struggles to re-define themselves to students and instructors not as “fix-it shops” (Carrino 96) can be seen from Steven North’s 1984 “Idea
of A Writing Center,” to Nancy Grimm’s 1996 “Rearticulating the Work of the Writing Center,” to Peter Carrino’s 2002 “Reading Our Own Words: Rhetorical Analysis and the Institutional Discourse of Writing Centers,” to Harris’ 2010 analyses of the prose characterizing a majority of Writing Center websites today (“Rethinking”). In conducting writing conferences across such a variety of stages and topics, writing mentors oriented first-year students to writing conferences as dynamic, engaged, and versatile events. As I have argued elsewhere, the mentored writing conference in the context of the trinary FYC course “teaches students that tutoring encompasses much more than grammar, equips students with the meta-cognitive vocabulary to articulate session goals, and ultimately positions them to consider approaching the writing center on their own” in their later university careers (Praxis n.p.).

The wide distribution of conferencing stages, in part, also enabled wide range of conference topics. On their end-of-semester evaluations, students were presented with a list of twenty conference topics and asked to identify which ones they had addressed with their assigned writing mentor. The results are displayed in the Table 3.7, below.
Table 3.7
Percentages of Mentored FYC Students who Addressed Various Conference Topics with their Writing Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference topic (from checklist of 20 items)</th>
<th>Percentage of mentored FYC students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generating ideas for the paper's content</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know each other; developing rapport</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the assignment's requirements</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing the paper more effectively (including transitions)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying the paper's purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing (or modifying) a topic</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honing grammar, usage, and style</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying the instructor's comments for revision</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding material that was covered in class</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing confidence as a writer and college student</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding outside sources</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating outside sources into a piece of writing</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching the instructor with concerns, questions, requests</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for writing conferences (with the mentor or instructor)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing technology and/or university resources (i.e. library, websites, student health . . . )</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring skills in time management and personal organization</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholding class and/or university policies and expectations</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling issues of college and personal life not directly related to the course</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing critical reading skills</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating with classmates (addressing any peer-to-peer issues)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Anonymous end-of-semester student evaluations.24

For triangulation, Appendix AM presents an identical list of conference topics, displaying them according to their rates of recurrence across the 6,602 overall mentor conference logs. As the above table indicates, students engaged mentors’ assistance across an expansive range of topics. Several conference topics were closely related to the FYC student learning outcomes, including clarifying a paper's purpose and/or audience (69%), finding outside sources (47%), incorporating sources into a piece of writing (44%), applying the instructor’s comments for revision (53%), and honing grammar, usage and style (56%). Conferences also regularly addressed a multitude of issues that significantly
affected students’ performances in FYC and the university beyond those few explicitly named within the FYC student learning outcomes. Examples include students who looked to their writing mentors for help in developing confidence as a writer and college student (49%); in approaching the instructor with concerns, questions, requests (38%); in acquiring skills in time management and personal organization (31%); in utilizing technology and university resources (34%); in handling issues of college and personal life not directly related to the course (26%); in addressing issues of upholding class and/or university policies and expectations (28%); and in collaborating with classmates or addressing peer-to-peer issues (17%). In composing the program’s assessment reports, this list offered useful evidence of the work mentors performed not only on behalf of the FYC program, but also the university.

Participant Satisfaction Rankings

Reported satisfaction rates were consistently high across all semesters of the program and all parties of the trinary. Of the 1,774 students who completed an anonymous end-of-semester evaluation, 56% claimed to be “very satisfied” with their assigned mentors, 32% to be “satisfied,” 7% to be “neutral,” 1% to be “unsatisfied,” and
Today more than ever, as universities such as UHM compete for students’ tuition dollars, “student satisfaction” has become yet another educational commodity. While I recognize the problematic nature of a survey question that positions program participants as consumers (of FYC, their mentors, etc.), I also acknowledge some potentially positive elements of a framework that forces university administrators to inquire of students as to their preferred modes of learning. As I address more fully in Chapter Four, the Writing Mentors Program model seems to have hit a generational nerve in its ability to provide first-year students with their own point person for nearly any writing-related and university-related issue they may face. Students’ follow-up comments repeatedly identified the source of their satisfaction as having access to a representative of the university who was at once “approachable,” “supportive,” “helpful,” “knowledgeable,” “willing to listen,” “cool,” and “always available” (SE).

Instructors reported perhaps the highest satisfaction rates of all groups, signaling that the program was not only popular among students but also educationally effective.
from instructors’ perspectives. Of the 64 instructors who responded to the question, “How would you rate your overall level of satisfaction with the mentoring program?,” 78% claimed to be “very satisfied,” 20% claimed to be “satisfied,” “1.5%” claimed to be “unsatisfied,” and 0 claimed to be “very unsatisfied.”

Fig. 3.7. Instructor satisfaction rankings with regards to the Writing Mentors Program.

Instructors tended to write about their satisfaction with the trinary configuration in terms of improved student writing; a more dynamic and engaged classroom environment; greater opportunities for individualized instruction; and their own sense of being re-energized as FYC teachers (IE).

As elaborated in Chapter Four, mentors most frequently tended to describe their “satisfaction” in terms of being engaged in work they found both personally meaningful and professionally useful. One mentor explained, “The most fulfilling was easily having students tell me that my assistance actually was beneficial to their learning. This is what I guess I’d refer to as my worker’s satisfaction, the thing that sustains and pays slightly more than money, that makes me realize I do want to teach sometime in my future” (ME 88). In the 96 anonymous end-of-semester program evaluations submitted by mentors, 57% claimed to be “very satisfied” with their experiences in the Writing Mentors Program, 40% to be
“satisfied,” “4% to be “unsatisfied,” and 1% to be very unsatisfied. (In two cases, mentors simultaneously checked the boxes for both “satisfied” and “unsatisfied” and explained in later survey responses both the fulfillment and frustration of the position.)

Fig. 3.7. Mentor satisfaction rankings with regards to their experiences in the Writing Mentors Program.

Despite these high levels of “worker satisfaction,” mentors also reported a number of problematic elements of the position, which I analyze in Chapter Four.

While the rates of response were above 70% for all groupings, it should be acknowledged that those non-responding program participants may have felt that silence was the safest form of dissent, particularly among instructors whose surveys in years one and two were not anonymous, a point I have discussed further in the Methodology chapter. The almost nonexistent rates of “dissatisfied” and “very dissatisfied” participants may be due, in part, to their under-representation in official programmatic data. Nevertheless, program records signal clearly that an overwhelming majority of participants in each trinary party claimed to be “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their experiences in relation to their assigned mentor and/or the Writing Mentors Program.
Presentations and Publications on the UHM Writing Mentors Program

The program’s final assessment report also emphasized its research dimensions as integral to its overall value. Eleven different writing mentors have presented on their own mentoring research at the UHM Annual College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature conference, a peer-reviewed graduate student conference. Additionally, research on the Writing Mentors Program has led to seven presentations at national and/or international scholarly conferences: the CCC’s Research Network Forum (x2), the CCCC’s Conference (x3), the International Writing Across the Curriculum conference, and the Association of American Colleges and Universities annual meeting. To date, five peer-reviewed publications have also come out of the program, including placements in *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, Currents in Teaching and Learning* (x2), the *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, and the *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. A full list of program-related publications and presentations, originally compiled by Jim Henry, can be found in Appendices AB and AC.

From Survival to Institutionalization

As the program’s three years of guaranteed funding came to an end, Professor Henry and I drafted a report to then-Department Chair Mark Heberle that summarized the program’s accomplishments and argued for its institutionalization (submitted November 5, 2009). We also contacted former mentors and invited them to email the Chair with their comments. Chair Heberle and Professor Henry forwarded the report, along with selected comments, to the Dean of the College (who had previously attended multiple mentor presentations at the LLL’s conference) and the Vice Chancellor. The program
was fortunate that the newly-hired Vice Chancellor, Reed Way Dasenbrock, happened to be a strong advocate for undergraduate education and the humanities, arguing in a 2011 *Professions* article that universities are badly mistaken when they treat undergraduate education, and especially general education courses, as a “cash cow” rather than as the “core competency” of the institution itself. Over the summer of 2010, those affiliated with the program held our collective breaths in hopes that the program’s budget would not be eliminated and the job offers that had been extended to the incoming cohort of mentors would be actualized. Despite a state budget crisis that generated severe university-wide budget cuts, including a 6.67% faculty pay reduction for that same year, the Vice Chancellor’s office approved of including the $98,000 line item for the Writing Mentors Program in the university budget.

While it is possible that this line item could be cut in future years, it is unlikely that it would happen in the foreseeable future given that the Writing Mentors Program has since been highlighted as a success story among the university’s first-year programs in the final reports composed by both the UHM Re-Accreditation Committee and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) visiting team.\(^{26}\) Furthermore, the program is backed by a number of vocal advocates at the department, college, and university levels. One example is the College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature Dean, who at a May 2011 college-wide meeting praised the program in front of the college’s Department Chairs, expressing his commitment to the program’s continued funding and encouraging other departments to initiate their own student-centered programs similar to the Writing Mentors Program model (e-mail correspondence with
Department Chair Jeff Carroll). Of course, with (apparent) institutionalization comes a new suite of programmatic challenges and opportunities.

One of issue of debate has been the question of whether to formalize mentoring as a 1-hour lab credit. Early on, I argued for requiring students to enroll in a 1-hour lab in order to work with writing mentor. My rationale was that this lab designation would offer mentors and students a mutual pre-designated meeting slot, reducing the time spent scheduling and re-scheduling meetings; allowing for more group conferencing opportunities; circumventing the problem mentors usually faced with one or two students each semester of simply not being able to find a mutual window outside of class for face-to-face conferences; and supplying students with academic credit toward graduation for the extra time devoted to their writing.

However, my research has led to me to believe that more would be lost than gained through the implementation of a 1-hour lab. For students to receive academic credit, there would have to be standardization of conferencing quotas, policies, and outcomes across trinary sections. This standardization would decrease the range of ways in which students experienced writing mentoring. This range (in terms of conference duration, location, topics, etc.) is part of the genius of the present program—and part of the reason why the program is able to satisfy such a broad range of students. Instead of conferences occurring at the *kairotic* moment in which students needed assistance, they would occur in pre-set intervals according the logic of *chronos*. As such, conferences would lose some of their voluntary *ethos*. Of course, not all mentored conferences in the present system are approached kairotically or voluntarily, but enough are that mentors and students report the experience to be highly satisfactory. When I posed this query to
mentors in participant check roundtables, they overwhelmingly felt that despite the logistical hassles a set lab time would resolve, first-year students need to be taught how to set and keep appointments and that the present system was teaching students habits of professionalism that will serve them well beyond FYC.

Like the Writing Mentor Program’s predecessors of a placement exam and designated lab section, the standardization surrounding a 1-hour lab credit would likely take some of power of directing students to the mentor out of instructors’ hands. Given the remarkable expertise and variety across the FYC teaching cohort in the UHM English Department, I would much prefer to offer instructors a suite of strategies and guidelines for trinary collaborations (as in the “50 Ways to Add Your Mentor” and “Key Mentor-Supportive Practices” documents) than to present them with a set of standards and rules which would likely come with a 1-hour lab credit for mentoring. The core of participating instructors who are tenure-track professors will also theoretically have the opportunity to team with writing mentors over a career, reflecting upon and honing their approaches to working with a third classroom actor in ways that suit their own unique teaching goals and styles. As Lad Tobin so eloquently put it, “Effective teaching is so difficult to achieve and differences with personal styles and material conditions so profound, it seems wise to keep all reasonable options on the table” (205). While Tobin was referring to effective teaching in a binary classroom configuration, I would argue that his observations are all the more true for trinary classroom configurations.

**Conclusions**

The arguments for the value of the Writing Mentors Program and the narrative of programmatic success presented in this chapter are productively complicated in the next
chapter, which analyzes the paradoxes mentors encountered in offsetting the traditional classroom binary configuration by attempting to act as team performers with both instructors and students. There, I investigate how mentors found in the lived positionalities of their institutional positions both pitfalls and possibilities, many of which were so closely interconnected that one could not exist without the other. However, it is my hope that this current chapter also complicates readings of the “data” that inform later chapters, reminding readers of the ways in which efforts to ensure programmatic survival were inseparable from every element of programmatic data collection, including its design, completion, and even interpretation.
Notes


2 See, for example, Sharon Crowley, *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays* (U. of Pittsburgh, 1987) and her 2002 updated article, “How the Professional Lives of WPAs Would Change in FYC were an Elective;” Susan Miller, *Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition* (Southern Illinois UP, 1991); Eileen Schell and Patricia Lambert Stock, ed., *Moving a Mountain: Transforming the Role of Contingent Faculty in Composition Studies and Higher Education* (NCTE, 2001); and Marc Bousquet, Tony Scott, and Leo Parascondola, ed., *Tenured Bosses and Disposable Teachers: Writing Instruction in the Managed University* (Southern Illinois UP, 2004).

3 I experienced some of these conditions first-hand from 2002-2003 as a Graduate Teaching Assistant at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. After a semester-long course in teaching composition, I was given a universal textbook (*The Scott, Foresman Handbook for Writers*) and a program-specific teaching handbook with a required progression of writing assignments and sent into the classroom. Although the graduate course culminated in the production of our own syllabus, writing assignments, and lesson plans— which must all adhere to strict programmatic guidelines— our training involved no apprenticeship or observation of another’s teaching. We were required to meet a few times over the year in small groups with an experienced Ph.D. student “mentor” who observed our classroom teaching at the mid-semester point for the purposes of evaluation, but there was no mentoring in the teaching of FYC by full-time faculty. As I walked into the classroom for the first time, I realized that I was merely five years older than the average student on my roster. I taught the course three times— largely by trial and error— and then graduated with my MA. Based upon my recollections of the program, I would estimate that at UNC, the average years of teaching experience across the cohort of FYC instructors was two, perhaps three. Although the FYC program was directed by Erika Lindemann, a well-respected pioneer in the field of Composition Studies, she was working with a set of departmental realities and institutional constraints that many Writing Program Directors at research institutions face.

4 Since 2006, however, the teaching of FYC at UHM has already shifted closer to national norms: under severe budget cuts and hiring freezes, the English Department lost fifteen full-time faculty and gained six, requiring more sections of English 100 to be taught by lecturers.

5 For example, community college instructor Dan Morgan explains: “Extensive, concentrated individual attention is best, but many of us with heavy teaching loads read and evaluate over eight *hundred* essays per semester, and don’t work in private offices. Thus, my reality is that I hold required conferences for all of my writing students
only once, to discuss, approve, and help with term paper topics” (322-323). While individual writing conferences with FYC students are not required of instructors at UHM, such practices are a strong part of departmental culture, and it is common to see faculty office doors with conference sign-up sheets and students waiting for their conferences in the hallway.

While a strong majority of FYC and undergraduate writing instruction is geared toward individual writing processes and products, repeated observations have come from the fields of Composition Studies and Technical and Professional Communication on the need to teach students collaborative writing. Examples over a twenty-plus year period include Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford’s 1990 *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing*; Helen Dale’s 1997 *Coauthoring in the Classroom: Creating an Environment for Effective Collaboration*; Bruce Speck’s 2002 *Facilitating Students’ Collaborative Writing*; and Jim Henry’s 2012 “Performing Professionally as a Writer: Research Revival Vlogs.”

To emphasize the level of expertise in both scholarship and teaching that these professors bring to their FYC composition classrooms, I list the following sampling of awards. For, Bacchilega the Chicago Folklore Prize (2008), Guggenheim Fellow (2001), Hawai‘i Board of Regents’ Award for Excellence in Teaching (1991), and College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature Excellence in Teaching Award (1988). For Franklin, the Frances Davis Memorial Award for Excellence in Teaching (1998), and Board of Regents’ Award for Excellence in Teaching (2007). And for Ho’omanawanui, Ford Foundation Fellow (2001-2005), Carnegie-Mellon Post-Doctoral Fellow (2009-2010), and CCCC’s Scholar of the Dream (2010).

For a semester-by-semester breakdown of mentored and non-mentored sections of First-Year Composition, see Appendix AE.

Positions funded by the Vice Chancellor’s office came in the form of quarter-time teaching assistantships for MA students in which mentors received a partial tuition waiver and pay for ten hours of work per week. Positions funded by the Department of English came in the form of half-time teaching assistantships for both MA and first-semester Ph.D. students, which included a full tuition waiver and stipend. MA students who were awarded this competitive departmental support served in a rotation that included assignments to large-enrollment sections, writing center tutoring, and the Writing Mentors Program. The NEA support for five sections was awarded to undergraduates who were paid at an hourly rate.

Administratively, the English Department granted the Program Director position a reduction of one course per year and covered the costs of paying a Graduate Student Assistant Director at five hours per week over the program’s first two years. From Fall 2009-Spring 2011, in exchange for two mentored sections per semester, the Vice Chancellor’s office supported a half-time Graduate Research Assistant position for the program.

As opposed to the then-common national FYC placement mechanisms of a multiple choice test and/or a very brief direct writing exam, the University of Hawai‘i exam featured locally-developed writing prompts and a five-hour testing period (three hours of required writing in the morning, a break for lunch, followed by two optional hours in the afternoon) that was meant to encourage time for invention and revision. In their 1992
publication, *Making Your Writing Program Work: A Guide to Good Practices*, former Mānoa Writing Program Director Thomas Hilgers and former UHM English Department faculty Joy Marsella describe the exam’s positive ripple effects state-wide, lauding it as “a novel exam worth teaching to” and explaining that high school teachers reported students “taking instruction in writing much more seriously” and that over 50% of student writers were still writing 1.5 hours into the optional afternoon session by the exam’s third year (218-219). Another feature of the placement exam to consider are the expenses involved: in their “Sample Writing Program Annual Budget,” written in 1992, Hilgers and Marsella allot $2k to in-state placement exam travel and $17k to placement exam scoring (114). And of course, the placement exam also influences such dimensions of the budget as office supplies, student help, and employee salaries. Using the Bureau of Labor Statistics Inflation Calculator, the $19k directly allotted to the placement exam in 1992 would be worth approximately $31k today. As such, savings from eliminating the placement exam could be seen as covering around one-third of the $98K line item in the annual university budget now allotted to UH Writing Mentors Program.

12 Individual instructors determined whether the English 100 student population was made aware of the dual designation, and many instructors went to lengths to ensure that the 101L students’ status was kept confidential.

13 In the department debate over whether to terminate the placement exam, Jim Henry explained that when he joined the English faculty in fall 2005 and requested a section of English 100/101 as part of his teaching assignment, he was intrigued by this mainstreaming configuration—an approach he had never encountered—yet somewhat perplexed by the semester’s end. Two of his five 101 students were among only four to receive A’s in the class, and a third who quite possibly would have otherwise failed mustered a B- by virtue of a tutor’s support, thus demonstrating the value of tutoring. Yet three other students in the class who had placed into English 100 would have benefited enormously from tutoring, but they did not qualify. In my own experience as a first-semester Ph.D. apprentice tasked with tutoring in a 101L section, one of the 101L students had, by her own accounting, “blown off the placement exam” sleeping through much of the required morning session and not returning after the lunch break. This student turned out to be one of the most capable writers in a course in which at least two other students who passed the placement exam needed a fair amount of additional tutoring to pass the course.

14 As a step toward a model of directed self-placement, beginning in Fall 2008 students were alerted to which sections of English 100 were part of the Writing Mentors program through the online university course catalogue. Mentored sections had an unmistakably bold line reading: “ENG 100 [section] will be a mentored section. For details, see ‘Choosing an English FW section’ at www.mwp.hawaii.edu.” The link provided a description of the Writing Mentors Program and testimonials by first-year students.

15 For example, a student commuting to campus, working multiple jobs, and caring for family members may decide that the grade of a B is all she or he can reasonably aim to achieve and does not want to be pushed to invest in English 100 the time required in order to earn an A. In “Course-Embedded Mentoring for First-Year Students: Melding Academic Subject Support with Role Modeling, Psycho-Social Support, and Goal Setting,” Jim Henry, Jennifer Sano-Franchini, and I identify students’ predispositions
toward mentoring as an important construct in determining the quality of a mentoring relationship, quoting from a student who wrote on her anonymous end-of-semester evaluation “students need to be taught to care,” a point I revisit in my data chapters.

16 This question was not added until the program’s second year. Seventy-three out of 89 instructors completed this question, with a response rate of 82%. While these survey results are undeniably positive, I believe it is entirely appropriate to assume that the silence of those instructors who did not respond may well have been a means of expressing dissatisfaction, either with the program’s administration and/or with their assigned mentor. Furthermore, in a handful of situations in which the instructor checked “satisfied,” their follow-up written comments indicated that the mentor’s performance fell below their expectations.

17 A similar logic has been pursued by Mary Soliday, who claimed that writing fellows programs serve as a “gateway” to the writing center.

18 Dr. Mary Allen holds a Master’s in Statistics and a Ph.D. in Psychology, which may help to explain her orientation toward assessment. Her biography on the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) website reads in part: “Dr. Mary Allen is a sought after speaker, consultant, and workshop presenter and has worked with over 100 colleges, universities, and college systems” (http://www.wascsenior.org/seminars/facilitators). The number of institutions Dr. Allen has worked with signals the mass adoption (and standardization) of outcomes-based assessment.

19 For example, the subsequent FW assessments on information literacy (which I did not help to conceptualize or administer) followed the previous research design of comparing student writing in mentored versus non-mentored sections. In these cases, mentored students scored worse than their non-mentored counterparts. The conclusions, however, were based upon writing samples from only 17 mentored and 16 non-mentored students, far fewer than the 80 mentored and 82 non-mentored student essays that were used in the previous assessment. Furthermore, with mentored sections now being advertised, it was no longer appropriate to compare the populations in a control group study.

20 During Spring 2008, a total of 305 students were enrolled in FYC mentored sections and 378 students were enrolled in non-mentored FYC sections. One semester after taking FYC, 81% of the students in mentored sections were still enrolled at UHM and earning credits toward graduation, to 82% of students in non-mentored sections. As of Spring 2012, four years after taking FYC, 39% of students in mentored sections had graduated to 42% of their counterparts in non-mentored sections. It would be methodologically inappropriate to compare the populations of mentored and non-mentored students from year two of the program onward, as mentored sections became advertised at this point, and numerous campus entities serving at-risk students were notified to recommend these mentored sections to first-year students.

21 Professor Henry literally made the mentoring program a “selling point” in a December 2010 trip to Kauai with a recruitment team from UHM. His talk on the Writing Mentors Program was preceded by one of his former English 100 students, who struggled in her first semester of college but has since gone on to conduct campus tours for prospective students. This student explained that her transition from Kauai to Honolulu was far more
difficult than she had anticipated and that having a writing mentor made a huge difference in her persisting at the university (Jim Henry; personal correspondence).

Data on numbers of conferences were drawn from students’ reporting in end-of-semester evaluations, and data on conference lengths were drawn from mentors’ conference logs. The 1,765 total end-of semester student evaluations represent a 72% rate of return; as discussed in the Methodology chapter, students who responded were likely more engaged in the course and in the mentoring than those who did not respond.

While it could be illuminating to disaggregate data according to additional demographic variables, I am unable to do so because I designed program evaluations so as to preserve students’ anonymity and thus did not inquire about any other demographic information beyond first-generation status and gender.

The methodology chapter includes further discussion of the evolution of these conference topics and the strengths and limitations of the data collection instruments that generated these programmatic findings. Students were presented with eighteen of the twenty topics across all four years, whereas two topics were added in later semesters. I have weighted the percentages accordingly.

Two percent of the students surveyed did not respond to this question.

See UHM’s “Educational Effectiveness Review Report” to WASC (18-19) and WASC’s “Final Report of the ERR Visiting Team” (30).
CHAPTER 4: The Paradoxes of Team Performance: Writing Mentors
Researchers’ Institutional Positioning and Lived Positionalities in Classroom
Trinaries

Understanding Trinary Collaborations through Theories of Performance

While the job description presented in the previous chapter serves as an official
representation of the institutional position of the writing mentor (see Appendix AF), it
sheds little light on mentors’ lived positionalities. To offer a more nuanced portrayal of
how mentors performed the position, this chapter presents discourse-based analyses of
end-of-semester evaluations completed by students (n=673), instructors (n=49), and
mentors (n=89). These end-of-semester evaluations provide triangulated accounts of the
enormous range of behaviors and roles enacted by this third classroom member. These
evaluations also feature mentors’ accounts of the most frustrating and fulfilling elements
of their work as trinary collaborators, offering a window not only into mentors’
perceptions of other institutional actors, but also the degree and complexity of teamwork
required of those performing the position of “writing mentor researcher.” Such variously-
positioned accounts of mentors’ work reveal contradictions and incongruities that
underscore contrasts between mentors’ institutionally-defined positions and their lived
positionalities in trinary configurations, illustrating the tensions mentors frequently
experienced between approaches to mentoring as voluntary, altruistic, and even familial
and the institutional realities of mentoring being a quarter-time job serving first-year
students who do not always want to be mentored. Based upon these dynamic tensions,
this chapter argues that mentors occupy paradoxical positions within trinary classrooms
and institutional hierarchies that (a) enable them to embody a range of roles available to
few, if any, other agents in the university; (b) prepare them uniquely for future roles as classroom instructors; and (c) offer the profession insights into teacher and student performances of FYC from a new kind of composition researcher.

To probe these dimensions of writing mentor researchers’ performances within trinary configurations, this chapter draws upon the branch of performance studies forwarded by such scholars as Erving Goffman, Victor Turner, Richard Schechner, Marvin Carlson, and Jon McKenzie, who have applied theatre studies concepts to analyses of social actors across a variety of settings.\(^1\) Compared to other disciplines within the humanities and social sciences, field of composition studies has been somewhat slow to recognize the possibilities of this branch of performance theory. One of the first extended studies of writers to engage performance theory was Thomas Newkirk’s 1997 *The Performance of Self in Student Writing*, which drew upon Goffman’s notion of “the presentation of self” to analyze students’ autobiographical writing not as revelations about individual student selves but rather as enactments of available literary modes, social roles, and cultural discourses. While Newkirk engaged Goffman’s work, he did not reference any additional performance theorists or situate Goffman within the broader discipline of performance studies. Perhaps the first formal call for the integration of composition studies and performance studies came in a 2005 *CCC*’s article by Jenn Fishman, Andrea Lunsford, Beth McGregor, and Mark Otuteye titled “Performing Writing, Performing Literacy:”

We believe that performance studies, a field that emerged formally in the 1950’s, has much to contribute to composition studies, a field with a parallel history and a
host of similar concerns, including relationships between language and the body, individuals and communities, and social norms and forms of resistance. (227)

More recently, a 2012 issue of the *CCC’s Online* followed up on this agenda, naming “The Turn to Performance” as the special focus of its inaugural publication. Two articles within this issue—“Remembering Ghosts and the Rhetoric of Collaboration: A Play and Text for Teachers and Writers” by Keith Dorwick, Bob Mayberry, Paul M. Puccio, and Joana Smitherman Trapp and “Devising/Revising Student-Centered Pedagogy” by Kevin DiPirro—focus on the classroom as a kind of stage, considering the import of such theatre studies concepts as directorship, rehearsal, improvisation, gesturing, role play, and collaboration to inform writing classrooms. Drawing upon the theory that all theatre performance “is involved with memory and haunted by repetition” (qtd. in Dorwick et al. n.p: 11) from Marvin Carlson’s 2003 *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre as Memory* Machine, Dorwick et. al illustrate the ways in which any staging of a classroom performance is always shared—not only with the other classroom actors immediately present, but also with memories of “the ghosts whom we (intentionally and unintentionally) bring with us into our classrooms” including those of former teachers, students, administrators, writing experiences, and more (n.p). These studies serve as a reminder that participants in the UH Writing Mentors Program each came to the trinary FYC classroom with a host of classroom and writing memories, most of which were likely informed by binary configurations. Inhabited by these memories, participants often needed additional cues to discern trinary roles and to stage productive trinary collaborations.
Participants’ memories can be understood as a kind of performance “standard,” functioning as one of many invisible rubrics that informed their written assessments of the trinary classroom and mentor performances. Methodologically, performance theory offers useful ways to critically frame and interpret the end-of-semester evaluations that constitute this chapter’s primary data collection instrument. As an almost universally-employed genre within higher education today, these evaluations exhibit striking parallels to the genre of the workplace performance appraisal, which Jim Henry has recently analyzed by leveraging (among others) Jon McKenzie’s three categories of organizational, cultural, and technological performance enumerated in Chapter One of this dissertation (Henry, “Performing Professionally” and “(Re)Appraising”). As Henry argues, McKenzie’s multiple registers of performance not only offer a more robust apparatus for approaching and appraising workplace performances, but they also usefully shift definitions of performance away from “wholly individual and presumably isolatable traits to be measured” toward the “embodied enactment of cultural forces” (“Performing” n.p). These theories help me attend to depictions of trinary classroom performances that have not been pre-designated as programmatic “outcomes,” but nonetheless represent valuable dimensions of organizational, cultural, and/or technological performance. Furthermore, performance theories help me to approach end-of-semester evaluations as reflections not of individual mentors’ degrees of success or failure, but of the broader position of “writing mentor researcher.” Thus, I treat the mentors depicted in these evaluations not as autonomous subjects but as social actors operating under a shared set of institutional constraints.
In addition to offering a critical methodology for reading end-of-semester evaluations, performance theory also highlights mentors’ roles as “social actors.” These theories assert that when a new social actor enters an everyday scene, this actor’s presence inflects the performances of all other actors sharing the same stage. The significance of this fairly commonplace tenet of performance studies, when applied to the trinary FYC classroom, is illustrated by the following comment left by a FYC instructor on an end-of-semester evaluation. I cite this comment at length for the range of ways in which this instructor recognized the writing mentor’s presence to have shifted her own embodiment of the teacher role and her relationship to the students:

With a mentor in the room, I felt self-conscious about someone else observing my particular bag of teaching tricks, some of which I was never that happy about. In one way, it was freeing to know that there was someone else the students were seeing, and I felt less need to work at establishing this perhaps overly comfortable relationship that I’ve felt I needed in the past. In another way, having the mentor meant trying to figure out different ways to relate to the students and that wasn’t always comfortable. Having a little more distance between the students and me than I typically have had helped me to stay focused on what they were doing in their writing. At the same time when I met individually with the students in required conferences for the first paper, I felt at a certain point I could afford to set the paper aside (because they would also be seeing the mentor) and ask about how they were doing at UH, whether or not they planned to stay. . . -- questions related to retention that I think faculty need to be concerned with. Those conversations were personal certainly, but in a different way than when I haven't had a mentor. I felt these conversations stayed more focused on the student in relation to the institution and were less invitations for them to feel like they could tell me whatever they wanted. I think women, in particular, can get cast into “the mother” role w/ younger students, and I think some of my own ways of getting them comfortable with me that I had been unhappy with
in the past probably facilitated that tendency. With a mentor, I felt more unequivocally the teacher in their eyes (and my own) in almost all of my interactions with the students. When you teach writing, and especially to freshman whose most intimate class is likely to be English 100, you learn a great deal about the students, and that knowledge can at least potentially disrupt (both productively and unproductively) your experience and assessment of their writing. I think having a mentor in the course, in the best cases, can make both the students and the instructors more accountable for the work that they do. (IE 5)

For this instructor, the shift from a binary to a trinary classroom configuration occasioned alternative enactments of roles (including those related to gender and authority), arrangements of actors, and environments for teaching and learning. Furthermore, sharing the responsibility for performing FYC with a mentor allowed the instructor to occasionally “set aside” the immediate student learning outcomes for FYC, moving beyond the conversational unit of the assigned paper to engage students’ experiences within the larger institution. To further probe the relations among mentors, student, instructors, WPAs, and the university set into play by trinary configurations, I will now address three specific performance studies concepts: mise-en-scène, directorship, and team performance.

Mise-en-Scène

A widely-used concept which performance studies adopted from theatre studies, mise-en-scène can be roughly translated as “placing on stage” or “staging.” In theatre, such staging includes the relationships among arrangement of actors, scenery, and other properties of a production (OED). In the Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis, Patrice Pavis explains that “mise-en-scène” addresses the process whereby
a written script with stage directions is transformed into a live(d) performance (363-368). Pavis writes, “In short, it [mise-en-scène] is the transformation, or better, the ‘concretization’ of the text, using actors and the stage space, into a duration that is experienced by the spectators” (364). Parallels can certainly be drawn between theatre and trinary classroom performances: the play’s script and the UH Writing Mentors Program job description both offer stage directions that must be interpreted and enacted. And participant discourse repeatedly highlights ways in which the position of “writing mentor” is concretized, so to speak, in the interplay of various trinary actors and institutional spaces. Pavis’ explorations of the links between “the dramatic text and its context of enunciation” (364) offer parallels to mentors’ position(alties) within trinary FYC classrooms:

Both the dramatic and the performance texts can be understood only in their intertextuality, particularly in relation to the discursive and ideological formations of a particular era and corpus of texts. One has to imagine the relationship of the dramatic and performance text with the social context, i.e. with other texts and discourses on reality produced by society. As this relationship is extremely fragile and variable, the same dramatic text easily produces an infinite number of readings, and therefore stagings that cannot be predicted solely from the text. (365)

The enormous variability across mentor performances described within program records indicate how an institutional actor’s job description, when performed within a trinary setting, produces “stagings that cannot be predicted solely from the text.” Such a theory of intertextuality, not only of dramatic text and performance, but also of discursive,
ideological, and I would add, institutional formations, helps to explain the wide range of ways in which mentors act out the part—and the even wider range of ways in which students and instructors interpret mentors’ performances. Pavis’s theorization of *mise-en-scène* also links performance to time and place, underscoring the ways in which both the performance of a play and the performance of a FYC initiative such as the UH Writing Mentors Program would not evolve in quite the same way at any other institution or historical moment.

**Directorship**

Pavis attributes primary responsibility for the *mise-en-scène* to the performance director. Parallels can be drawn here between the director of a staged theatre production and the figure of the Writing Program Administrator (WPA). Pavis explains that the theatre director is responsible for explaining a vision of the overall performance; interpreting actors’ performances on the basis of this vision; making adjustments to actors’ relations to the other actors; and sequencing the various performance scenes. Pavis asserts that especially among contemporary directors, “the staging is not necessarily an exercise in authoritarianism” (366), highlighting the model of Brechtian directorship that envisions the director’s work to be, in Brecht’s own words, “awakening and organizing the productive activity of the actors” (366). The performance director also constitutes an important figure in the sociological analyses of Erving Goffman. In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Goffman attributes to the director the two primary responsibilities of “bringing back into line any member of the team whose performances become unsuitable” through “soothing and sanctioning” (98) and of “allocating the parts in the performance and the personal front that is employed in each part” (99). While the
director of the Writing Mentors Program could allocate some elements of the “parts” (most notably which instructors would receive a mentor and with whom they would be paired), faculty were still vested with primary “directorship” of their own classrooms, as analyzed more fully in Chapter Three. Aside from being an imagined audience for the end-of-semester evaluations that constitute the key data source for this chapter, the WPA was largely invisible to students. Instructors and mentors, on the other hand, interacted much more regularly with the program’s directors and were aware that such interactions came with varying performative stakes.

Even these substantially limited powers inflected the relationships between WPAs and the various trinary actors. Goffman theorizes directors to be in a compromised position when it comes to acting as team performers:

It is apparent that if the director corrects for improper appearances and allocates major and minor prerogatives, then the other members of the team (who are likely to be concerned with the show they can put on for one another as well as with the show they can collectively stage for the audience) will have an attitude toward the director that they do not have toward their teammates. Further, if the audience appreciates that the performance has a director, they are likely to hold him more responsible than other performers to the success of the performance. The director is likely to respond to this responsibility by making dramaturgical demands on the performance that they might not make upon themselves. This may add to the estrangement that they may already feel from him. A director, hence, starting as a member of a team, may find himself slowly edged into a marginal role between
audience and performers, half in and half out of both camps, a kind of go-between without the protections that go-betweens usually have (99).

In the case of the Writing Mentors Program, the Director had to answer to upper-division administrators looking not only for “hard data” as evidence of achieved “learning outcomes,” but also for budget lines to cut in response to extreme state revenue shortfalls. Thus, the Director placed “demands on the performance” of all participants to provide detailed documentation to help justify program survival. Furthermore, as a specialist in Composition Studies and Technical/Workplace Writing, Professor Henry approached the program as a research endeavor, both for himself and the mentors. As he explains, “I would never condone this mentoring if it did NOT include the researcher component because to do so would be to betray my own philosophical, ideological, and disciplinary allegiances” (e-mail correspondence). Whereas mentors were repeatedly directed to act as participant-observers in documenting and problematizing interventions made in student writing performances, they were teamed with instructors who, for the most part, had never undertaken research in the composition tradition themselves and likely saw empirical research as a foreign undertaking. As such, the director was responsible for representing the program’s value to university administrators, for representing the value of the field of C/R to department faculty outside of C/R, and for representing value of empirical research to other C/R faculty who approached the field with different scholarly allegiances. Thus, the “directing” of the initiative introduced a range of roles that would otherwise not necessarily have surfaced.
Team Performance

Perhaps most useful for understanding the collaborations that took place among actors within the classroom trinary are Erving Goffman’s analyses of team performance. In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Goffman draws upon his ethnographic study of a 1950’s hotel staff in the Shetland islands to theorize the social dynamics inherent when “any set of individuals. . . co-operate in staging a single routine” (79). Of course, many differences exist between my study and Goffman’s: the UH Writing Mentors Program is far removed from Goffman’s research site in time and space; my focus is more on the co-operation of institutional actors than of individuals; and I approach the FYC classroom as a plural set of performances rather than as a single routine. However, the participant discourse analyzed in this chapter evidences “team performance” as a salient construct, particularly in understanding the high degrees of indeterminacy and flux in mentors’ experiences across different trinary scenes. Much of this variation can be attributed to the fact that mentors must collaborate closely with both their assigned instructor and students, adjusting their own performances to the stated policies and ephemeral cues coming from multiple directions. Mentors’ collaborations with one party, however, were not supposed to entail collaboration against the other, and mentors found themselves treading on precarious performative grounds in complying with the position description mandate to “develop rapport with students,” while at the same time complying with its directive, “under no circumstances should you undermine the authority of the instructor” (UHM Writing Mentor Job Description). While the trinary configuration was presented officially as a team endeavor, participant discourse and personal experience in administering the program reveal just how tenuous such teams can
be and just how much time, discourse, cultural awareness, and goodwill it can take to maintain a functional team.

Goffman claims the two defining features of team performance to be reciprocal dependence and reciprocal familiarity, and participant commentary indicates these to be conditions of the job that mentors lived out daily. Of reciprocal dependence, Goffman writes: “while the team performance is in progress, any member of the team has the power to give the show away or to disrupt it by inappropriate conduct. Each teammate is forced to rely on the good conduct and behavior of his fellows, and they are forced to rely upon him” (82). As such, student and instructor evaluations of the mentor may be read as an occasion in which members of the team have “the power to give the show away” by calling the director’s attention to the mentor’s shortcomings. That evaluations of the mentor were so overwhelmingly positive can be read as indications of the degree to which trinary actors conceived of their relationships to mentors as team performers of sorts. Mentor comments repeatedly indicated their enactment of the position to be dependent upon instructor and student cooperation, noting the hardships they faced when their efforts were not reciprocated. Furthermore, students and instructors wrote about the ways in which they came to depend upon the mentor—ranging from the more visible examples of mentors making themselves available to students in order to meet conferencing quotas or standing in when instructors were unavailable to teach the class to the more subtle ways in which mentors worked to facilitate communication and understanding between the two institutional actors. Goffman theorizes that mutual dependence not only links actors to one another but also transforms the larger institution: “When members of a team have different formal statuses and rank in a social
establishment, as is often the case, then we can see that the mutual dependence created by the membership in the team is likely to cut across structural or social cleavages in the establishment and thus provide a source of cohesion for the establishment” (82). By requiring instructors to team with graduate students and graduate students to team with first-year undergraduates, the relationships in trinary classrooms certainly “cut across structural or social cleavages” in higher education. While the ways in which the UH Writing Mentors program “provides a source of cohesion for the establishment” may be difficult to substantiate quantitatively, the end-of-semester evaluations which this chapter analyzes include multiple examples of mentors working to humanize the institution and to connect students with campus resources, while also increasing instructors’ sense of efficacy and engagement, indicating programmatic outcomes at the level not only of actors but also of the institution.

Goffman theorizes that team performances are characterized secondly by the condition of mutual familiarity. Of the condition of familiarity, Goffman writes,

[I]f members of a team must co-operate to maintain a given definition of the situation before their audience, they will hardly be in a position to maintain that particular impression before one another. Accomplices in the maintenance of a particular appearance of things, they are forced to define one another as persons ‘in the know,’ as persons before whom a particular front cannot be maintained. Teammates, then, in proportion to the frequency with which they act as a team and the number of matters that fall within impressional protectiveness tend to be bound by rights of what might be called “familiarity.” (82)
While contemporary readings of Goffman would point out that actors in a bureaucratic setting would never exhibit familiarity with actors at other status levels in complete mutuality, program records nonetheless document the ways in which limited forms of familiarity impacted the kinds of teaching and learning that occurred across trinary participants. By helping students to deliver an impression to instructors in the form of written work that the student had understood and fulfilled an assignment, mentors witnessed first-hand the ways in which students did not initially understand or fulfill that assignment. Mentors also frequently reported being privy to student disclosures of procrastination, confusion, roadblocks, and resistance—writing about how these student disclosures opened spaces for “teachable” or “mentor-able” moments. Across conferencing scenes characterized by heightened familiarity, mentors reported feeling compelled, as a gesture of mutuality and support, to disclose their own failures as a first-year student, struggles as a transitioning graduate student, or unproductive habits as a writer. I am aware of three cases in which mentors (two female and one male) reported that students misread this familiarity as an opening for dating solicitations. Instructors sometimes confided in mentors their misgivings about students, lesson plans, assignments, and FYC; and mentors depicted themselves confiding in instructors their nervousness about teaching a lesson or their struggles to reach a particular student.

Degrees of instructor-mentor familiarity were also inflected by such factors as institutional rank and age: some sections paired tenure-line professors with MA or Ph.D. student mentors (n=43), while others paired Ph.D. student instructors with MA student mentors (n=46), while others paired lecturers with MA student mentors (n=11). (For a full breakdown, see Appendices AN and AO). These parties became acquainted through a
range of institutional settings and experiences, leading to various terms of “familiarity.”

While students and instructors often acted with less “impressional protectiveness” in the presence of mentors, these situations should be read not so much as authentic displays but as performances provoked by the presence of a third classroom actor. Such examples underscore the significance of mentors’ team performer status to the FYC *mise-en-scène*—including the knowledge production that is enabled through this third party’s access to performances that are generally unavailable to other institutional actors.

Goffman theorizes that “the privilege of familiarity” characterizing team performance can develop either organically or formally. He writes, “Among teammates, the privilege of familiarity—which may constitute a kind of intimacy without warmth—need not be something of an organic kind, slowly developing with the passage of time spent together, but rather a formal relationship that is automatically extended and received as soon as the individual takes a place on the team” (82-83). Mentor discourse includes numerous examples of students who, at the first conference, confided details to the mentor that would indicate the presence of a high degree of familiarity. However, mentors’ careful theorizing of the influence of geographic, cultural, ethnic, gender, class, age-related, and other factors indicates that such quickly-achieved familiarity is hardly “automatic.” Mentors frequently wrote and spoke about the high stakes of the first “intake interview” conference in establishing roles and performing for students an inviting yet professional mentoring persona. These reflections indicate “familiarity” to be not only an outcome of mentors having been staged as team performers with students, but also of the extensive efforts mentors made to build rapport and individualize support. Furthermore, the 32 (or 5%) anonymous comments in which students claimed that the
writing mentor performed no significant roles in their experiences underscore the lived reality that scripting two individuals as “team performers” does not necessarily mean that dependence or familiarity will ensue. Whereas some student writers wanted a mentor’s help solely for FYC, utilizing them more as an academic tutor, other students valued most the opportunity to talk with the mentor about subjects beyond FYC. Thus, the mentor not only had to perform as a team with the students and the instructor, but also to read these co-performers’ cues and shift accordingly across a spectrum of roles ranging from “friend” to “substitute teacher.” While my discourse-based empirical research debunks certain “grand” elements of Goffman’s theories (several of which have already been debunked theoretically by postmodernism), it also opens up understandings of the terms of familiarity as they became crafted by the actors who found themselves cast in these new roles.

While this chapter primarily researches the ways in which uneven relations of dependence and familiarity with other trinary actors inflected mentors’ perspectives and performances, it should also be acknowledged that the conditions of team performance also placed heightened demands upon students and particularly upon instructors. Instructors expended substantial time and effort in re-scripting course policies, writing assignments, and daily lesson plans to accommodate the mentor—as well as in maintaining an ongoing dialogue with the mentor regarding day-to-day exigencies and meta-level issues. Co-performing FYC with a mentor also meant that instructors invited into their classrooms a new kind of participant-observer whose participation could potentially undermine their authority and whose observations could render the instructor’s pedagogy public in unprecedented ways. Even experienced instructors found
that this new audience member’s gaze changed the once-familiar *mise-en-scène* of the FYC classroom in both energizing and unsettling ways, as illustrated by the extended instructor comment offered in the chapter’s opening pages. Performance studies and theatre studies scholar Marvin Carlson offers a definition of performance as “all activity carried out with a consciousness of itself” (4), and the heightened self-consciousness displayed by this instructor’s comment indicates the ways in which a mentor’s presence made the teaching of FYC even more explicitly performative than in binary classrooms.

Under the pressures of transforming the programmatic job description into a lived performance, complying with WPA demands to perform as composition researchers, teaming with both student and instructors, and transitioning to the demands of graduate school themselves, mentors often found themselves in performative spaces characterized by paradox. The incongruities, ironies, and tensions mentors lived out indicate a position and positionality that is more demanding, but perhaps also more rich, than any writing program director could definitively script or any dissertation fully capture. Thus, while the remainder of this chapter aims for rigor in identifying, tabulating, and analyzing mentors’ roles as program participants reported them, it is by no means exhaustive. In order to provide further documentation of my methods and to open space for future mentors to re-examine participant discourse through different lenses (and in doing so, to more fully occupy the role of composition researcher), I offer a number of supporting appendices with a fuller range of data.

**Behaviors and Roles Performed by Writing Mentors**

Against this theoretical backdrop of team performance, this section of the chapter presents discourse by and about writing mentors. Drawing upon mentors’ evaluations of
the program, I first consider what can be learned about mentors’ lived positionalites from mentor reports about the time they allotted to various duties of the position; the classroom roles they adopted; and their rationales for adopting and shifting among these roles. I then turn to student and instructor evaluations of their assigned mentors, cataloguing the array of roles and behaviors they assigned to this third classroom actor. These analyses offer (a) empirical evidence of the variety of stagings that ensued under the position title of “writing mentor;” (b) a window into the ways in which mentors co-performed with students and instructors by drawing upon the voices of co-performers; and (c) triangulation for mentors’ later self-depictions of the problems and possibilities of their institutional position.

**Mentor Reports of Time Allotted to the Position and of Classroom Roles Adopted**

The official job description for the position of “writing mentor” allotted to the job ten hours of weekly work to be divided as follows: approximately three hours of attending class; six hours of holding individual conferences and documenting this work; and an hour per week divided among conferring with the course instructor, reading and/or preparing for bi-weekly roundtables of mentors, and making entries in the mentor’s composition log book. When asked in anonymous end-of-semester evaluations about the weekly hours spent on the job, mentors reported an average of 9.8 hours per week, with a range of 5 to over 15 hours. The follow-up survey question asking mentors to break down their hours according to various duties of the position reveals the following range of experiences:
Table 4.1
Average, Minimum, and Maximum Percentage of Working Hours Reported by Mentors across Mentoring Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Duty</th>
<th>Avg. % of Working Hours</th>
<th>Min. % of Working Hours</th>
<th>Max. % of Working Hours</th>
<th>Max minus Min. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing with students</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending class</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing logs and memos</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for class</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with instructor</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emailing students</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending mentor roundtables</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in composition notebook</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These mentor-reported averages are not too far from what program directors mapped out in the job description. The surprise, however, exists in the discrepancy between the minimum and maximum percentages of time allotted to each activity, indicating that mentors lived out the duties of the job in remarkably different ways. Some mentors, for example, reported spending no time communicating with the instructor, whereas others devoted 25% of their total mentoring hours to such communication.

The degrees of classroom participation reported by mentors also varied widely. In response to the question, “How would you most accurately describe your role within your English 100 classroom?” mentors were presented with four options, listed in order of increasing classroom involvement. The table below summarizes mentors’ responses.
Table 4.2
Mentor Responses to Survey Question, “How would you most accurately describe your role within your English 100 classroom?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited Choice Survey Option</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked almost exclusively outside of the classroom, rarely attending class, except perhaps for introductions;</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended class regularly, functioning mostly as an observer and speaking only occasionally;</td>
<td>21 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended class regularly and participated in classroom activities and discussions, asking questions and making comments on a regular basis;</td>
<td>17 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended class regularly and participated in classroom activities and discussions, asking questions and making comments on a regular basis; gave input into assignments and activities; took the lead in occasional workshops, activities, discussions, and sessions;</td>
<td>40 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the optional box for remarks, mentors left 49 comments that shed some light on factors which led mentors to adopt any given classroom role.

Comments left by the twenty-one mentors who attended class regularly but who functioned mostly as observers indicated that this role was often determined by the instructor:

- Professor preferred this style, so I responded accordingly. (ME 49)

- The reason I settled in this role was mainly because the instructor I was grouped with almost always used every minute of time, in the good sort of way. I didn't want to interfere with the planning she must have made, so I focused on engaging students when they broke into small groups rather than making my commentary or questions to the whole class. (ME 88)

- I sometimes found it difficult for me to actively participate in classroom discussions because I didn't want to overstep myself and interrupt the instructor. Sometimes I feel nervous about cutting off the instructor I am working with even though I know that she welcomes discussion. (ME 8)
In the first comment, the instructor explicitly cast the mentor into the role, whereas in the second and third comments the mentor inferred a more restrained role to be most supportive of the instructor. Several comments in this category (n=4) evidenced some discomfort and/or role confusion, speaking to the degree of interpretation required in performing the mentor role and the difficulties this performative scenario can create for the third classroom actor. Comments across this category indicated a more instructor-centered classroom with little time or space set aside to enable a fuller development of the mentor’s role, at least during class sessions.

Mentors who claimed to have “participated in classroom activities and discussions, asking questions and making comments on a regular basis” represented 19% of the total responses. While comments in this category often addressed the “what” of the mentor’s classroom activities (n=5), the following two comments elaborated the “why” and “how:”

• Sometimes I would allow the students’ discussion to go on without saying much because I felt that they were hindered when I participated too much—like there was a “right” answer to their opinions on a subjective matter. Other times, I would participate more. (ME 87)

• At times I could see students thinking about responses were they seemed hesitant to contribute to the discussion. I tried to ask questions or make comments that invited students’ opinions. (ME 56)

In both comments, mentors factored perceived student needs into their determinations of classroom roles, albeit with different performative outcomes: while the mentor in the first comment hesitated to speak out when such participation might close off possibilities for student discourse, the mentor in the second comment sensed students’ hesitations and worked to “invite” their opinions. Whereas comments in the previous category could be
classified as instructor-centered, these comments indicated a more student-centered rationale for the mentor’s classroom roles.

Mentors most frequently (45%) identified with the most overtly participatory option that included “taking the lead in occasional workshops, activities, discussions, and sessions.” A majority of comments in this final category indicated a strong team relationship between the mentor and instructor:

- I had the pleasure of working with my former advisor from my undergraduate days this last semester, who gave me almost “free rein” in the classroom. . . The professor and I met at the beginning of each class to go over the day’s readings, any papers the students had turned in, and the agenda for the lesson. (ME 25)

- The instructor and I also conferred regularly and extensively on how individual students were doing in the class, and discussed various techniques to help encourage class participation and deeper commitment to the coursework. (ME 30)

These comments illustrate the “regular” and “extensive” dialogue required for high degrees of effective mentor participation. These instructor-mentor teams carefully coordinated their performances both behind the scenes and in front of students. The author of the first comment indicates that a degree of familiarity was already in place prior to the semester’s start, allowing the partners to feel comfortable with one another from the venture’s outset, rather than taking several weeks to cautiously figure out preferred modes of participation and communication, as many mentors described.

Perhaps most telling were the responses in which mentors checked more than one box (n=8) or commented on a lack of fit with the questions’ categories (n=17). Multiple comments (n=7) addressed the ways in which mentors’ roles fluctuated over time. In certain cases, mentors described themselves gradually growing into a fuller embodiment of the mentoring role over one or multiple semesters. While some mentors (n=3) cited a
correspondence between their degree of comfort with the position and their levels of involvement in the classroom scene, the degree of involvement for other mentors had little to do with their own desires, and more to do with “the instructor and how the class was run” (ME 82). Such statements highlight the degree to which mentors’ roles were determined by variables beyond their control, demanding interpretation, flexibility, and frequent re-scripting. Other mentors noted discrepancies between their in-class versus out-of-class roles: “I think that my out-of-class work was the most important and effective, but it was in part my presence and participation in class that made it possible” (ME 16). As in the previous comment, mentors frequently described their out-of-class roles to be more active and meaningful than their in-class roles, while acknowledging the reciprocal relationship between the two spaces. Such comments serve as reminders of the many stages on which mentors performed (as analyzed further in Chapter Five) and the ways in which their roles fluctuated, highlighting the tensions between mentors’ institutional positions and their lived positionalities and underscoring the impossibility of making any one definitive statement about writing mentors’ roles.

**Student and Instructor Depictions of Mentors’ Behaviors and Roles**

**Data Sources and Coding Protocols**

While the end-of-semester survey question posed to mentors about classroom roles came with a pre-determined continuum of responses, students and instructors were given much more open-ended prompts that directly elicited discourse. Table 4.3, below, presents these survey questions regarding mentors’ roles and summarizes some quantitative traits of these responses:
Table 4.3
Summary of Data Sources for Coding of Mentor Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Question(s) Coded and/or Tabulated</th>
<th>Response Length (in words)</th>
<th>Total Responses Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Surveys</td>
<td>Please list the various roles your mentor played during class. (i.e., asked clarifying questions, passed out assignments, led discussions...)</td>
<td>Avg: 78</td>
<td>n=49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 0-464</td>
<td>(Years 1&amp;2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>In your own words, please identify the various roles that your mentor played this semester, both in the course as a whole and in your experience as an individual student. Please give as many specific, detailed examples of your interactions with your mentor as you can remember.</td>
<td>Avg: 25</td>
<td>n=673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 0-106</td>
<td>(Years 1&amp;2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working with this dataset, I first coded instructor and student comments with the goal of cataloguing the fullest possible array of behaviors observed in their writing mentors across the semester. While I applied the same coding protocols to both instructor and student comments, I analyzed each set of comments separately so as to minimize the ways in which my reading of one might influence my interpretations of the other.

Drawing upon Richard Schechner’s notions of “twice-behaved behavior” or “restored behavior,” I kept note of any repeated actions performed by mentors in the framework of the trinary classroom (16). Because I was attempting to catalogue repeated actions that were applicable to the institutional position (rather than isolated observations about a specific mentor), to qualify as a “writing mentor behavior” at least two student and/or instructor comments had to mention an action. Using a “descriptive coding” protocol which, according to Matthew Miles and Michael Huberman, “attributes a class of phenomena to a segment of text” and as such “entails little interpretation” (57), I coded primarily at the level of the clause, although in cases where more than one behavior was represented within a single clause, I occasionally coded at the level of the word. The 49
instructor comments included a total of 73 different behaviors performed by mentors, and the 673 student comments included a total of 158 different mentor behaviors.

I approached the second round of data analysis with the intention of drawing on the behaviors described by instructors and students in order to identify significant mentoring “roles.” My definition of “roles” includes Goffman’s sense of the term as “the enactment of rights and duties attached to a given status” (16), while acknowledging that such “rights and duties” may be “attached” to mentors not only by WPA’s who composed the official job description but also by instructors and students who each re-defined mentors’ positions in response to more localized factors such as classroom dynamics, assignment constraints, and individual desires. For this analysis, I applied a “pattern coding” scheme to the catalogue of “behaviors” from my previous round of coding. As Miles and Huberman explain, pattern codes entail larger degrees of inference and “illustrate an emergent leitmotif or pattern that you have discerned in local events and relationships” (57). Using a highly recursive process, I identified ten roles which represented the full set of mentor behaviors described by instructors and students: 1) Another student; 2) Lead, advanced, or role model student; 3) Personal writing coach to students; 4) Personal research coach for students; 5) Resource for individualized, comfortable, knowledgeable, and seemingly always-available student support; 6) Interpreter of classroom assignments, actors, and discourses; 7) Third party perspective; 8) Participant-observer researcher; 9) Classroom supporter; and 10) Co-instructor. Had I worked with participant responses to additional survey questions that did not directly elicit commentary on mentor roles, I would have no doubt identified roles beyond these ten, especially in the survey questions added in years three and four of the program that
asked participants to comment on the mentor’s promise as a future instructor. The relative distribution of each of these ten roles across instructor and student comments can be seen in Appendices AQ and AR.

**Results**

As space and time do not allow me to present and analyze each behavior and role in depth, in the section below I offer summary tables for each of the ten roles that feature lists of corresponding behaviors. I present these ten tables in an order that moves loosely from the most student-like of roles, to roles that indicate significant team performances between mentors and students, to roles that were understood by both instructors and students as team performances across the teacher-student binary, to roles that indicate significant team performances between mentors and instructors, to instructor-like roles. Although I isolate these roles in their initial presentation, I next consider how mentors dynamically combined and moved between roles. To save time and space for these analyses, I comment only briefly on most of the ten roles, devoting the majority of my analyses to those roles that seem most significant in light of mentors’ work as team performers.

The most student-like role, that of another student, was evident in 18% of the total clauses composed by instructors and in 6% of the total clauses composed by students. As displayed in Table 4.4, comments in this category frequently described mentors enacting typical student behaviors such as taking notes in class, participating in class discussions, and joining in small group activities as another group member.
## Table 4.4
Student and Instructor Comments on Writing Mentor Role #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role 1: Another Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviors identified by instructors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attended class regularly along with students (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Took notes during class (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participated in small groups (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participated in class activities (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participated in class discussions (n=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reminded class of mentor’s status as a fellow student (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asked questions (n=5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional named roles by instructors</th>
<th>Additional named roles by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“Friend” (n=22), “one of the boys” (n=1), “Student” (n=6), “Peer” (n=4), “Peer reviewer” (n=2), “Peer editor” (n=2), Peer revisor” (n=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple student comments in the category depicted mentors as “friends” (n=22) and “peers” of various kinds (n=5), with perhaps the most dramatic example of such familiarity coming from a student who claimed, “He was like one of the boys!” (SE 760). While this student asserted that he was “very satisfied” with the mentor’s performance, several instructor and student comments indicated that extensive leveraging of this “another student” role by mentors could become redundant, limiting, and/or counter-productive, preferring instead the mentor who favored the persona of a lead, advanced, or role model student displayed in Table 4.5:
What mentors were modeling, here, were largely cultural performances associated with mature and engaged student behaviors. In a few sections, instructors asked mentors to complete the same writing tasks assigned to students, as a model of a more advanced writer’s process and product, engaging the realm of organizational performance. While this model student role figured largely into WPA’s representations of mentors’ work in program orientations, it constituted a relatively minor theme in instructor and student discourse, making up 8% of instructor clauses and 2% of student clauses.

The third role, that of a personal writing coach to students marks a shift toward a kind of middle space between students and instructors. As one student explained, “She helped out on a peer basis. By this, I mean when it came to looking for advice from 1) someone not grading your paper, and 2) someone who wasn’t afraid to be critical, [mentor’s first name] was perfect” (SE 194). While mentor performances in this category were most directly and overtly with and on behalf of students, they could also be considered co-performances with instructors to the degree that they were aimed at helping students meet the
instructor’s criteria for an assignment and/or took into account the instructor’s pedagogical vision. It comes, perhaps, as no surprise that students wrote with the greatest frequency about this role, depicting 51 different repeated actions on the part of mentors, as displayed in Table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6
Instructor and Student Comments on Writing Mentor Role #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role 3: Personal Writing Coach to Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviors identified by instructors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Met with each student for a brief initial meeting in the first 2 or 3 weeks of the semester (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Passed around conference sign-up sheets (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Made all-class announcements about conferences (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Met with each student designated number of required times (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Held writing conferences with students for each major paper (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Met with students regularly (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Met with students on a voluntary basis (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Met with student to “go over” their essays (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coached students individually across various stages of the writing process (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students in conferences with revisions (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taught students grammatical patterns and individualized editing strategies in conferences (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Took initiative to offer students different approaches to conferences (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviors identified by students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explained mentor’s roles to students (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Passed around the mentor’s schedule (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Met individually with students to work on writing (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offered group conferences (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students with papers over email (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students with all (or almost all) assigned papers (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students with specific paper assignments (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students with writing assignments [generic] (n=52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students to improve their papers (n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students to like their own papers more (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drew upon knowledge of students to help them put more of themselves into their writing (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guided students throughout the stages and processes of writing a paper (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students prepare for assignments (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategized with students on how approach assignments (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped to jumpstart students’ writing processes (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students to find a paper topic (n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students “talk out” papers, drawing out the students’ ideas (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborated with students to generate ideas for the paper (n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offered ideas to students (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listened attentively to students’ ideas (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students to draft essays (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Read through students’ early drafts and engaged substantially with their writing (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students to expand their ideas and lengthen their essays (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students develop and hone their thesis statements (n=16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Helped students clarify their purpose in a paper (n=6)
- Helped students to address audience (n=4)
- Helped students who were “stuck” to get through “standstills” (n=10)
- Helped with organization [generic] (n=4)
- Helped students to organize their thoughts (n=8)
- Helped students to organize paragraphs more effectively (n=3)
- Helped students to organize overall paper (n=18)
- Introduced students to more sophisticated paper structures (n=2)
- Helped students to streamline the essay’s organization (n=2)
- Helped students to compose transitions (n=6)
- Helped students to revise work (n=24)
- Facilitated students’ own revision processes (n=6)
- Helped with major revisions (n=2)
- Provided specific feedback on papers in the form of advice, suggestions, and constructive criticism (n=44)
- Helped with fine tuning papers (n=7)
- Helped with clarity (n=6)
- Helped with voice and style (n=6)
- Helped with grammar (n=35)
- Served as editor (n=41) [behavior and named role; spectrum of mentor editing to helping student internalize editing]
- Helped with elements of creative writing (n=3)
- Aided the development of the student’s writing abilities (n=33)
- Gave students strategies for improving their own writing (n=4)
- Helped students understand how to organize papers (n=8)
- Helped students to evaluate own writing (n=5)
- Helped students to think more critically and rhetorically as writers (n=6)
- Helped students to improve their overall writing (n=9)
- Offered writing-related help, but not codeable beyond generic level (n=11)

**Additional named roles by instructors**

- “Professional writing consultant” (n=1)

**Additional named roles by students**

While a percentage of student comments positioned the mentor as an editor of sorts (n=80), the vast majority (n=525) depicted the mentor working with students in more pedagogically-rich scenarios. For example, students claimed that their mentors strategized with them on how to approach an assignment (n=7); helped students who were “stuck” to get through “standstills” (n=10); introduced them to more sophisticated paper structures (n=2); drew upon knowledge of students to help them put more of themselves into their writing (n=6); helped students to “like” their own papers more (n=3); helped them to evaluate their own writing (n=5), aided the development of their [long-term] writing abilities (n=33); and helped them think more critically and rhetorically as writers (n=6).

A related category is that of personal research coach for students:

Table 4.7
Instructor and Student Comments on Writing Mentor Role #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role 4: Personal Research Coach for Students</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviors identified by instructors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Behaviors identified by students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accompanied students to the library (n=2)</td>
<td>• Offered assistance with research [generic] (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accompanied students to the library to search together for sources (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helped students learn how to use the library and its resources (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taught students search strategies (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helped students find sources (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gave students sources (sent email with links to additional sources or allowed student to borrow a book from mentor) (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Served as a resource for Hawai‘i-based papers (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provided background on the validity of sources (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helped with citations (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional named roles by instructors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional named roles by students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“Research assistant” (n=1), “Moving library” (n=1), “Hawaiian reference” (n=1), “Source of information” (n=1), “Resource” (n=3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both instructors and students wrote about mentors accompanying students to the library, signaling a place-based embodiment of this role that I address further in Chapter Five. Student discourse includes examples spanning Jon McKenzie’s three arenas of performance: Mentors addressed organizational performance by helping students to find sources that were presumably needed to fulfill the assignment criteria and to cite these sources properly according to an established style guide—a category which, if mentors also spoke with students about the academic and disciplinary values driving these conventions (as they claimed to do in roundtables) also bridges cultural performance. Another example of cultural performance included providing background on the validity of sources, as such validity is inflected by both academic and local Hawai‘i cultures, a facet of mentors’ place-based work I consider in Chapter Five. Finally, mentors’ work to teach search strategies and library use in a digital age addresses technological performance. Similarly to the previous role of writing coaches, student comments recognized that mentors’ work as research coaches tended to bridge both the immediate goal of performing successfully within FYC and the longer-term goal of honing students’ research abilities for their university and professional lives.

Students also wrote frequently about ways in which their writing-based relationships with mentors led them to seek the mentor’s assistance in other areas that were not explicitly writing-related. The second-most frequently addressed mentor role by students was that of being a resource for individualized, comfortable, knowledgeable, and seemingly always-available student support. As displayed in Table 4.8 below, this mentor role included 6 different repeated behaviors observed by instructors and 34 observed by students.
**Role 5: Resource for Individualized, Comfortable, Knowledgeable, and Seemingly Always Available Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors identified by instructors</th>
<th>Behaviors identified by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mentored students outside of class on college and life issues (n=2)</td>
<td>• Served as a comfortable (yet still knowledgeable) person for students to talk to (n=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Got to know students outside class (n=1)</td>
<td>• Served function of “being there” for students (n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sought out students and invited them to conferences (n=6)</td>
<td>• Reached out to students with offers to meet (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Checked in with students who had been absent (n=2)</td>
<td>• Made her/himself easy for students to reach (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was available just before and after class for students to discuss progress (n=1)</td>
<td>• Offered availabilities to meet with students during set office hours (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Took calls and emails when students needed help (n=1)</td>
<td>• Offered generous availabilities in mentor’s schedule that made meeting easy (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accommodated students’ schedules by making additional meeting times available (n=19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Was always willing to meet with students (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Was available and responsive to students through email (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Was always available (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Was always willing to help students (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Was always willing to help students with papers (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Was always willing to answer student questions (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Served as a “go-to” person when students needed help (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Made “great efforts” to help students (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helped students beyond the required meetings or the mentor’s duties (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Offered to help students beyond the semester’s end (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learned about students’ backgrounds (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrated effort to get to know students individually (n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Talked with students about their goals (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Talked with student about majors and careers (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Talked with student about life beyond first-year composition (including other courses, college life, and “life issues” beyond school) (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouraged and motivated students (to work to full potential, to finish strong, to complete assignments) (n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Built students’ confidence (in self, standing in class, and writing) (n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gave (good) advice to students (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Offered helpful tips for succeeding in college (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helped students organize time and improve study habits (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helped students with the transition to college life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
helped students transition to college-level writing (n=6)
• Connected students with campus resources (n=13)
• Was a friendly face and welcoming presence (n=5)
• Demonstrated caring when students experienced personal problems (n=13)
• Discussed students’ interpersonal relationships (n=3)
  Helped student grow as a person (n=3)

Additional named roles by instructors
n/a

Additional named roles by students
  “Person to talk to” (n=2), “Older sibling” (n=1),

The most frequently-repeated word across student comments in this role was “always” (n=71), which I interpret not only as a representation of mentors’ availability in a temporal sense, but also a perception of mentors’ consistently supportive attitudes (despite their great fluidity in roles). Take, for example, the following student comments:

• [Mentor’s first name] was always willing to take the time to help me become a better writer. (SE 736)

• He always was available to help and even scheduled conferences on his own birthday after class to help me work on a paper. (SE 753)

• She was always available for questions, emails, advice, and so much more. (SE 1040)

• She was always helpful in conforming to my schedule as best as she could. (SE 611)

• Anytime of the day, she was there for you. (SE 203)

While these student comments reflect high levels of dedication on the part of mentors, the problems and frustrations mentors encountered in performing this degree of availability (which was not part of the official job description) were a strong theme across mentor comments, which I take up later. As discussed in my treatment of participant satisfaction...
in the Chapter Three, mentors’ performances in this individual support role contributed strongly to students’ high levels of professed satisfaction. 

Comments describing the mentor’s enactment of this role tended to stage the mentor in relation to both FYC and the university:

- He was a teacher, a mentor and an influence. He has influenced us to really bring out our personality in our writing and to feel comfortable putting our thoughts and ideas into a topic that are sometimes hard to write about. Especially with his lesson on pidgin, he taught us to be comfortable in our own skin. (SE 740)

- My mentor played various roles this semester. Obviously she mentored me as I began writing the essays, and was a guide who helped me expand upon ideas to create my paper. She was concerned about the well-beings of others (including me), and was a friendly face in a crowd of strangers. When I was sick and we met for a meeting, she was concerned for my health, which made me feel cared for. When I saw her out of class, she waved happily towards me, making me feel more comfortable in this new place. (SE 104)

- She helped me feel welcomed to the university
- I learned more about my writing
- I learned how to improve my writing
- I learned to organize my paper better & make it flow
- We talked about life outside of school (Which I thought was cool) (SE 1011)

These first-year students depicted the mentor as a welcoming presence, humanizing the university with a “friendly face.” The student comment claiming that the mentor’s lesson on Hawai‘i Creole English (or “Pidgin”) taught students “to be comfortable in our own skin” indicates that mentors performed work related to class, culture, geography, and language that inflected students’ readings of FYC and the institution, helping them see the university as a place where they could belong. While these kinds of interventions
were not part of mentors’ official job descriptions, theories of performance make these roles visible and value-able as a form of cultural performance.

Mentors primarily performed the previous three roles (writing coach, research coach, and individualized support) in the presence of students but not of instructors, leading to the high visibility of these roles in student comments and their relative oversight in instructor comments. The next two roles—those of classroom interpreter and third party perspective—were frequently performed in the presence of both parties simultaneously. This role of interpreter of classroom assignments, actors, and discourses constituted a strong recurring theme across both instructor and student comments, qualifying as the fourth most frequently described mentor role by instructors and the third by students.
## Table 4.9
Instructor and Student Comments on Writing Mentor Role #6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role: Interpreter of Classroom Assignments, Actors, and Discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviors identified by instructors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarified student questions and points during class discussions (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Served as someone instructor could call upon to re-phrase points &amp; provide input (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarified instructor’s discourse to students (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarified points made in class (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitated and mediated instructor-student relations (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Made sure students understood the assignment (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Took students’ questions to the instructor (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asked clarifying questions (n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anticipated and asked questions students likely had but were unwilling or unable to ask (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviors identified by students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bridged the “gap of perception” between student and instructor (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provided clarification [generic] (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explained “things” [generic] (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarified writing assignments [generic] (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarified students’ confusion about assignment prompts (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answered students’ questions about writing assignments (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students understand writing assignments on a deeper level (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students see a wider range of options within an assignment (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students understand instructor’s requirements for a given assignment (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students understand the instructor’s expectations &amp; preferences for assignments (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offered insights to students on instructor’s grading (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarified instructor’s comments to students left on their papers (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-phrased instructor’s explanations, questions, and instructions in ways students could understand (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students approach and/or resolve issues with the instructor (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Met with students who were unable to (or uncomfortable with) approaching the instructor (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped students understand the instructor’s expectation for the course (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explained course concepts and readings in a way students could understand (n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provided student with an overview of the course (structure, requirements, etc.) (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asked questions in class that gave voice to students’ confusions or concerns (n=6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Additional named roles by instructors</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Classroom interpreter” (n=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Additional named roles by students</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Bridge” (n=3), “Clarifier” (n=1),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This role is particularly significant to mentors’ work as team performers who bridged the traditional binary of classroom actors usually encountered by students and instructors. As
one student theorized, “The mentor acts as a step between the professor and the student so that the mentor can put instructions in terms of student’s level and vice versa” (SE 39). Another student described the mentor as “a sort of bridge b/w students & teacher, serving to close the gap of perception that exists b/w the two” (SE 273). Comments indicated that this “gap of perception” existed at the levels of expectations, terminologies, generational attitudes, and geographic and cultural orientations. For example, one student wrote: “[Mentor’s first name] helped me to understand the main question being asked, because sometimes it was worded strangely” (SE 105). This student’s perception that the instructor’s question was “worded strangely” may indicate a need for bridging on any of these aforementioned levels. Of the 10 repeated classroom interpreter behaviors listed by instructors and the 19 by students, the three most-frequently repeated arenas of bridging mentioned by both parties included the mentor (1) helping students to understand prompts, purposes, protocols, and teacher expectations related to reading and writing assignments; (2) re-phrasing and explaining the instructor’s commentary to students and vice versa; and (3) helping students approach and/or resolve issues with the instructor.¹⁴ Both instructors (n=18) and students (n=6) depicted the mentor in this interpreter role asking questions of a clarifying nature in class:

- **Student Comment:** When our instructor was going over things and there was something we didn’t understand but no one said anything she would ask. (SE 635)
- **Instructor Comment:** Asked just the questions that I know the students would have asked had they been braver (IE 1)

The mentor is well positioned to read students’ body language and anticipate areas of confusion that the instructor may not have been aware of. This role of clarifier takes on added significance when considering that asking direct questions of the teacher goes
against the familial and cultural norms of many students in Hawaii’s classrooms.

Whereas the instructor’s comment attributes students’ reticence to a lack of bravery, mentors often attributed such behaviors to respect, revealing another potential gap that some local mentors bridged for non-local instructors.

In a similar vein are mentors’ roles of serving as somebody that the instructor could directly call upon in class to rephrase or respond to a question, particularly during “lulls” and perceived periods of “awkward silence.” The following student comments illustrate ways in which the mentor facilitated student participation:

- When we were in class and I wasn't sure if I was going in the right direction of the discussion she helped me. (SE 718)
- She encouraged the class to speak their thoughts on controversial topics like racism in Hawaii and cultural values. (SE 732)

Particularly when students were uncomfortable speaking out in class or were concerned about saving face, the mentor played the role of offering reassurance and encouragement. Another student explained that the mentor helped to “diffuse situations” (SE 988), a significant role in classroom discussions addressing controversial topics. In these instances, mentors leveraged their positionalities as doubly-bound team performers to aid both parties in greater communication and understanding.

From this middle position, mentors also performed the role of a *third party perspective*. This role was geared less toward bringing instructor and student perspectives into alignment than toward introducing a perspective unique to both parties.
### Role 7: Third Party Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors identified by instructors</th>
<th>Behaviors identified by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Added a unique perspective to class discussions (grounded in mentor’s life experience, work with students, and knowledge) (n=6)</td>
<td>• Added the mentor’s own ideas to class discussions (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared insights with the class from mentor’s own experiences as a writer (n=4)</td>
<td>• Added a unique (and more sophisticated) perspective to class discussions (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offered feedback to the instructor during out-of-class conferences (n=8)</td>
<td>• Allowed students to see their papers from a different perspective (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Made announcements about campus events (n=3)</td>
<td>• Shared the mentor’s own experiences as a college student (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Offered meta-commentary about classroom discussions (n=4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional named roles by instructors</th>
<th>Additional named roles by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“Second opinion” (n=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the examples in the table indicate, mentors’ unique perspectives inflected both instructor and student perspectives, offering instructors feedback on student performance and conferencing trends that would have been otherwise unavailable and allowing students to “see” their papers from a different perspective. As I elaborate in Chapter Five, when mentors performed a third party perspective in classroom discussions, these discussions were often nudged beyond the stasis of binary arguments with over-determined “sides” and into more dynamic teaching and learning exchanges for all parties.

Although mentors were described regularly as assisting students with research, they were rarely depicted as researchers in their own rights, indicated in the table summarizing the eighth mentor role of participant-observer:
Role 8: Participant-Observer Researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors identified by instructors</th>
<th>Behaviors identified by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Functioned in class as a participant-observer (n=2)</td>
<td>• Observed the class (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observed the class (n=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional named roles by instructors</th>
<th>Additional named roles by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“Observer” (n=2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the official job description for the position of writing mentor explains the importance of taking participant-observer fieldnotes in the role of composition researcher, allusions to this role occurred in fewer than one percent of student or instructor comments. Furthermore, such comments often came with a degree of misunderstanding and/or dismissal, as in the instructor who skeptically wrote, “took notes, on Eng100 I think” (IE 42) and the student who reported “He sat and watched class,” adding in response to a later question about areas of improvement, “maybe more involvement” (SE 332). In these cases, mentors’ enactments of the observer dimensions of their participant-observer roles were seen as passive, suspect, and apart from the actual mentoring. Other comments noted more positive elements of mentors’ observer roles, as in the student who wrote, “I thought he was very aware about everything happening in class” (SE 141) and the instructor who enumerated thirteen different mentoring behaviors beginning with “observing (and I mean that in the most active sense and w/ agency)” (IE 5). This role stemmed most explicitly from the program’s directorship, although it was perhaps the least visible role to the other trinary actors within the classroom the mise-en-scène: while mentors’ work as composition researchers actively supported their team performances with both mentors and instructors, such composition research was not generally
understood as a team performance by either of these parties, as they were not privy to mentors’ written records.

Not surprisingly, instructors wrote most frequently about the ways in which mentors actively supported and/or shared in their instructional duties. Instructors listed 27 different repeated actions pertaining to mentors’ work in the classroom supporter and co-instructor roles, with these combined roles accounting for 40% of the total instructor clauses describing mentors’ work. This ninth mentor role reflects mentors teaming with students and even more with instructors to support the overall functioning of the classroom.

Table 4.12
Instructor and Student Comments on Writing Mentor Role #9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role 9: Classroom Supporter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parts identified by instructors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assisted instructor with technological elements of course delivery (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Took attendance (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped instructor to distribute and collect paperwork (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reminded instructor about announcements and topics s/he would have otherwise forgotten (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supported instructor [generic] (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Left classroom to make extra copies or fetch needed items (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Took notes on board so that students could follow instructor and/or class discussion better (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped out small groups that were missing members or otherwise struggling (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worked across small groups, facilitating draft workshops and group activities (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped facilitate and develop class discussions (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped when class discussions lagged (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provided help to students during class (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognized and complemented student and class improvements (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional named roles by instructors
“Extra pair of hands” (n=1)

Additional named roles by students

In some situations, the mentor served as what one instructor called “an extra pair of hands” (IE 5), assisting with such “nuts and bolts” (IE 38) of running a classroom as taking attendance (n=2), helping to distribute and collect paperwork (n=9), and occasionally leaving the classroom to make extra photocopies or fetch needed items (n=5). In other situations, mentors drew more fully upon their knowledge and/or positionality in assisting with technological elements of course delivery (n=4), helping out small groups that were missing members or otherwise struggling (n=3), and helping to facilitate and develop class discussions (n=4).

On numerous occasions, mentors also stepped into more direct teaching roles:
Table 4.13
Instructor and Student Comments on Writing Mentor Role #10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role 10: Co-Instructor</th>
<th>Parts identified by instructors</th>
<th>Parts identified by students</th>
<th>Additional named roles by instructors</th>
<th>Additional named roles by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parts identified by instructors</td>
<td>• Offered suggestions to instructor on course content (n=8)</td>
<td>• Supplemented instructor’s teaching during class (n=9)</td>
<td>“Bad cop” (n=1)</td>
<td>“Teacher” (n=25), “Instructor” (n=3), “Another instructor” (n=1), “(Like a) second professor” (n=4), “(Like a) second teacher” (n=5), “Teacher’s sidekick” (n=2), “On the side teacher” (n=1), “Like a professor should be” (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Added insights to instructor’s lectures (n=3)</td>
<td>• Backed up instructor’s points (n=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Crafted learning aids and opportunities to supplement instructor’s teaching (n=3)</td>
<td>• Led part of a class session (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taught lessons on topics the mentor perceived that students needed (n=4)</td>
<td>• Led discussions (n=3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taught lesson on place-based topics outside of instructor’s command (n=2)</td>
<td>• Created workshops for students (n=6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staged classroom co-performances with instructor (n=4)</td>
<td>• Taught the class on a few occasions (n=14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Circulated within the classroom space (n=6)</td>
<td>• Taught a lesson on a specific topic that students remembered and named (n=9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Took part in management of student behavior (n=5)</td>
<td>• Taught class when professor was absent (n=6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Split the class in two and took half the class (n=5)</td>
<td>• Took the lead on a unit/section/assignment (n=4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Led all-class discussions (n=9)</td>
<td>• Graded student papers (n=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Took the lead in teaching designated lessons to the full class (n=18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taught the class in the instructor’s absence (n=10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taught a full unit in preparation for serving as lead instructor the next semester (Ph.D. Apprentices only) (n=7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Team taught” with the instructor (n=3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When sharing in the teaching function, mentors often drew upon their out-of-class interactions with students to offer suggestions to the instructor on course content (n=8) and to craft supplementary lessons and learning aids addressing issues of student concern (n=3), as in the following example:
• Aside from providing suggestions for readings, assignments, and his own translation work for the class, [mentor’s first name] shared problems some of the students were encountering during their mentoring sessions, which led me to incorporate student concerns in my teaching. (IE 39)

In this case, the instructor was able to utilize knowledge derived from the mentor in order to make her pedagogy more responsive to student needs. As another instructor explained, “The mentored classroom now makes teaching without one feel curiously incomplete--and unresponsive to the pedagogical experience that first year composition students deserve from their institution” (IE 105).15 These instructors (and I presume others) came to rely upon the mentor’s third-party knowledge in order to place student-centered theories into fuller practice in their own classrooms—as well as to envision their course within the institution’s first-year experience for students. Instructors also frequently wrote about the mentor assuming the instructional spotlight by teaching designated lessons to the full class (n=18), teaching the class in the instructor’s absence (n=10), and in the case of Ph.D. apprentices, teaching a full unit in preparation for serving as lead instructor the next semester (n=7). Even in these teaching situations, however, this third classroom actor often approached the classroom from the positionality of a mentor. As one instructor narrates:

• I had to miss one class near the end of the semester, and [mentor’s first name] conducted discussion in my absence. She asked students about problems they were having, and she made a worksheet with those questions and suggestions for dealing with those problems. Students found this very helpful, and so did I. (IE 46)

To base an entire lesson on students’ self-reported problems requires the mentor to have established a degree of trust with students that enables such dialogue about challenges to occur. The instructor claims to have found this lesson “very helpful” to both the students
and herself, perhaps not only for the ways it responded to immediate classroom exigencies, but also for the ways it modeled fresh thinking about teaching and learning.\textsuperscript{16} It is the kind of lesson plan that would be much less likely if an instructor had developed a fixed curriculum and were trying to keep multiple sections of FYC on the same pace. Even when playing the part of “substitute teacher,” which may have constituted the most instructor-like role across the spectrum of documented mentoring roles, this mentor acted primarily from an awareness of and concern for students.

Perhaps most pertinent to \textit{mise-en-scène} were those comments in which instructors wrote about sharing the instructional stage with mentors as co-performers. These co-performances include such mentor behaviors as moving strategically within the classroom space (n=6), taking half the class while the instructor took the other half (n=5), “team teaching” with the instructor (n=3), and staging classroom co-performances with instructor (n=4). The following comment depicts the instructor and mentor staging a co-performance of peer response:

- Perhaps most interesting, she helped me to model the peer evaluation process by taking the role of the evaluator to my role of the writer. The essay was one from an earlier ENG 100. I thought I knew the essay well, for I had used it as a model before, but her questions showed that she was thinking of all possible levels of commentary. Her thoroughness impressed me and made the modeling scenario vivid and lively for the students—and thus a success. (IE 18)

This casting of parts with the instructor as “writer” and the mentor as “peer evaluator” inverts traditional classroom hierarchies, offering first-year students a different and perhaps more humanizing perspective on the instructor as a writer. Another mentor-instructor pairing that also co-performed the peer review process went on to co-publish
on the endeavor in an article titled “Teaching Intellectual Teamwork in WAC Courses through Peer Review.” In this article, Jim Henry and Lehua Ledbetter analyze how their own use of meta-commentary in responding to one another’s work dramatized for students the “intellectual teamwork” necessary to engage in effective peer review.17 As Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford’s Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing demonstrates, the ultimate form of intellectual teamwork may in fact be co-authorship: Henry and Ledbetter’s co-authored article constitutes one of four co-authored publications to date on trinary collaborations by former mentor-instructor pairs.

Another role that would have strongly surfaced had I expanded my analyses to include those survey questions asking instructors and students to comment on mentors’ abilities as future teachers is that of future instructor. While the first ten roles were depicted from the perspective of looking back on the mentor’s already-performed work, this eleventh role is an anticipation of mentors’ future performances. The questions asking students and instructors to project the mentor into a future teacher role named a different audience: that of prospective employers. As such, the overwhelmingly glowing responses to this question—as well as the distinctly more formal tones students adopted for this final survey question—indicate an example of reciprocated team performance.

A Case Study of Mentoring Roles in Combination

When mentors’ roles are momentarily isolated, as in the previous section’s analysis, one misses out on the fact that each mentor enacted and shifted fluidly among multiple roles, which according to Mary Soliday, is a defining feature of classroom-based
tutoring. The following comments indicate some of the rich combinations of roles cited by participants:

- **Student Comment:** a teacher, advisor, editor, friend, Peer revisor, source of information (SE 245)
- **Instructor Comment:** In class: He led class sessions, helped facilitate discussion, asked clarifying questions, helped facilitate activities/exercises, assisted students in-class by providing immediate feedback to questions and problems, supplemented my lecture points, and generally served as a supportive go-to person. Outside of class: he met with each student at least three times, providing feedback on paper ideas, outlines, drafts, and revisions; he taught them patterns of grammar and how to edit common technical problems in student papers, among other things. He also often played the "bad cop" to my "good cop," emphasizing basic issues of student responsibility in meeting deadlines and following instructions, both in and out of class. (IE 48)

The third actor’s fluidity is perhaps best exemplified by the student comment that combined in the mentor the seemingly contradictory roles of “friend” and “teacher.” Similarly, the instructor comment depicted the mentor as both “assisting students” and “playing the ‘bad cop.’” These two comments are somewhat atypical in the number of roles they depict the mentor playing: the average student comment listed two different mentoring behaviors and the average instructor comment seven. However, these examples signal the remarkable scope and fluidity of roles that mentors (were perceived to have) performed by virtue the ways in which their position(alities) enabled them to collaborate with the other trinary actors on a variety of temporal and spatial stages.

While the list of ten aggregated mentor roles may seem within any one mentor’s comprehensive reach, I would argue that it would be counterproductive to use this research as a means of standardizing trinary actor roles into the form of a programmatic
outcome. As Patrice Pavis reminds us, the “same dramatic text easily produces an infinite number of readings, and therefore stagings that cannot be predicted solely from the text” (365): such performance concepts are especially true of a classroom *mise-en-scène* that engages as many social actors and spaces of interaction as do trinary FYC collaborations. The following case study indicates that it would also likely be impossible for a mentor to be perceived as enacting all of these roles in the course of a single semester. Table 4.14 tracks one writing mentor’s end-of-semester evaluations across three FYC courses. This mentor was paired with one full-time instructor, one Ph.D. student, and one tenured professor. All three instructors claimed to be “very satisfied” with his performance, as did a strong majority (71%) of the students.¹⁸ One of these sections was designated “English 100 A: Honors” and two were linked with the College Opportunities Program (COP) for Hawai‘i residents from under-served communities. Table 4.14 displays the distribution of 3 instructor comments and 51 student comments (86% rate of return) on the mentor’s roles across the three sections:

Table 4.14
Distribution of Commentary About Writing Mentor Roles Across Three Sections of FYC With the Same Mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Role (Abbreviated titles)</th>
<th>Section 1 (Honors)</th>
<th>Section 2 (COP)</th>
<th>Section 3 (COP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Another student</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lead student</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal writing coach to students</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Research coach for students</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Resource for individualized support</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Classroom Interpreter</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Third party perspective</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Participant-observer researcher</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Classroom supporter</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Co-instructor</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table indicates, instructors and students across the three sections combined to describe the mentor performing all ten roles. However, no institutional actor within any one section described the mentor embodying all ten roles. Furthermore, it was rather astonishing how differently two students within the same section could depict the mentor, while both claiming to be “very satisfied” with his performance:

- My mentor is like a second professor. He was very helpful in making sure I understand the course material. There were incidents where my professor could not make it to class, and the mentor took over. He is always prepared and willing to help. (SE 754)
- He was like one of the boys! (SE 760)

These comments speak to the pliability both of third actor performances and their interpretations. Performance theory helps to account for some of these discrepancies, illustrating the ways in which different “theatre ghosts,” or memories of past classrooms actors and configurations inhabit all classroom performers and inflect their interpretations of present actors and configurations (Dorwick et al.). For example, my own memories of college professors and of teaching “the boys” in my 9th grade English classes (whose classroom performances could sometimes be characterized as rambunctious) lead me to read these two comments as signaling roles that were wildly divergent, perhaps even oppositional. However, the trinary classroom offers a stage in which (a) one actor’s performance can simultaneously engage and embody two seemingly binary roles; and/or (b) two different observers will simultaneously perceive within one actor’s performance roles that appear to be opposites, at least to a researcher who was not a direct member of the course. Perhaps these comments signal that within a trinary classroom, such roles can no longer regarded as countervalent performances on a linear educational continuum.
This case study also hints at some of the paradoxical positions mentors occupy, a notion I take up in the next section.

**The Paradoxical Positions Embodied by Third Classroom Actors**

This section engages mentors’ self-representations of their lived positionalities. Qualitative coding of mentor survey responses indicated that writing mentors experienced paradoxes related to (a) occupying an in-between role in institutional hierarchies; (b) enacting mentoring visions within institutional realities; and (c) performing as participant-observer composition researchers. In the following section, I present my data sources and enumerate the three rounds of qualitative coding I undertook to arrive inductively at this concept of the positional paradox.

**Data Sources and Coding Protocols**

The primary data I work with are mentors’ anonymous responses to two end-of-semester survey questions: (1) “What have been the most frustrating and/or problematic aspects of your job as a mentor? Please explain why.” (2) “What have been the best and/or most fulfilling aspects of your job as a mentor? Please explain why.” These two questions were asked across all four years of the program, generating 96 responses or a 77% rate of response. Mentors gave me permission to work with 89 of these responses. Mentors’ responses to question one averaged 87 words, with a range of 0 to 662 words. Mentors’ responses to question two averaged 81 words, with a range of 8 to 362 words.

By soliciting commentary on frustrations and problematic aspects of the position, the survey attempted to engage mentors on both an emotional and analytical level (without enacting an artificial binary between the two). Mentors’ combined responses offer a portrait of what the trinary configuration looked and felt like from mentors’
perspectives. This portrait, of course, is shaped by mentor’s awareness of the survey’s audience of WPAs. Even though I assured mentors that the survey was anonymous, mentors no doubt faced a range of problematic constraints that increased the likelihood of their withholding or carefully filtering critique. These constraints include mentors’ awareness that the population taking the survey in any given semester was small; that administrators were already familiar with elements of their classroom situations from roundtables and with their writing styles from reading logs and memos; and that mentors would likely need references from and continue to cross personal and professional paths with members of the program, a situation that applies to life on an island perhaps more than in other contexts. Thus, these comments represent mentors’ institutional positions in ways that both document their self-observed performances and perform responses that are inflected by their lived positionalities. Furthermore, in inquiring about the best and worst parts of the position, I am unable to account well for mentors’ perspectives on some of the position’s more mundane elements. My attempts to treat equally the position’s problems and possibilities may also skew the fact that mentors’ overall levels of satisfaction with the position were overwhelmingly positive: 57% claimed to be “very satisfied;” 40% to be “satisfied;” 4% “dissatisfied;” and 1% “very dissatisfied.”

I submitted mentors’ responses to these questions to three different rounds of qualitative coding that built upon one another and involved increasing degrees of inference. In my first round of analysis, I coded the two sets of responses according to the ways in which comments addressed mentors’ perceived relationships to the other institutional actors in the trinary configuration and the Writing Mentors Program. I classified responses using a “descriptive coding” protocol according to their references to
students, instructors, and administrators/administration of Writing Mentors Program (Miles and Huberman 56).²⁰ The table below displays the breakdown of mentor comments by institutional position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor in relation to...</th>
<th>Percentage of comments addressing the most frustrating/problematic parts of position</th>
<th>Percentage of comments addressing the most fulfilling/best parts of position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program administration</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Codeable</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly all of the mentors surveyed (96%) identified some dimension of working with students as one of the best or most fulfilling parts of the position, and a majority of comments (64%) also identified aspects of working with students among the position’s most frustrating or problematic elements. The fact that 142 of 178 total comments (or 80%) addressed the mentor’s relationship with students underscores the student-centered nature of the position. A majority of mentor comments across the two survey questions (n=105) mentioned only one institutional actor, yet many comments simultaneously addressed two (n=52) or three (n=17) institutional others. While this initial coding scheme allowed me to isolate and begin analyzing elements of mentors’ perceived relationships with each institutional actor, it did not allow me to account for the interactions across multiple institutional positions.

Once comments were assigned to these four overarching categories related to institutional position, I then performed a second round of analysis using an “interpretive coding” protocol in order to identify salient themes within each category (Miles and Huberman 57). In order to empirically catalogue the frustrations and fulfillments of the
position as mentors reported them, whenever possible I employed “in vivo codes,” or category titles that drew directly from participants’ own words (Corbin 528-529). Comments were coded at the unit level of the clause; as such, a single comment could and frequently did address more than one code. In the end, I settled upon thirty-nine repeated themes, which are displayed by frequency in Appendix AT and by institutional position in Appendix AU.

In my third and final round of analysis, I employed a “pattern coding” scheme (Miles and Huberman 57). In graphically representing my findings from the first two rounds of coding in Appendices AT and AU, I noticed that many of the frustrating and fulfilling elements of the position seemed to exist in interdependent relationships, to such a degree that if the frustrating aspect of the position were eliminated, a corresponding area or areas of fulfillment would no longer be viable. I was also struck by the degree to which mentors’ enactment of the role seemed to depend upon student, instructor, and administrator cooperation and/or obstruction. These insights led me to investigate the position’s paradoxes, looking for the contradictions and incongruities in mentors’ experiences as they related to mentors’ positioning in the trinary configuration and in a formalized mentoring program within an institution of higher education. Working with the catalogue of themes I had identified in my previous rounds of coding, I began by juxtaposing frustrations and fulfillments that seemed to exist in relation to one another. In this final round of pattern coding, I worked across comments made with regards to students, instructors, and administrators, re-integrating themes that had been separated through my earlier round of coding according to institutional position. In the end, I found that all of the codes I had identified in my earlier rounds of data analysis pertained to at
least one of these three paradoxes. And I came to see these paradoxes more as interrelated than discrete. The breakdown of thirty-nine descriptively-coded frustration and fulfillment themes across the three paradoxes is displayed in Appendix AV.

My final methodological step was conducting “participant checks” (Miles and Huberman, 275-277) with the current cohort of mentors who generously reviewed a chapter excerpt and shared their responses with me during two different hour-long roundtables. (My protocols for this activity are addressed in the Methodology chapter.) Mentors reported that on the whole, they saw much of themselves and their experiences in the paradoxes I had identified. One mentor whom I met for the first time that day explained, “I felt like every time I was reading each of the paradoxes, I was like, ‘oh my god, that’s so me.’ They resonated really well, and there were definitely specific instances I could think of that would speak to each of them” (PCR). Mentors’ feedback also led me to nuance my explications of the paradoxes in significant ways. For example, I had initially described the mentor as occupying a position of relative disempowerment, and mentors alerted me to the kinds of power they recognized, exercised, and sometimes resisted within the position, which my earlier explanations had overlooked. In the section below, I present these paradoxes and illustrate them through mentor comments, arguing that they represent at once the most compelling problems and possibilities of the institutional position(alties) of trinary team performers.

**Paradox One: Occupying an “In-Between” Role in Classroom Hierarchies**

This first paradox addresses the degree to which mentors occupy a role that is both “instructor” and “student,” but that is also neither fully “instructor” nor “student.” As one mentor in the participant check roundtable put it: “you’re a student, yet
kind of an instructor, yet kind of nothing, but everything” (PCR). Here are some ways mentors theorized themselves operating within a kind of in-between institutional space:

- As a mentor I am able to get to know students in a different way—both as a peer and as an instructor of sorts—than if I were a TA. The students in the class that I mentored would often refer to the mentor's role as "in-between" that of another student and of an instructor, and I feel that this is an accurate description of my role. By functioning as such, I have helped students develop their writing skills and help them negotiate their first years in the university. I have gotten to know many of the students on a personal level, and can appreciate them for who they are, for their strengths and their challenges, and for the individual experiences they bring to the classroom. (ME 30)

- One of the most fulfilling aspects of the mentoring positions is the positionality of the mentor. Being in this "third space" (not the instructor or the student) has made me appreciate each role within the classroom on a deeper level than I had as a student. I feel that this can only add to my future teaching experience because as a mentor I was able to be more fluid. (ME 50)

While the first comment depicts the mentor playing the roles of “both a peer and an instructor of sorts,” the second comment situates the mentor in a “third space” defined as being neither instructor nor student. (Interestingly, in both comments the term used to depict the mentor’s positionality is enclosed in scare quotes.) Mentors wrote and spoke of this positionality as a space that simultaneously allowed them to mentor and be mentored, both by the instructor and students. From this third institutional space, mentors related to the instructor as an apprentice, informant, and collaborator without having to bear the primary burden of responsibility for the course. Advantages that mentors saw in their in-between positionality included getting to know students and instructors on a personal level, appreciating both classroom roles more deeply, and experiencing a high degree of fluidity in their own deployment of mentoring roles.
Mentors found that the mandate to represent simultaneously the interests of both instructor and student positions placed them in some particularly delicate situations with high performative stakes. In the participant check roundtable, one mentor illustrated such a scenario:

I had one student who was saying essentially, “I wish you could be my instructor instead of the one I have.” And it’s like that really tight spot where you’re like, “Oooh. Big compliment, but I need to remain neutral.” But I think that what’s valuable about it is trying to get them to explain exactly what their frustration is. Because I don’t think as an instructor, many students, if they felt that way, would actually verbalize it to you, except maybe through the end-of-class feedback. So it’s useful to hear what exactly their grievances are. . . You don’t want to step on the toes of the instructor. And you don’t want to mirror the student’s complaints to make them feel better, you know. You really have to kind of, almost, like, become your own entity. You’re like, “okay I can understand why you might be frustrated. Honestly, the instructor is more qualified and more knowledgeable than me. But you know, maybe let’s go over what she was talking in class, and maybe I can explain it in a way that makes a little more sense to you.” . . . You don’t really want to take either side in that situation. (PCR)

As this mentor re-enacted the parts of both the student and mentor in this potentially-compromising scene, the other mentors around the table chuckled and nodded their heads in what I perceived to be a shared recognition of a situation which many of them had experienced or could imagine experiencing in the third classroom role. In order to accomplish the performative goal of “remaining neutral,” the mentor must renounce a number of readily available roles. In this situation, for example, the strategy of “mirroring,” which was presented to mentors as part of the active listening workshops conducted by the university’s Counseling and Student Development Center, could constitute a breach of team performance with the instructor, as the act of hearing the
The mentor echoes the student’s complaints and emotions might be misinterpreted by the student as the mentor agreeing with the student’s assessment of the instructor. The mentor’s solution of “becoming your own entity” initially sounds like a thirdspace strategy, but in order to achieve it he must perform elements of each of the binary roles, first taking the perspective of the student to admit, “I can understand why you might be frustrated,” next reinforcing the instructor role in claiming, “the instructor is more qualified and more knowledgeable than me,” and finally performing a kind of third mentoring function by carefully offering, “let’s go over what she was talking in class, and maybe I can explain it in a way that makes a little more sense to you.” Between the student-like and instructor-like lines, the mentor inserts the word “honestly.” Whether or not the mentor believes the statement he is about to announce, the word “honestly” functions as the transitional lynchpin of the argument, reminding the student of their shared rapport while also asserting a non-student, non-instructor voice. Furthermore, in expressing a desire to substitute the mentor for the instructor, the student in this scenario would have been re-instituting a binary classroom configuration, and the mentor’s refusal to “take either side” served to reinforce the trinary configuration. This scenario illustrates the ways in which mentors are doubly-bound team performers, in multiple senses of the term.

The official job description for the position anticipates scenarios of this sort in stipulating that “under no circumstances should you undermine the authority of the instructor.” The task, however, of harnessing one’s power as a mentor to influence student’s readings of and relationships with the instructor (and vice versa) in productive directions takes maturity, tact, ethical awareness, and “positional reflexivity” (Henry and
Bruland). Given that creating and maintaining a “team performance” with both the instructor and students is no simple task, feeling as though one has accomplished this feat with some degree of success ranked for some mentors among the position’s highlights.

Several mentor comments depicted the satisfaction mentors took in such collaborations:

- I was able to see the fruits our (the students, the instructor, and my) labor. (ME 57)
- I was also excited to hear from students in their feedback that the instructor and I worked well together, which proved that our efforts to collaborate and stay on the same page helped students understand the classroom as a coordinated effort. (ME 77)
- Seeing the students trust me and trust the instructor was also an amazing aspect of the mentoring program (ME 72).

The first comment defines team performance as a shared responsibility across all three trinary actors, whereas in the second comment, the mentor and instructor are positioned as a collaborative pair who perform the classroom as “a coordinated effort” for an audience of students. The third comment explores shared “trust” to be virtue of the trinary configuration: instead of competing with the instructor for the students’ trust, this mentor claimed to have found fulfillment in seeing (and perhaps facilitating) the students’ trust in the instructor, too.23 As the next comment indicates, when high degrees of openness and trust existed between the mentor and instructor, more information about students was potentially exchanged behind the scenes:

- As a mentor, it is crucial to work with both the instructor and students; to keep in mind the interests of both parties. The students cannot write “successful” papers without the mentor knowing the instructor’s “platform” and vice versa, the instructor benefitted from kind of “knowing where the students are at” which was the information that I, as mentor, could provide. . . The instructor and I collaborated very, very well. She was extremely
open to collaborating with me, asking me input on students’ progress. I made it a point to share with her feedback about students’ progress, challenges, and triumphs. (ME 73)

In this case, the mentor positioned her/himself as being able to share specialized information across the binary, informing students of the instructor’s “platform” and providing the instructor with “feedback about students’ progress, challenges, and triumphs.” As both references to “students’” are plural possessive, it appears as though the mentor is relaying observations in aggregate rather than disclosing details of her/his work with individual students. Ostensibly, such sharing helps the instructor to be more in touch with the students’ needs, but as mentors pointed out in the participant check roundtable, mentors were also in a position to convey information from student conferences that might constitute a breach of student trust or bias an instructor against certain students. Such are decisions and dilemmas mentors faced regularly in “keeping in mind the interests of both parties” while performing FYC “as a coordinated effort.”

Mentors wrote specifically about the value of teaming closely with an instructor in 36% of the end-of-semester comments regarding the best parts of the position. These comments touched upon such themes as observing first-hand an exemplary teaching model (n=12); dialoguing/ debriefing with the instructor about the course (n=5); picking up specific assignments and teaching techniques from the instructor for the mentor’s future use as a FYC instructor (n=4); being “mentored” by the instructor (n=3); having a scaffolded, supported initial classroom teaching experience (n=3); and co-performing the course with the instructor as a coordinated effort (n=3). However, mentors also found that being bound to the instructor as a co-performer proved challenging at times and left them feeling disempowered to varying degrees, noting dimensions of working with their assigned instructor as ranking among the position’s more frustrating and/or problematic
elements in 36% of the end-of-semester comments. Themes across such comments included the challenges of functioning within an instructor’s pedagogical vision, course structure, or teaching style that differed from that of the mentor (n=8); realizing when elements of the instructor’s communication were not reaching the students and feeling the burden of addressing this impasse (n=4); decoding the instructor’s expectations of the mentor (n=5); coping with instructor behavior judged by mentor to be unprofessional (n=4); and functioning in situations of ensuing confusion between instructors and program administrators about what it means to have a “mentor” in the classroom (n=2).

The following end-of-semester comments, presented along what I see as a least-to-most-problematic continuum, illustrate the more challenging elements of co-performing with instructors:

- Negotiating a classroom environment largely defined by an instructor whom I like and whose work I respect, but whose pedagogical approach and perspectives on desirable SLOs are often drastically different from mine. The short and hectic pace of the time in which both the instructor and I must learn how to make this mentoring partnership work as advantageously as possible for both our sakes as well as the students; I think we would attempt to do many things quite differently if given the time and opportunity for another outing as a team. (ME 30)

- Frustrating aspects have been having to endorse and support a Professor's vision which is very different from my own. This working arrangement was not what I expected, but I maintained a solid foundation between myself and the Professor in order to keep cohesion among the forces and to not break the teaching bond. I would choose a Professor with a similar teaching style to myself next time. (ME 45)

- There has been some miscommunication and I've felt that I've tried to get things as clear as possible (i.e., what assignments require) but often felt that I had to just work with the situation and damage control with the students instead. Although it is not my job to direct
the classroom, as someone who wants to be proactive and vested in students’ learning processes, it was frustrating. (ME 70)

- The professor missed four or five class meetings and didn't offer students much guidance, so it was difficult not to cross the line into acting as an instructor and rule-enforcer. That same semester, the professor would make comments about the students to me in front of other students, which I thought was inappropriate, but I didn't know how to say something. (ME 20)

- The instructor I worked with was the most problematic aspect of the job. An explanation of why that is would fill pages. Beyond feeling like I was being exploited, it was a very uncomfortable position to be in for a number of reasons. It was extremely difficult to communicate to the instructor in order to improve the situation as well. (ME 7)

Despite each of these mentors’ professed differences with their paired instructors, they depict themselves as team performers working to uphold the “teaching bond.” Performing cohesion meant different things in different situations, ranging from “just work[ing] with the situation” as best they could, enacting “damage control,” to resisting the impulse to “cross the line” into the instructor’s territory of directing the classroom or enforcing rules. Mentors felt most compromised by their lack of recognized institutional power when instructors acted in ways they perceived to be unprofessional and/or unethical. In these cases, mentors especially suffered from not being in a position to communicate on equal terms with instructors. As one instructor noted in a focus group interview, this power dynamic can potentially become even more problematic in situations in which the instructor also happens to function as the writing mentor’s thesis advisor, committee member, or graduate course instructor.

While graduate student TAs across the university generally operate in tenuous institutional positions vis-à-vis instructors, they usually have grading powers, which
means that they can administer meaningful consequences when students miss appointments, fail to submit work, or act in otherwise unprofessional ways. And graduate students who serve as writing center tutors are protected by set hours, uniform conference sign-up protocols, and center-wide attendance and cancellation policies. Writing mentors’ comments frequently addressed the problems of having neither of these sources of power, making their ability to fulfill their job description not only contingent upon the mentor’s entrepreneurial and rapport-building skills, but also on a number of factors largely outside of mentors’ control, including the instructor’s ability to send students to the mentor at appropriate intervals, students’ motivation and wherewithal to utilize the mentor appropriately as a resource, and the instructor’s willingness to enforce and/or adjust policies regarding the mentor in the case of infringements. Mentors noted a number of problems and frustrations related to their lack of overt power, including the challenges of getting students to attend conferences when the instructor did not mandate or incentivize regular student-mentor conferences (n=13); dealing with conference cancellations and no shows (n=6); feeling as though the mentor’s feedback was not valued and/or implemented by students (n=3); and finding that students were confused about how to interact with the mentor or vice versa (n=3). These comments spoke to mentors’ feelings of disempowerment in relationship to students:

- At times I have felt very frustrated with feeling like I have to prioritize students’ time over my own. As a graduate student trying to finish the MA degree on time this can make life really difficult, especially during trying times. The students’ freedom to choose when they want to have their required meetings has at times resulted in a flood of students at the end of the semester who did not seem to value my feedback as much as they just needed the conference to meet class requirements and avoid having their grades lowered. . . . The mentor’s position is at times one that makes it obligatory to yield to the
student—a power dynamic that can compromise the mentor’s personal and study time. (ME 37)

• The students procrastinated with meeting times. I would send emails, but I always ended up feeling like I was pursuing the students to make an appointment with me. For the last meeting, the instructor made it an option that they were able to meet for their 4th paper or the final portfolio. I felt this could be a problem because I had my own work that I needed to work on in those final weeks, so I sent an email out advising them about the schedule and providing dates to meet; only one student responded and the rest waited till the last minute, which did not do either of us any good. I was not able to provide as in-depth help to them, and they mostly did not have revisions ready. (ME 73)

When instructors did not carefully integrate mentor conferences into the course, mentors were placed in situations in which it seemed “obligatory to yield” to students’ demands, schedules, and lack of advanced planning. When conferences were not mandated or incentivized, mentors found themselves without the institutional backing needed to attract many first-year students to meet with them at all. On the other hand, when instructors required a set number of conferences without attaching these conferences to specific assignments spread across the semester, mentors found that they were placed in the situation of having to conduct a majority of conferences in the final weeks of the semester, sacrificing their own academic work for meetings with little sense of actual purpose. As one mentor in the participant check roundtables explained, “If they have to meet with me, that puts a lot of pressure on me to be available for them. Because if I’m not available, it’s gonna impact their grade. And so I know you talked about how we don’t have the power to grade papers, but in a sense, we do somewhat impact their grades, especially if you’re really tight with the instructor” (PCR). Following this comment, another mentor added, “There’s times where I don’t have time to meet with them, but I feel like I have to make time— that their priorities for meeting with me, since it impacts their own grades, comes over my own
deadlines” (PCR). In these and many other cases, ill-conceived course policies regarding mentor conferences have scripted writing mentors into co-performances with students that do not reinforce effective writing habits for either party. In response to this paradox, both participant roundtable groups brought out the importance of drawing boundaries that can help the mentor survive as a graduate student and model professionalism, all the while acknowledging that such boundaries must be reinforced and respected by all trinary parties to prove effective.

Paradox Two: Enacting Mentoring Visions within Institutional Realities

This second paradox addresses the ways in which visions of mentoring as altruistic, voluntary, and even familial come into tension with the institutional realities of mentoring being a quarter-time job serving students who do not always want to be mentored. Given the complex realities of this programmatic and institutional mise-en-scène, mentors frequently wrestled with such questions as: How do I manage the impression of being “available” to students without surrendering my own academic and personal priorities? How do I reconcile the program’s mission of “helping all students excel in English 100” with students’ confessions that they only aim to pass the course? And how do I orient students to the university as a stage for active, integrated, and individualized learning when the institutional system treats students in aggregate and the college degree largely as a compartmentalized checklist of coursework?

In light of Goffman’s work on performance as impression management, perhaps the most difficult impression mentors worked to facilitate was that of being “available” to students while still preserving time and space for the mentor’s own priorities. Student evaluations offered abundant evidence that mentors did indeed come across to students as
being very available, even “always available.” In some cases, students portrayed mentors as though they existed in a perpetual state of waiting for students to call upon their help.

From my vantage point as a graduate program administrator, however, I observed a very different picture. Mentors frequently arrived at bi-weekly program roundtables looking harried and stressed, talking amongst themselves and sometimes with program administrators about their struggles to transition to graduate school, keep up with heavy reading and writing loads, maintain mentoring hours, and juggle additional jobs to stay financially afloat. The following comment was selected from the nineteen mentor responses that addressed the competing demands on mentors’ time as a problematic element of the job:

Balancing my schedule was my biggest challenge while working as a mentor. I knew, coming into the program, that the only person putting a "ceiling" on my weekly appointments would be me, as only I would know which students were asking to meet when/who was canceling at the last minute/who really needed to meet with me at least one more time on the latest assignment if s/he was going to get a passing grade, etc. I was proactive about trying to both encourage students to meet with me, and also have a firm hand about students' keeping appointments and being professional with their time and mine. Still, I'm sure that out of our 16 weeks this semester, I had more than eight hours of appointments in at least 12 of those weeks. I'm not sure what could have helped me to better contain my mentoring time (while still meeting the needs of the students), as I felt very supported by the instructor and by both Jim and Holly, all of whom understood my other time constraints (other jobs/my own class work, etc). At the beginning of the semester, the instructor did ask me to set my mentoring hours, and she announced these hours to the class during the first week. She was sure to tell the students that if those hours didn't work for them, the students should switch sections to either an "unmentored" class or to one with different mentoring hours. I found this helpful in theory, but since Eng
100 is now a freshman class, and because of increased class sizes, etc, switching
sections wasn't as easy the instructor made it out to be. In turn, for the students who
stayed in our class even though they knew my times wouldn't work for them, I ended up
making exceptions that eventually kept me pinned to Sinclair for the better part of my
mentoring days, as I'd have an appointment every, say, hour, but each appointment
would only last 30 minutes. (MS 2)

Mentors frequently noted how quickly the quarter-time position of mentoring became all-
consuming, especially when mentors were dedicated and successful at building rapport
with students. Mentors’ heightened awareness of the challenges facing first-year students
(institutional, course-related, personal, cultural) made it especially difficult to dismiss
their requests for help. As one mentor explained, “I have difficulty saying ‘no’ to my mentees,
for I feel their frustrations of going to school. I would often place my own work behind the needs
of my mentees, not allowing for ‘me’ time” (MS 50). Multiple mentors spoke of bending their
schedules to accommodate their students to the degree that they sacrificed their own
academic work, sleep, and personal time. For this reason, beginning in the program’s
second year Professor Henry and I scheduled workshops with university counseling as
part of the program’s orientation, asking them to address self-care, setting boundaries,
and making referrals.

However, while a portion of mentors struggled to contain their mentoring hours,
another cohort struggled to fulfill theirs, describing themselves as feeling “superfluous,”
“underutilized,” and “just a filler.” Quantitatively speaking, although mentors reported an
average of 9.8 hours spent on the job per week, the range of average weekly hours was
quite wide: 5-6 hours (11%), 7-8 hours (21%), 9-10 hours (25%), 11-12 hours (18%), 13-
14 hours (11%), 15+ hours (7%), and blank (7%). Mentors often found that their own
talent and dedication were not enough to enable to them to fulfill the program’s vision of
their position, as they must rely heavily upon the instructor’s support and pedagogical savvy in promoting a regular cycle of out-of-class conferences as well as the students’ interest and cooperation in attending them. Given that FYC is a required course and that many students come to it with negative previous writing experiences, such cooperation on the part of students was no guarantee.

Thus, mentors were faced with the paradoxical challenge of serving in a program that espouses to “helping all students excel in English 100,” while remaining true as a mentor to helping individual students accomplish their own self-determined goals for the course, which did not always include excelling in the ways envisioned by mentors, instructors, and/or WPAs. In the following comments, mentors describe and analyze students’ rejections of their help:

- Probably the most frustrating thing about being a mentor are the students that are not motivated to meet with me and see me as a nuisance rather than a resource. As a Writing Center tutor, I am used to people not only wanting and appreciating my help, but are sincerely motivated to develop their skills as a writer. Most of these students, while nice, friendly, amiable, etc, only see this as a course to get through. And while I can't fault them for that, after all I would probably have felt the same at their age, it does decrease my motivation at times. (ME 57)

- Frustrations for me clustered around dealing with students who just wanted to get by and were in it to pass the class and get on with life. I know people have different interests and priorities than me but it’s harder to help someone when we disagree about what “help” is. I also dislike being put in that shoving-things-down-unwilling-throats position. (ME 14)

Such comments speak to the complexities of directorship within trinary FYC classrooms: mentors recognized that there was not one simple “go-to” director of the mentor-student relationship, as there is in many theatrical performances or in Erving Goffman’s theories
of directorship within workplaces and other everyday social dramas. Directorship in these mentoring relationships involved a dynamic give-and-take among student, mentor, instructor, and WPA visions and mandates.

Mentors’ visions of treating students as individuals and lifelong writers also came into tension with the mise-en-scène of FYC as a sixteen-week course with pre-designated, standardized student learning outcomes. In many comments (n=12), mentors expressed regret about failing to reach or “break through” to a particular student within the allotted timeframe of the semester, despite extensive effort:

- Being unable to reach certain students has been very frustrating for me. I’ve had one student in particular who I spent a good amount of time with early in the semester who showed considerable improvement. However, he ended up dropping the class AFTER writing and turning in his third of four major essays. I failed on my first attempt to get through community college when I was right out of high school. It was difficult for me to deal with that failure, and in a perfect world I could help every student I mentor avoid having to go through a similar situation. (ME 28)

- I know it was just one student, but I suppose it bothers me because I saw myself in that student and I sincerely wanted to make a connection with her. (ME 28)

- In this semester, for example, a football player had attended only one conference with me, even though three conferences were required in the course. What is more frustrating is that the student is an intelligent young man who likes to read. (ME 85)

I am struck in these comments by how, after a full semester of feeling unsuccessful in their attempts to reach a particular student, these mentors were not dismissive of the student, but rather tended to describe the student with generosity and compassion, often seeing some of themselves in that student. (In fact, only one comment out of the eighty-nine employed the word “lazy” in depicting students.) The care that mentors professed
to feel towards students on an individual level, even when a student did not reciprocate the mentor’s efforts, points to one of the position’s most significant possibilities, which I return to in this chapter’s conclusions.

While the *mise-en-scène* of FYC (accompanied by numerous other interpersonal factors) proved too restrictive for some mentoring relationships to blossom, writing mentors found it to be the ideal staging ground for others. Mentors experienced within this trinary *mise-en-scène* the fulfillments of getting to know students both personally and academically (n=42); being able to track individual students’ development over a semester’s duration (n=34); helping students negotiate the transition to the university (n=17); and receiving confirmation that the mentor has been helpful to students (n=32).

In the comments that follow, mentors describe the kinds of meaningful, individualized relationships they were able to develop with students:

- What I found most valuable was working with the students on a one-on-one basis instead of as a class. I gained insight into their learning modes, expectations of the course, as well as expectations of college. These are insights I would not have gained outside a classroom setting or through a very specific writing assignment requesting such insight. (ME 62)

- I could see student challenges inside and outside the classroom, had more open access to the sorts of real life problems that actually jeopardized their college standing, and most of all had the time to actually give them the help in research and analysis I thought they needed. (ME 15)

As the second comment indicates, it is quite a luxury for an institutional actor in a large university to find himself in a position that offers “time to actually give [students] the help in research and analysis I thought they needed.” While an instructor may discern that a student is in need of extensive individualized help, the logistics of teaching multiple
sections while also fulfilling other research and service duties simply does not enable instructors to provide such support. And while a handful of positions within institutions of higher education allot the majority of a worker’s time to helping students individually, the individuals in these positions must frequently serve so many students at once that they are unable to devote such extended attention to any one student. Furthermore, students must have the motivation and wherewithal to seek out these helping positions, especially when a student would not otherwise come into contact with their office. In working with a maximum of twenty students in any given semester, and in interacting regularly with them both inside and outside the classroom, mentors were positioned to contextualize and individualize their approaches to a greater degree than almost any other institutional actor.

While mentors were able to take the time to help those students whom they perceived to be in need of extensive academic support, they also were able to individualize instruction for students who were already strong and/or interested writers:

- I think I took to the students who had an inclination toward writing, or toward some kind of topic that they felt passionate enough about to be interested in writing as a means of studying/researching that topic. Specifically it was fulfilling to see them begin to value my advice and perhaps feel more validated and encouraged because of the interest I took in them and their writing. (ME 14)

- I met with this student probably 2-3 per paper. I felt that this was a successful situation; I believe that because of these meetings the student, on her own, improved her writing. She was also proactive and completed drafts on time, had drafts before meetings with me, actually worked on a lot of revision. This student put in a great deal of effort, therefore the mentor meetings were of benefit to her. It was so amazing to watch her
grow in her writing process and her confidence as a writer, while improving her writing
(which was already focused and clear). (ME 73)

These comments reflect a recurring theme across bi-weekly mentor roundtables: that of
challenging already-strong writers to take their writing to the next level. Such examples
speak to a strength of trinary FYC classrooms: that third actors are positioned in ways
that enable them to theorize and practice mentoring not only as coaching in
organizational performance meant to bring students “up to standard,” but also as
engagement with the cultural and technological elements of performance.

When offering individualized support, writing mentors often framed their work in
relation to the larger university. The following comments illustrate some of the ways in
which mentors worked to personalize students’ early encounters with an often-impersonal
university:

- Many of my students expressed early in the semester that they felt "lost" and
"overwhelmed" at UH. They did not know where anything was or how anything worked.
They felt a distance between themselves and everyone else. I directed them as best I
could to the various activities and resources available to them, and I could see their
confidence grow. Over the course of the semester, many of them felt "better" having
someone to talk to who was older and knew the in's and out's of the university. (ME 39)
- I was also able to mentor them in other aspects of college life and it created a bond with
the students that normal T.A.-ing or work in the writing center probably would not be able
to establish. (ME 4)
- Another fulfilling experience is being able to serve as a mentor for the students beyond
their writing. I appreciate the trust some of these students have placed on me when they
confide to me about their personal concerns. I am not trained to give advice, but that
hardly matters. Sometimes all they needed was someone to listen, and I was happy to be
that person. One student, for instance, was on the verge of failing the class. He started to
talk about the real reason why he was failing. I think he just needed a little encouragement and I was there for him. After our conference, he began showing more interest in the class. (ME 13)

- I enjoyed helping my students improve their writing skills and understand their own writing processes because these are skills and knowledge that will serve them well throughout their academic, professional and personal careers. It was also nice to put a human face on the university because I think it helps to ease the transition to college for a lot of new students. (ME 45)

Mentors found that writing-based relationships potentially “created a bond with the students” that led to their mentoring students on other transitional issues. As these comments (and the seventeen total comments in which mentors describe themselves addressing students’ college transitions) indicate, mentors theorized their work not only in relation to the specific mise-en-scène of FYC, but also to the university at large. That one mentor paradoxically described herself putting “a human face on the university” reveals not only the far-reaching extent of mentors’ roles, but also a perspective of the university as an entity that can be humanized by an individual performing within the interstices of institutional hierarchies.

**Paradox Three: Performing (or Else) as Writing Mentor Researchers in the Tradition of Composition Studies**

This category addresses the ways in which mentors simultaneously embraced and rejected the role of “composition researcher” as part of their job description. I name this third paradox with a nod to Jon McKenzie’s monograph, *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance*, to signal the ways in which the position of writing mentor researcher disciplines mentors to some degree as compositionists. Of the three paradoxes, this one speaks most directly to performance theories of directorship. As elaborated in
Chapter Three, Program Director Jim Henry made a point of beginning each mentor orientation with an explanation of how research in Composition Studies problematizes students’ learning and learning environments. This narrative served for many incoming mentors (particularly those in Literature, Creative Writing, and Cultural Studies) as a first introduction to the field of Composition Studies. Professor Henry explicitly positioned mentors as teacher-researchers in their own right, emphasizing the value of mentors’ roles as participant-observers: they were to take notes in class not only as a means of tracking course content, but also of modeling note-taking for students and more carefully observing and theorizing student performance. Furthermore, mentors were to document formally their work with students as means of enriching their own mentoring performances and as the basis for programmatic research and assessment needed to justify continued funding.

In their end-of-semester commentary, mentors specifically mentioned several research-related elements of the position as being among the best or most fulfilling parts of their jobs: connecting graduate theory-driven coursework with classroom praxis (n=6); occupying a field researcher role as participant-observer (n=12); observing first-hand an exemplary teaching model (n=12); dialoguing and debriefing with instructors about course issues and student challenges (n=5); working across a full class of students (n=6); observing students both inside and outside of class (n=8); being able to track individual students’ development over a semester’s duration (n=34); witnessing first-hand student “breakthroughs” (n=8); interacting with other mentors and program administrators (n=4); and confirming teaching as an informed career choice (n=7). There were, however, several elements of the composition researcher role that mentors described as frustrating
or problematic. Among these were fulfilling the documentation requirements of the position (n=11); finding a lack of fit between Ph.D. students’ needs and mentor program policies (n=2); dealing with uncertainty about the program’s continuation (n=2); and finding mentor training and professional development to be lacking (n=3). In the following section, I explore mentors’ perspectives as composition researchers, looking specifically at the ways in which mentors’ comments position them as future composition teachers, but perhaps not so much as future composition researchers.

An important thread throughout the tradition of composition research has been connecting theory with praxis, and several mentors (n=6) recognized the position as affording them classroom experience they might not have otherwise gained from their graduate educations.

• I feel that I am gaining necessary classroom experience to fully understand and practice the theories that I encounter as I progress through the MA program. (ME 30)
• The best part about working as a mentor is that it gives me sense of purpose. Working with first-year students provides me with the opportunity to put the theoretical knowledge I derive from my M.A. course work to good use. (ME 36)
• There were many different aspects I enjoyed: working with a variety of great instructors, observing a college classroom from a unique angle, and getting the opportunity of putting the sometimes abstract theories from my own classes to use in a real-world setting. (ME 82)

Implied in these comments is the assumption that graduate coursework and readings offered “theory” and “knowledge,” whereas the FYC classroom and mentored conferences offered “experience,” “practice,” and “good use.” These comments tended to sustain a binary between “abstract” theory and “real-world” practice, indicating opportunities for helping mentors as researchers to more consciously bridge the two.
These observations may partly account for mentors’ sense that completing conference logs and weekly memos existed outside the realms of theory or knowledge building. On the whole, eleven mentors (12%) claimed the logs and memos to be among the position’s more frustrating or problematic elements, whereas not a single comment specifically mentioned it as a highlight. These comments characterized such “documentation” as time-consuming, tedious, and occasionally overwhelming. The following quotations represent some of mentors’ documentation-related frustrations:

- All the “paperwork” - filling out spreadsheets and mentor logs can get tedious, no matter how “on top” of things I am. (ME 29)
- There wasn’t really any frustrating aspects of the job, aside from when I realized that I was VERY behind in my logs and weekly memos. It was hard to do all the paperwork, as well as mentor, attend class, work another job, and so on. But those were more a result of my personal inadequacies than with any problems with mentoring itself. (ME 4)

These comments reveal a gap between program directors’ vision of the logs and memos as a positive introductory experience to composition research, and mentors’ perceptions of them not as intellectual work but as “paperwork,” “reports,” “data entry,” “record keeping,” and “documentation.” As a researcher of mentor logs and memos, I found mentor discourse to be thorough and insightful in ways that “paperwork” is not, and I puzzled over this seeming discrepancy. However, many mentors no doubt felt pressure to submit strong documentation of their work, particularly those mentors competing for the limited number of graduate apprenticeships available in UHM’s Ph.D. program, but certainly for any mentor seeking a letter of recommendation from WPAs.
Mentors’ frustrations stemmed in part from the standardized nature of these data collection instruments. One written comment, for example, described the documentation as containing “occasionally restrictive categorizations,” and another comment suggested implementing “group conference logs” when a mentor finds herself “go[ing] over the same things” repeatedly with more than one student. Several mentors in the participant check roundtables added that the templates themselves felt “official,” “rigid,” and “formal,” discouraging the more informal kinds of reflection and exploration that mentors might find more engaging. While mentors believed that they were supposed to be “logging everything,” they found such a directive to be impossible in practice. Because conferences occurred so regularly, the task of reflecting in writing on each and every conference could begin to feel monotonous, not leaving the mentor sufficient time or energy to record the quick, informal face to face conversations, emails, IM or Facebook discussions, text messages, and other ephemeral exchanges in which mentoring work was taking place. Furthermore, the requirement for conference documentation tended to accelerate a feedback loop whereby conducting more student conferences led to more documentation and conducting fewer conferences led to less documentation, resulting in over-extended mentors becoming even more over-extended, while under-employed mentors becoming even more under-employed. One mentor wrote, “students were so interested in improving their skills that their commitment exceeded what feasibly I could give in my own time. Both on line and in person, I met with many students so often I simply no longer logged it because it became too much of a strain on my already over extended time” (ME 23). Many mentors, however, believed that they were regularly engaging in deeper reflection and analysis of their mentoring, but that it took place in their private fieldnotes,
mentoring journals, informal conversations with other mentors, and roundtables—rather than within the logs themselves.

In an end-of-semester memo, one mentor described in detail the way she prioritized logging conferences within the overall hierarchy of tasks facing her in the final semester of her MA:

I was especially worried about the amount of time I’d be able to spend with the students and my mentoring duties when I considered my other workload this semester. . . I made a chart, sectioning out my hours during each week. I set aside a certain amount of time for student meetings, mentor logging, and class participation. I reserved the weekends for Masters Project work and research. I set aside other hours during certain days for class reading and work in my two other seminars. I color coated the chart and sent it to my instructor. She appreciated my organization and took the schedule into consideration; she was very understanding. I also created a hierarchy of tasks to follow if time became especially tight. I placed the logs for my mentoring services at the very bottom of the list, and sacrificed the logs (especially the reflection logs) before all of my other responsibilities. However, I placed my mentor meetings with the individual students above my own work. This split in the mentor job description—between the actual mentoring and the documentation—as the two extreme ends of my task hierarchy, was interesting. It made the most sense to me. I couldn’t be happier with the mentoring experience in terms of time. I spent a lot of time with the students and classes, but this time never became overwhelming. I was able to complete my MA project in the quality I desired, I was able to present at a conference in [city], I was able to complete everything required for my other two seminars successfully, and I was able to maintain a somewhat healthy lifestyle. (WM 665)

I find this mentor’s carefully-strategized task hierarchy particularly interesting, not only as a means of balancing the demands of the position with her other responsibilities, but also as a hint into how she theorized composition research. The split she creates between
“the actual mentoring” and “the documentation” implies that the two are disconnected activities, with documentation constituting something other than mentoring. While the statement, “I couldn’t be happier with the mentoring experience in terms of time” marks this mentor’s perspective as somewhat of an anomaly, when I shared this passage with the mentors in the participant check roundtable, 9 of 15 stated that they approached the job in a similarly bifurcated manner, generally prioritizing student conferences above their own work and the documentation of such interactions below it. Such findings indicate a challenge for administrators to help mentors envision conference logs as research rather than documentation, and to perceive themselves as “composing” rather than “completing” logs.

One suggestion that came up in both participant check roundtable sessions was to expand the purpose of these logs beyond program assessment. Only two of the eleven end-of-semester comments on the topic of logs mentioned any purpose for the required documentation:

• I understand the need to track hours and areas where we helped students, but I found I spent an inordinate amount of time with the logs and spreadsheet. (ME 58)

• The data entry/logs was pretty difficult at times, but I understand that they are necessary. (ME 42)

These comments concede a programmatic necessity for documentation, a purpose which WPAs emphasized in the program’s early years in light of the very real need to justify the program’s budget to university administrators. While this programmatic need will always be present to some degree, I believe the program has matured to the point at which it should consider what new formats, purposes, and audiences might increase the value of documentation for the mentors themselves, making it less WPA-directed and more self-
directed. For example, one mentor explained that because she understood the primary audience of the logs and memos to be program directors, she treated them as procedural matters, leaving out details that might betray the terms of team performance they had established with students. This mentor stated:

I've had some really personal situations come up in this semester about things that I had to relate to the professor, but I don't write about those in the logs, because they're so personal and I'm not—I—because it's got the name of the student... so I leave that stuff out of the log... That format is limiting us in terms of what we feel comfortable saying in it. (PCR)

This mentor’s observation elicited almost unanimous nods around the table. In both participant check roundtables, mentors claimed that beyond the vague sense that WPA’s were reading the logs, they generally felt that they were submitting these documents into a void, unsure of additional payoff for the time and energy expended in writing them. Such feelings of futility are likely heightened by the dimensions of technological performance involved in using SurveyMonkey, which upon completing a log and pressing “submit” presents the mentor immediately with another blank conference log template—and the implicit message that their work has been erased or consumed rather than performed.  

In light of the directorship challenge of supporting mentor performances as researchers, I find provocative compositionist Jessica Restaino’s work regarding Hannah Arendt’s triad of labor, action, and work. In *The Human Condition*, Arendt theorizes, “It is indeed the mark of all laboring that it leaves nothing behind, that the result of its effort is almost as quickly consumed as the effort is spent” (qtd. in Restaino 23: 87). For Arendt, labor must be balanced and mediated by action, which Restaino glosses as those
“moments in which we reveal ourselves in the public arena for others to see, hear, and remember as distinctive, memorable agents” (53) as well as by work, or those “objects we fabricate with our hands [that] serve as monuments to the fact of our existence, that we acted and spoke together” (54). Framing these Arendtian concepts in theatre studies terms, Christopher Higgins writes, “A world created by work alone would be like a stage set after the show has been closed” (qtd. in Restaino 54: 420). Paradoxically, while WPAs designed the logs to facilitate work and action, many mentors experienced them primarily as labor. Keys to re-invigorating mentors’ composition researcher roles in light of these concepts are: (1) to make visible to mentors the uses and value of their documentation as programmatic and professional work; and (2) to provide stages upon which mentors can experience composition research as action. Here, I imagine action taking the form of traditional academic scholarly presentations and publications— as well as forms of creative display such as dramatizations of trinary perspectives for audiences of future mentors and instructors; creative writing about classroom scenarios informed by mentors’ insights into teachers and students; slam poetry performances about the first-year experience; teaching experiences in which mentors leverage their research to create engaging lesson plans; opportunities to lead mentor roundtables for their cohort; and more.

I believe it is no coincidence that one of the few mentors who spoke out on behalf of the logs’ value at the participant check roundtable had previously leveraged these logs in staging a scholarly presentation on her work as a writing mentor. That eleven mentors to date have drawn upon their logs, memos, and evaluations to deliver conference presentations at the peer-reviewed graduate student conference put on by the
University of Hawai‘i Mānoa College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature (LLL) indicates that certain mentors have bridged labor, work, and action. (However, no mention was made of the LLL’s conference in end-of-semester comments.) Following the participant check discussion, another mentor emailed me his Introduction to Composition and Rhetoric Theory graduate seminar paper titled “Experiencing Lessons of Shaughnessy and Berlin through Mentoring,” in which he directly cited his conference logs as a primary source. This mentor explained to me that experiencing a full graduate course in composition theory provided context for the documentation requirements of the position and made composing them much more rich and dynamic. While the program’s former director has long argued that ideally all mentors would take a course on “Mentoring Composition” concurrently with their first semester in the position that would enable them to contextualize the composition researcher role and further develop their own lines of research, due to a variety factors such a course has not received departmental backing.

Here, I present a brief excerpt from the participant check roundtable in which two mentors (M1 and M2) proposed more compelling rhetorical situations for conference documentation and mentor research:

**M1:** I’m curious about how the data and the information that, like, we collect, and that you guys [indecipherable] collect, does it impact the way English100 is taught, separately from “if you have a mentor, you’re gonna work this certain way?” I wonder, is there’s any impact that way, yeah, in terms of English 100 teachers getting workshops, or something, about “these are the things that we’ve found in the mentor program that I think you should consider?”

**M2:** I think as well that would, that would impact our feelings about the reporting, or “the composition researcher role,” because, you know—
M1: --if it’s changing the program--

M2: --if it’s going make an impact, if it’s going to be useful in some way, and impact the experiences for the next set of students. . . Depending upon the professor, there might be a really clear, you know, sort of instructions for how they want feedback about their blind spots, or what we’re learning from students they aren’t learning because they aren’t mentors, they’re instructors. But that isn’t always clear. . . Bringing to her the concerns that I was hearing from students—there, there wasn’t really a natural way to do that. But I was talking about them the, you know, in my reporting. (PCR)

These mentors recognized that as differently-positioned knowers within the institution, they had unique insights to offer into student learning, including knowledge of what lies in instructors’ “blind spots” that would benefit instructors teaching in both mentored and non-mentored classrooms. Furthermore, although the opportunity and/or power dynamic might not always be present in which to share insights with a mentor’s instructional counterpart, these same instructors may benefit from hearing mentors’ collective insights about first-year students, assignments, teaching strategies, etc. in a more impersonalized setting such as a workshop or panel. As I explained to the mentors at the participant check roundtable, part of the intent of this dissertation is to promote this knowledge cycle, making mentors’ insights available to a broader set of audiences. As elaborated in the dissertation’s conclusions, I also envision the creation of a more widely-accessible database of logs and memos (one that preserves the anonymity of students and mentors and the confidentiality of information) which mentors themselves could leverage to more fully occupy the role of composition researcher. I believe that mentors’ comments regarding the role of composition researcher offer a challenge to future program administrators, a challenge that invites theories of performance in tapping more meaningful stages on which mentors can experience what Arendt terms as action.
While mentors’ end-of-semester comments did not generally depict composing logs and memos as a fulfilling research opportunity, numerous end-of-semester comments did indicate (n=12) that mentors found value in the participant-observer dimensions of the composition researcher role. These comments reveal mentors taking seriously the observer behaviors of studying reflexively the positionalities of instructors and students, the learning space itself, the mentor’s own approach to students, and the classroom’s overall workings. The following comment elaborates one mentor’s understanding of the richness of this participant observation opportunity available to a third classroom actor:

You learn the most by watching and experiencing vicarious reality more than by anything else--actually being in the classroom with instructors let me see different approaches to teaching writing and to negotiating a classroom. I had worked as a tutor before, and the fragmented accounts of what students said they did in class made it difficult to discern what they needed help with the most. Working directly with the professor, having open access to them and the classroom experience, made the process dramatically more rewarding. I could see student challenges inside and outside the classroom, had more open access to the sorts of real life problems that actually jeopardized their college standing, and most of all had the time to actually give them the help in research and analysis I thought they needed. (ME 15)

By being both-and-neither a student and an instructor, the mentor could project herself into each of these roles and sympathetically simulate to some degree their respective perspectives. This positionality afforded the mentor a means of “access” to the instructor, students, and classroom experience previously unavailable to her as a writing center tutor, where glimpses into student performance had been “fragmented” and decontextualized. This positionality also afforded the mentor avenues for triangulation, informing her
analyses by accounts from both instructors and students and by observations from both inside and outside the classroom. All of these factors allowed the mentor to more richly problematize student performance and to more clearly “discern what help they needed,” illustrating the ways in which this third actor’s praxis at least partially entails reciprocal dependence and familiarity, Goffman’s two traits of team performance.

As such, the participant-observer role also offers a way to shift naïve notions of mentoring as purely altruistic toward approaches to mentoring as reciprocal. Team performing with both students and instructors is particularly valuable to writing mentor researchers who desire to one day occupy the instructor role, an intended future career professed by 95% of the mentors in my study (MDS). As one mentor explained, “I would say that for a Mentor, particularly one going into teaching, the program allows us a unique dual access to both the 'teacher's classroom' and the students themselves” (ME 12). Several mentors envisioned their fieldnotes becoming a repository of assignments, strategies, approaches, and insights to someday apply toward their own courses. In the following two comments, mentors depict the ways in which they were able to enhance their observations with what qualitative researchers might call “spot interviews” with the instructor:

- Observing different faculty teach in different ways and seeing firsthand how students respond to different teaching styles and assignments takes some of the guesswork out of figuring out what might work and what probably won't work in the classroom. I also enjoy discussing with instructors how they developed/what was their rationale for certain assignments and how I might use some elements of their instructional practices for my own classroom one day. (ME 37)
• By not only taking notes while observing, it was beneficial to also have the instructor available and willing to discuss her classroom management techniques, fears, learning points, and hopes. To learn the good, the bad, and (sometimes) the ugly of it all. (ME 88)

Certainly not all mentors experienced such open dialogue with the instructor, particularly about the “bad and (sometimes) ugly of it all.” Based upon mentors’ reports, these kinds of discussions were more likely to occur in pairings with Ph.D.-level instructors near the beginning of their teaching careers (and sometimes even enrolled in teaching-related courses alongside their mentors) than with more experienced faculty, although there were certainly exceptions to this trend.

Mentors also leveraged their participant-observer roles to research college teaching as a future career. In several cases, mentors professed that a highlight of their experiences in the Writing Mentors Program was confirming teaching as an informed career choice (n=7). The following comments illustrate how mentors used the participant-observer role as an opportunity to research and confirm their future profession:

• Since my career plans involve working at the college level, the mentoring was an excellent experience in which I could observe, interact and experiment with my future profession. (ME 3)

• As a future professor of English, it was such a privilege to be able to sit in a classroom and observe, in detail, the workings of an English 100 classroom. This experience has, more than anything in my academic career, convinced me that my place is in the classroom building individual, writing-based relationships with students. (ME 84)

Mentors recognized this opportunity to “test the waters” of a teaching career through observation and experimentation as a “privilege” and “luxury,” a conclusion that is underscored by Jessica Restaino’s ethnographic research on the challenges four graduate
students faced in teaching FYC for the first time during their first semesters of graduate school, an experience that left them unsure about future teaching careers. In the second mentor’s vision of classroom teaching as “building individual, writing-based relationships with students,” one can detect the influence of trinary mentoring experiences rather than immediate immersion into instructorhood. And this mentor’s sense of what lies at the heart of teaching writing represents a significant departure from national norms in higher education, offering a hopeful future for the profession.

Reflecting on the less-than-ideal models for teacher preparation currently in place within many composition programs nationally, Restaino writes:

While continuing to reject the notion of graduate students as the children Arendt seems most intent on protecting, I want to suggest that the task posed to those responsible for initiating graduate students into composition as a field—teaching and scholarship bound together—is to search for ways to preserve their potential to “love this world.” As Arendt suggests, the key here is that we somehow protect them from this world, at least partially, not by pushing them too soon into the pressures of self-identity and public stances, so that they have the space in which to figure all that out. But, as anyone knows who has ever loved another honestly, Arendt also insists that we owe the “young” full disclosure, mediated and augmented though it may be, about what this world of ours looks like so far. Only when equipped with the security of a forgiving, more flexible space for experimentation and the whole story about composition’s conflicted roots in higher education do graduate students have any chance of real connection and real change agency. (116)
As my treatment of this third paradox indicates, although WPA’s envisioned in the third actor’s role a space for “teaching and scholarship bound together,” this vision has been only unevenly realized and offers a challenge to future directors. Restaino also argues for offering those who are new to the profession both a “space in which to figure all that out” and classroom experiences that allow for “full disclosure.” In many ways, what Restaino is calling for in this paradoxical vision is a thirdspace that blends student and teacher positionalites: a space that has been depicted within the student, mentor, and comments throughout this chapter. The paradoxes mentors encountered and lived daily through this position—particularly the challenges of holding in tension notions of mentoring as altruistic, voluntary, and even familial with the institutional realities of occupying a quarter-time position serving students who do not always want to be mentored—honored their skills of team performance and endowed them not only with the ability to teach to pre-set standards, but more importantly with the flexibility to shift from classroom to classroom, role to role, and student to student.

Restaino calls for the creation of “a forgiving, more flexible space for experimentation.” Mentor accounts indicate that the space within these paradoxes is indeed one of flexibility and experimentation. While it may be naïve to think of a doubly-bound team performer as occupying a forgiving space, the classroom anecdote in the next section reveals the comparatively unforgiving performative perils of instructorhood.

**A Dramatization the Paradoxes of Trinary Team Performance**

The following anecdote from a trinary FYC classroom was shared with me by a mentor during a participant check roundtable. I offer her story as both a dramatization of the paradoxes and an illustration of the ways in which adding a writing mentor researcher
to the FYC classroom shifts the terms of this familiar *mise-en-scène* to reveal a whole host of performances that would otherwise be invisible and un-documentable to the field.

To set the stage: A highly dedicated instructor has been working to challenge her FYC students to become more critical thinkers and writers. Several students have indicated to the mentor that the instructor’s ways of challenging them have left them feeling defeated, put on the spot, and “disliked” by the instructor. The mentor has focused much of her out-of-class conferencing on helping these students not to take the instructor’s feedback so personally, but to interpret it as an invitation for further revision, research, and critical thought. Mid-way through the semester, the instructor attempts to engage the students in a critical analysis activity by bringing to class a popular music video. According to the mentor, most if not all of the students have seen the video before in other contexts. In introducing the music video and corresponding classroom activity, the instructor slightly mispronounces one of the performers’ names.

The excerpted transcript from the conversation between the mentor (M) and myself as a program researcher (R)\(^{34}\) traces the scene that unfolded on the heels of this instructor’s unfortunate performative slip:

**M:** That set the students off immediately. They were like, “I don't even wanna watch this with you. This is ridiculous.” Which is weird; it was really weird. It’s like the professor was trying to get into the pop culture of the youth, but maybe doesn’t *quite* get it, and then over-analyzes it to the point where students were like “You’re not getting this. It’s not that we don’t get it; you’re not getting it.” So that was the attitude that came across.

**R:** So what kind of space did you find yourself occupying, or changing, or—

**M:** Uh, in an uncomfortable space, actually. Because I think on one hand this particular professor really does push the students, and I really admire that because she makes her job so much harder. . . The professor left— to go to the restroom, I think. And everyone was just, you know——

[facial expression I took to indicate annoyance and contempt].

**R:** Was it with each other, or did they do it to you?
M: It wasn’t to me. It was with each other, and I intervened. So then they were talking to me. But just the pronunciation of her name really set them off. [Laughter] It’s just, like, crazy!

R: Yeah, it’s amazing how some seemingly small element of a performance can totally shift the rest of the dynamic. Wow! So when you said, “I intervened,” can you go into that just a little bit more?

M: I just mostly asked questions, cause I wanted to understand where they were coming from. One girl in particular, who I’ve come to love, who had this major attitude from the very beginning and I thought for sure she’d drop, and she didn’t drop, and she was failing papers. And she’s just turned full circle, and we’ve just worked together so well: I just love her. She’s the one who really started it. She was like, “How are we supposed to take her seriously? This is ridiculous. It’s like she thinks we don’t know what this means, and the way she’s analyzing this is completely wrong.” And so the way I was trying to move the conversation forward was, “What do you mean by wrong?” And it was that the professor was analyzing this video as something much more than [issue] and trying to categorize all of the emotions, whereas this girl was saying, “This is my neighborhood. . . .” And so she just felt that her idea of what that video represented was right on key and the professor’s was just out there.

R: So all of this that transpired, how much time?

M: Oh, six minutes. Maybe not even.

R: Wow, the kind of work that happened. So when the professor came back into the room?

M: It was just quiet, and we moved on to do some grammar stuff, I think. But I didn’t feel like I really knew how to bring this up and engage the professor. And the other thing was, I didn’t want my students to feel like, “Oh, I guess we can’t say anything in front of her because she’s gonna put us on the spot.” I’m sure it was a conversation the professor would have loved to have had. She would have been really interested in it, ‘cause I think she thought, “This is a really good example!” [Laughter] And, to be totally honest, I sound like a wus, I guess, I haven’t brought it up to her either because I’m not sure [3-second silence] how to.

Another Mentor: Did you consciously pronounce her name right?

M: I did, and every other student in there did. . . . But maybe we’re all wrong and she’s right. . . . I understand. We do some group reading sometimes, and this professor brings in a lot of local lit. And where there are Hawaiian words or local words and it’s my turn to read, I kind of go over it ten times in my head to make sure I’m saying Haleakalā right [Laughter]. ’Cause I’m gonna do the same thing that [music video name] thing did.

Although this chapter has focused largely upon what happens when a third actor enters the classroom scene, this anecdote illustrates some of the ways in which the mise-en-scène shifts when one of the three actors exits the stage. During this ephemeral classroom scene, the mentor finds herself in an “uncomfortable” space between a teacher she professes to “really admire” and a student she claims to “have come to love.” The mentor
describes her first impulse as a student-centered one, explaining: “I wanted to understand where they were coming from.” While the mentor is able to sympathize with elements of both student and instructor perspectives, she finds it difficult if not impossible to facilitate understanding between the two parties themselves. For example, although the mentor’s intervention nudged the student toward the kind of critical analysis that the instructor intended from the activity, such analyses were not possible in the instructor’s presence. The mentor concedes that her decision not to reveal to the instructor what transpired in her absence might sound cowardly to an observer’s ear; however, I see this short-term silence as a decision to uphold the delicate balance of trinary team performance in favor of the many long-term benefits that might grow out of this paradoxical space.  

**Conclusions**

While the UH Writing Mentors Program is far removed in time and space from Erving Goffman’s research site, the participant discourse analyzed in this chapter demonstrates “team performance” to be a salient construct in understanding trinary FYC collaborations. Evidence of reciprocal dependence and familiarity, which Goffman theorized to be the defining characteristics of performance teams, can be seen in student and instructor depictions of mentors and in mentor depictions of students and instructors, albeit in far less even distributions than Goffman formulated. My research suggests that the apparent success or failure of a given trinary classroom can be usefully understood as the degree to which (a) instructors and students were willing and able to act as team performers with writing mentors; and (b) writing mentors were willing and able to occupy the paradoxical spaces involved in acting as team performers with both instructors and students.
While certain elements of dependence and familiarity exist between instructors and students, given the firm institutional hierarchies in place, I believe it would be naïve to think of these two as reciprocal team performers with one another to the same degree they are with mentors. However, this chapter does suggest team performance as a promising frame for teaching FYC more generally, and particularly for the instructor who endeavors to enact learner-centered approaches. Furthermore, a major strength of trinary classrooms is the experience this configuration offers in team performance to all three institutional actors. Such practice in team performance is particularly valuable given that the dispositions, skills, and ways of knowing required of team performers are eminently transferrable to (and required within) many other personal and professional contexts.

Of all three parties, mentors had arguably the most significant opportunities to hone their abilities as team performers, given that they were assigned the complex and delicate project of teaming simultaneously with two different institutional actors on opposite sides of the traditional educational binary. As such, these doubly-bound team performers found themselves scripted into several different double binds. When WPAs are added to this performative cast and the term “researcher” is affixed to the title of “writing mentor,” then mentors could perhaps more accurately be classified as triply-bound team performers. Goffman would likely classify writing mentors as occupying the “discrepant role” of a “go-between” or “mediator,” a figure who “learns the secrets of each side and gives each side the true impression that he will keep its secrets; but he tends to give each side the false impression that he is more loyal to it than the other” (149). Since Goffman’s studies in the late 1950’s, updated theories of performance would recognize these behaviors and roles not as “false impressions” but as the realities and
exigencies of institutional performance itself, and particularly of performances as complex as those within *mise-en-scène* of the trinary FYC classroom. That the most frequently-repeated word across participant descriptions of the mentor was “helped” (occurring 636 times in student comments on mentors’ roles and 30 times in instructor comments on mentors’ roles) indicates that mentors were perceived to be loyal and competent. Additional impressions of mentors’ loyalty can be seen in students’ frequent depictions of the mentor as a personal writing coach and a resource for individualized student support, compared to instructors’ frequent depictions of the mentor as a co-instructor and classroom supporter. While both groups saw the mentor as part-instructor and part-student, they also depicted the mentor offering a third party perspective and functioning as a trustworthy interpreter of classroom spaces, assignments and actors.

One of the most frequently-employed metaphors used to describe writing mentors was that of a “bridge,” and by acting as team performers with both teachers and students mentors in many ways bridged the traditional teacher-student binary. Of course, “successful” bridges in Western cultures are frequently understood to be stable, immobile feats of engineering, whereas writing mentors’ feats of bridging could only be accurately described as dynamic, contingent, and ever shifting. Such fluidity is reflected in the 158 different actions students perceived “their” writing mentors to have performed, along with the 73 different actions described by instructors. These actions constitute what Richard Schechner terms restored behaviors—those “physical or verbal actions that are not-for-the first time, prepared, or rehearsed” (22)—and here I would argue that mentors were restoring teaching and learning behaviors necessary to FYC and the institution. While no single action is particularly noteworthy in isolation, their combination within a
single institutional actor is unique. What other institutional actor, for example, is simultaneously described by a first-year student as “a teacher, advisor, editor, friend, Peer revisor, source of information” (SE 245)?

The official Writing Mentors Program job description stipulated the duties of the writing mentor position as collaborating closely with both instructors and students, and mentors found the task of embodying this tenuous position(ality) to be more fulfilling and frustrating than they or the program’s directors could have anticipated. An ongoing challenge mentors faced was in determining the most appropriate parts of their mentoring identities to deploy within any given semester, class session, writing conference, email, or passing interaction. An instructor who felt that her mentor had positioned himself too much as another student, explained this performative shortcoming as failure to find the “sweet spot” along the student-to-instructor continuum of available mentoring roles. As mentor discourse indicated, this “sweet spot” is a moving target, defined differently by instructors and students—as well as from one student to the next. Given this reality, the high degree of professed “satisfaction” across program participants is even more remarkable.

Mentors’ depictions of their lived positionalities evidence the dynamism, contradiction, and incongruity of paradoxical space. In this paradoxical institutional space, mentors found themselves faced with the ongoing challenges of managing the impression of being “available” to students without surrendering their own academic and personal priorities; serving in a program that espouses helping all students excel in FYC, while finding that all students do not want to excel in the ways envisioned by the mentor and/or program administrators; and approaching students individually and their college
educations holistically in an institutional system that treats students in aggregate and the college degree largely as a compartmentalized checklist of coursework to be completed. Advantages mentors perceived in their institutional positional(ities) included getting to know students and instructors on an individualized level, appreciating both classroom roles more deeply, and simultaneously being able to mentor and be mentored by the various trinary actors. Mentors also felt that the lived positionalities they embodied as writing mentors in trinary FYC classrooms richly oriented them to their future work as instructors, offering them pedagogical perspectives that they could not have gained by jumping immediately into the position of instructor upon enrolling in the MA program.

While this chapter focused largely on mentors’ position(alities) as team performers with students and instructors, mentors were also asked to collaborate extensively with program directors. Mentors’ completion of logs, memos, and program evaluations could be interpreted, in part, as team performances. This observation was particularly true during the program’s first three years when WPA’s and mentors were consciously engaged in promoting an image of the program as worthy of institutionalization. However, the cohort of mentors at the participant check roundtable (with individual exceptions, of course) explained that what WPAs originally perceived to be the research dimension of the position felt to them more like “paperwork,” “data entry,” and “record keeping.” By the program’s fifth year, the rhetorical situation surrounding the logs had changed, but the data collection form and professed administrative rationale had not. I revisit the challenge illustrated in this chapter of fostering team performances between WPAs and mentors in the area of composition research within the dissertation’s concluding chapter.
As theories of performance remind us, the entrance of a new social actor inflects the performances of all other actors sharing the same stage. While this chapter has focused on the ways in which mentors inhabited spaces characterized by paradox, it could also be concluded that a third actor presented WPAs and the other trinary classroom actors with new sets of paradoxes— as well as highlighted paradoxes to which they had become inured. WPAs, for example, frequently weighed the dangers of the mentor position becoming exploitative with the reduced range of mentoring roles and loss of voluntary ethos that would accompany administrative attempts to “protect” mentors by standardizing policies across sections. And WPAs also struggled to balance their desires for mentors to experience the benefits of composition research with their belief that the role of composition teacher-researcher is not best experienced as a command performance. Another example is the instructor in the chapter’s opening pages who recognized the ways in which a third actor paradoxically made her “self-conscious about someone else observing my particular bag of teaching tricks” while also “more unequivocally the teacher in [students’] eyes (and my own)” (IE 5). Or the first-year student’s end-of-semester comment on his mentor’s roles: “Helped correct my paper as best she could, but this is very difficult since different teachers look for different things in English. It’s not like math where 2+2=4” (SE 485). Such a comment indicates an awareness of the tensions between organizational measurements of performance and a discipline that tends to privilege cultural performances and anti-foundational epistemologies.37

While I came to the notion of paradoxical space first through my data, subsequent research indicates that paradoxes have proven to be a rich means for compositionists to theorize topics ranging from the use of social media in writing classrooms (Maranto and Barton); to the power of WPAs in small colleges (Jones); to instructor performances of
strategic empathy with working class students (Lindquist). Drawing upon the work of such feminist geographers as Doreen Massey, Nedra Reynolds explains that treatments of space as paradoxical offer a valuable antidote to readings of space as objectively singular and transparent, which she explains is “a particularly dangerous notion for women and other minorities because it denies differences or neglects the politics of space, especially in domestic or everyday environments” (“Imagined” 235). As this chapter has demonstrated, trinary classrooms call attention to the paradoxical spaces and relations that constitute the *mise-en-scène* of FYC, helping the classroom actors and larger profession resist the assumption that this almost universally-required course is a transparent undertaking with stock actors, an assumption which underlies factory models. Thus, this chapter engages Nedra Reynolds’s challenge to the profession when she claims: “A spatial politics of writing instruction would not call for a new frontier, but for a more paradoxical sense of space to inform our research and practices and to approach the study of the social production of spaces in a field already committed to examining the production of discourse” (“Imagined” 252).

This dissertation’s next and final data chapter continues this line of inquiry. There, I address the place-based dimensions of mentors’ work, a topic that was raised by mentors within both of the participant check roundtables I conducted on this present chapter (see partial transcripts in Appendices AW and AX). That our roundtable discussions on the institutional spaces mentors inhabit would transition inductively to a discussion of the politics of Hawai‘i as they inflect mentor performances highlights the many salient connections between space and place. Chapter Five also builds on the present chapter’s establishment of mentors’ team performer statuses to consider how such
institutional positioning both enabled and constrained place-based work. As team
performers with instructors, mentors’ place-related interventions came in response to and
support of the instructor’s selected readings, writing assignments, and pedagogical goals.
Other place-related interventions by mentors were elicited primarily by students’
complaints, concerns, and requests for help. And yet other dimensions of place-based
work were driven by mentors themselves.
Notes

1 As elaborated in the methodology chapter, I employ a stipulative definition of “performances” as *those roles, acts, and utterances that are perceived and documented by a given institutional audience.*

2 In cinematography, *mise-en-scène* refers not only to the staging of the action, but also to the ways in which a scene is recorded, taking into account how such factors as camera proximity, angle, movement, and filters influence the “spatial and temporal relations within the frame” (Giannetti 93). Such film studies understandings of *mise-en-scène* highlight the importance of a third classroom actor’s unique angles and movements within the classroom scene and the potential of this third classroom actor as a knowledge producer in the participant-observation tradition of research.

3 While the term “*mise-en-scène*” is used somewhat regularly within performance studies texts, I was unable to locate a working definition of the term in any of the performance studies texts in my works cited, and ultimately turned to a dictionary from theatre studies. Interestingly, the forward to this dictionary was written by performance studies scholar Marvin Carlson.

4 The “texts and discourses” upon which program participants draw include the cultural values of their families and upbringings, their previous educational experiences, the discourses of the institution, the influences of consumer society, and more.

5 While the English department was generally quite supportive of the program, faculty and administrators would not go so far as to require mentors to take a specific graduate course on mentoring in Composition Studies. Without such a course to help mentors to understand the position of writing mentor within various intellectual and research traditions while also supporting their own evolving research directions within mentoring, Professor Henry was placed in the position of supplying as much of this intellectual background and research training as possible on his (and the mentors’) own time through a fall orientation and bi-weekly roundtables. Even though mentors did not have prior experience in participant-observation research, many mentors came into the position with prior experience in tutoring and/or teaching.

6 One mentor mentioned in a roundtable that a student reported to her, upon completing the end-of-semester evaluation, that she gave the mentor a great evaluation and “checked every box” of the 20 possible conference topics. Whether the student had actually addressed each topic with the mentor or not is less relevant here than the fact that the student believed more checked boxes corresponded with the program’s definition of better mentoring and acted so as to uphold such an image of the mentor to her director.

7 For example, when Ph.D. students transitioned from serving as “writing mentors” to “instructors,” they frequently requested to be paired with specific MA candidates based upon what they had observed first-hand of these individuals in bi-weekly mentor roundtables, graduate courses, and social settings. In such cases, Ph.D. students held little institutionally-derived power over their MA mentor counterparts. In many faculty-mentor pairings, by contrast, the professor had taught or was teaching this mentor in another course, and in some cases the instructor was also the mentor’s thesis advisor or committee member. As such, faculty-mentor pairings entailed different institutional power dynamics than did Ph.D. student-mentor pairings.
For example, one mentor checked the box for “Attended class regularly, functioning mostly as an observer and speaking only occasionally” and commented, “I did lead two classes, but for the most part I felt like an observer who was called upon occasionally and was able to interrupt if I wanted” (ME 14). Another mentor took issue with the question’s language, explaining: “I did not make comments in class on a regular basis. I made announcements” (ME 41). Although follow-up dialogue would be necessary to understand the implications of this comment, the discrepancy between making “comments” and “announcements” may distinguish the mentor’s role from that of the students, indicating the performance of a more informed and institutionally-connected persona.

I find Richard Schechner’s understanding of performance as a re-enactment of pre-existing scripts, discourses, and activity patterns to be especially useful in considering the actions writing mentors perform in trinary classrooms. Schechner defines “restored behaviors” or “twice-behaved behaviors” as “physical or verbal actions that are not-for-the-first time, prepared, or rehearsed” (22). This definition parallels Erving Goffman’s notion of “parts.” Goffman explains that in order to enact any given role, an actor performs multiple parts, which he defines as “the pre-established pattern of action which is unfolded during a performance and which may be presented or played through on other occasions” (16). Although writing mentors are a new institutional actor in many ways, they draw from pre-established patterns of institutional action, including the scripts of such institutional actors as writing center tutors, reference librarians, instructors, students, advisors, counselors, coaches, and more. Furthermore, these pre-existing patterns of activity and re-mixed scripts made mentors’ work recognizable to the other trinary actors.

For example, the student comment, “He facilitated classroom discussions and personal growth” would qualify in my coding scheme as two behaviors: “facilitated classroom discussions” and “facilitated the student’s personal growth.” According to this coding scheme, a percentage of student (n=198) and instructor (n=12) comments were uncodable and/or contained un-codeable clauses. As displayed in Appendix AP, reasons for a comment or clause being un-codeable include the following: they were blank, too vague to classify, evaluative rather than descriptive (My mentor was awesome), qualities rather than behaviors (“He was patient”), or were denials of a specific mentoring behavior or the mentor’s overall impact. I kept a separate list of any explicitly-named roles such as “coach,” “peer,” and “interpreter” and set them aside for my next coding pass.

While the role of “editor” is generally treated in composition and writing center discourse as pedagogically flat, student comments indicated this role to be somewhat richer than expected. Included in the mentor-as-editor discourse are a number of comments that indicate that students were internalizing mentors’ instruction by learning to self-edit, as in the following student comment: “As a mentor [first name] made understanding mistakes so much clearer and she show mistakes and gives her advice on how to fix it with your own ideas” (SE 636). Another student comment reflects a more sophisticated understanding of “correctness” in writing: “Helped correct my paper as best she could, but this is very difficult since different teachers look for different things in English. It’s not like math where 2+2=4” (SE 485). That first-year students found such a rich array of ways to engage with their mentors—and that they had developed the meta-cognitive vocabulary to describe these interactions in terms that went beyond “editing”—indicates that classroom-based mentoring offers an alternative to the “last-minute editor” role into which students (and instructors) tend to pigeon-hole writing center tutors, a longstanding
theme across Writing Center discourse (North 1984; Grimm 1996; Carrino 2002; M. Harris 2011).

12 Even with the high degree of mentor “availability” cited in student comments, when students were surveyed about how the program could be improved, one of the most frequent responses was to provide multiple mentors per section, thus making a mentor available to students on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis. For a summary table of student suggestions for program improvement, see Appendix AS.

13 Part of this discrepancy can also be attributed to the survey question itself: whereas students were asked about mentors’ roles “in the course as a whole and in your experience as an individual student,” instructors were asked only about roles the mentor played “during class.” The question no doubt influenced instructors to write less frequently about roles performed primarily outside of class. However, it also can be inferred that mentors’ co-performances with students outside the classroom were to some degree invisible to instructors. Thus, another benefit of this catalogue of mentor roles and behaviors is to inform instructors about dimension of mentors’ work about which they might otherwise not be aware, increasing instructors’ ability to perform effectively as trinary collaborators.

14 While mentors frequently encouraged students to approach their instructors, students also described utilizing the mentor instead of the instructor (n=5), particularly when students felt “intimidated” by approaching somebody in the institutional position of professor. As one student wrote in response to a later survey question, “I did feel that she some what replaced the relationship with the professor. However, I think that is more up to the individual to take advantage of both the professor and mentor” (SE 244). A small handful of instructors also reported the perception that having a mentor increased the distance between them and their students: “I haven't read my course evaluations yet, but I will be very interested to do so. My teaching evaluations throughout my career have always been unusually high and I have always had a very familial relationship with my students. This bond, it seems to me, was not achieved in the way that it has been over the course of the past [n] years. I wonder if [mentor’s first name], because she was seemingly more approachable because of her ‘subordinate’ status (despite the fact that I rigorously fought that impression), created a boundary between my students and me. In other words, maybe my students went to her for their questions, problems, successes, etc., instead of to me?” (IE 33).

15 This quotation was taken from an anonymous instructor evaluation in the optional follow-up comments box in response to the question, “If given the opportunity, would you want to work with an English 100 mentor in the future?”. In describing a “brilliant” classroom lesson taught by her mentor, another Full Professor reported: “I wish I had had her do more lessons and teach this old dog new tricks” (IE 105).

16 As Professor Henry explained of his own teaching experience with an MA mentor: “Integrating [the mentor] fully and successfully took a lot of work, but mostly because I was trying to take advantage of her help to attempt teaching that would have been impossible otherwise. . . For the first time in my life, I wouldn't re-do a single class session--and there were at least forty of them--in my first-year composition course” (IE). Such commentary underscores the amount of work it takes for instructors to integrate mentors to the degree that such co-performances (and co-publications) can occur—as well as the sense of satisfaction resulting from successful co-performances.
Of the 51 responding students across this mentor’s three sections, 36 claimed to be “very satisfied” with their assigned mentor’s performance; 13 to be “satisfied;” 2 to be “neutral;” and 0 to be “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied.” It should be noted that two respondents checked the boxes for “satisfied” and “dissatisfied” simultaneously—a response that may be more in line with the way I have portrayed the position in this section.

I found that some interpretation was required in determining which comments applied to the category of writing program administrators, and in the end I classified under this category any comment that mentioned program administrators specifically or the administration of the program more generally, including the ways in which the duties and privileges of the writing mentor were constructed in the job description.

As Juliet Corbin explains, “sometimes the words of the respondent(s) are so descriptive of what is going on that they become the designate concept. . . The term that is used expresses meaning in a way far better than any word that could be provided by the analyst” (528). Corbin uses the example of an interviewee who describes his approach to cocktail party socializing as “working the scene,” a phrase far more interesting and revealing than a typical researcher’s assigned code of “social/work talk” (528-529). An example of an “in vivo” code that emerged from my analysis of participants’ descriptions of mentors’ roles was that of “classroom interpreter.”

Once initial interpretive codes were identified, I then re-examined the entire set of comments to ensure that all assertions regarding problems and possibilities encountered in performing the position of writing mentor were represented by a code, resulting in a handful of new codes. At this point, I reviewed any codes containing only one comment. When possible, I created a more inclusive classification that combined two or more single-comment codes. When such integrations were not possible, I deemed the comment as being applicable to the individual mentor rather than illustrative of the institutional position of mentor and did not represent it in the results. (In the case of one code with a single comment—“students working around the system” — I consulted triangulating data from mentors’ roundtable discussions, weekly memos, and responses to other survey questions to determine that the situation was indeed a recurring theme across the program, applying to the mentor position rather than to a single mentor.)

For a recent analysis of the role of trust in both theatre performances and writing classrooms, see Kevin DiPirro’s “Devising/Revising Student-Centered Pedagogy.”

On the subject of backstage discussions with the mentor about individual students, one instructor explained: “Early on, I also discovered how uncomfortable I felt discussing students’ weaknesses and strengths while using their real names. In the past, I may have said to a colleague, ‘I have a student who is bright but his whole self-identity is ‘the one who gets away with things.’ How would you say I could best help him?’ I’d ask, but I would never use his actual name. This named discussion of students made me feel very unprofessional” (IE 105).

Other mentor comments depicted students using mentors as “crutches.” One mentor explained, “The second most frustrating thing were the students who latched on to me throughout the semester. I understand and appreciate that they want to do well in the course; however, I felt, in some cases, that certain students were using me as a kind of crutch—they depended on me so much that I felt that they weren’t learning, just learning how to please or do what I tell them” (ME 57).
An early draft of the WASC re-accreditation report stated that the Mānoa Advising Office was severely understaffed, with three full-time advisors, one student coordinator, and six peer mentors for 4,400 students. With these ratios, the institution was not able to require academic advising for incoming students. These scathing statistics were excised from the final published report, partly because a few more advisors were hired in the interim. However, this situation indicates the importance of writing mentors’ work in the areas of campus referrals, informal advising, and transitional support for first-year students. When prompted to address any comments about the Program’s continued funding to the UHM Chancellor, one student wrote: “Keep it, without it, I might not have passed this class or have access to the resources that will enable me to graduate on time” (SE 527).

Of the eleven negative comments on this topic, six came during the program’s first three semesters when mentors were required to tally their conferences statistics in Excel spreadsheets, an unpopular practice that was discontinued when the program switched to online record-keeping through SurveyMonkey.

It should be noted that this mentor did not mention allotting time to an additional paid job, which many mentors must factor into their schedules. Furthermore, the mentor notes that the instructor “took the schedule into consideration,” indicating the importance of an instructor’s cooperation and reinforcement if a mentor is to successfully juggle the many demands of graduate school and the position.

As I explain in the methodology chapter, mentors were emailed a full set of their log and memo submissions every several weeks, and a full record of all their mentoring data (logs, memos, student evaluations, instructor evaluations) at the semester’s end.

This observation parallels the workplace performance appraisals discussed in the chapter introduction. As Jim Henry has observed, while workplace appraisals are frequently completed by administrators, they often rely upon the self-appraisals of employees. Henry cites the example of a workplace performance appraisal of senior technical writer Pete, quoting from Pete’s explanation of the process: “He [the boss] signed. I signed. Done. The attitude was, OK, here’s something HR says we need to do, so let’s get it out of the way and get back to the real work” (“(R)eAppraising” 15). As Henry explains, “Because enhancing ‘real work’ is theoretically the rationale driving performance appraisal, it is particularly ironic that this process and this instrument really only serve to interrupt the endeavors of workers and thus to impede the success of the organization” (16). Mentors’ attitudes toward conference logs as something apart from their “real work” with students parallels Pete’s attitude toward this appraisal, although the boss in Henry’s example takes a far different approach than did the initial Writing Mentors Program directors.

This mentor-researcher claimed that the logs facilitated her “thinking of how to help the individual students and the progress they’re making” (PCR).

While many mentors at the participant check roundtables also approached mentoring as positive confirmation of a future teaching career, one mentor offered a different perspective: “Both of the instructors that I have worked with... they had their ‘thing that they do,’ and they do it. I mean, not to be critical, but I can see—I take that as evidence of, like, what happens to English 100 instructors. They kind of find a ‘thing’ that works for them, and the same frustrations are there and the same problems are there. And it doesn’t seem as if there’s a lot of outlet for that. I feel like with one of them my presence was able to rejuvenate a little bit. With
another I feel like it didn’t quite work out. . . I feel like I get a kind of window of what it might be like in the future, perhaps, to be them, and it looks a little bleak sometimes. I hope that I am able—I’m glad for the time [set aside in the mentoring position] to reflect and sort of have new ideas renew your commitment to try to do good work with the students” (PCR).

33 In light of the sheer amount of Arendtian labor involved in teaching FYC for the first time, Restaino argues “The sense that one is constantly making an effort that doesn’t ‘stick’ but instead is perpetually wiped away can be draining and pull a new graduate students dangerously away from his or her identification with teaching and with the discipline of composition—first-year classroom included—as a space for knowledge making” (115).

34 Even this naming practice in my transcriptions underscores the pervasive sense that mentoring is something apart from research, making me wonder the degree to which my involvement in the program’s early years as a “graduate research assistant” communicated to mentors the message that research was someone else’s job.

35 According to Erving Goffman, this “sweet guilt of conspirators” is the mark of a team performer (105). Goffman explains, “[S]ince each team is engaged in maintaining the stability of some definitions of the situation, concealing or playing down certain facts in order to do this, we can expect the performer to live out his conspiratorial career in some furtiveness” (105).

36 Along with being “helpful,” the trinary classroom was frequently described as an “uncomfortable” space for mentors and instructors. Multiple educational researchers have found, however, that some discomfort is a requirement for genuine learning. Drawing upon Lev Vygotsky’s notion of “the zone of proximal development,” Composition and Rhetoric scholar Ghanashyam Sharma has blogged about aiming to create within his own writing classroom “a zone of productive discomfort” that ultimately fosters “a level of comfort with discomfort” (n.p.). Chapter Five address, in part, how classroom trinaries engage and create these kinds of spaces.

37 Based upon this brief comment, a researcher might locate this student on level two of Chris Thaiss and Terry Zawacki’s three-part scale charting the rough stages of development of disciplinary writers, while showing the promise of moving toward level three: “(1) A first stage in which the writer bases a sense of disciplinary consistency on writing experience in very few courses with criteria in these courses generalized into ‘rules.’ (2) A second stage in which the writer encounters different exigencies in different courses, and the sense of inconsistency, sometimes interpreted as teacher idiosyncrasy, supplants the perception of consistency. (3) A third stage. . . in which the writer understands the differences as components of an articulated, nuanced idea of a discipline” (109-110). While Thaiss and Zawacki note that is it is nearly impossible to determine a student’s orientation toward disciplinary writing based upon a brief survey response, student comments such as the one cited above indicate that trinary actors in the FYC classroom can help to orient students toward WID/WAC approaches, including this third level of understanding writing variation, a level Thaiss and Zawacki claim that many students never reach (110). However, another benefit I seen in the mentors’ roles as interpreters of classroom actors, assignments, and discourses is that it might allow students to embrace both levels two and three simultaneously, understanding that a successful writer must learn to perform both to instructor idiosyncrasies and disciplinary expectations, even when the two might represent somewhat of a paradox.
One mentor who recognized the unique space afforded by the position of writing mentor described how she turned this institutional space into an inhabited place from which to help students: “I feel like because we have less institutional authority than the professor but we have some authority, that puts in an interesting space. Students will tell us they haven’t done their homework or they haven’t written their paper. It’s a good place to be, I guess, because we can help them” (PCR).
CHAPTER 5: The Place-Based Work of Writing Mentor Researchers

Approaching Trinary Collaborations as a Place-Based Practice

In order to document and theorize the kinds of place-related work enacted by trinary collaborations, this chapter engages the growing body of scholarship on place-based composition. While the inception of Composition Studies is frequently traced to the Writing Process Movement of the 1970’s, which was characterized primarily by studies of writing as mediated by time, the most recent decade can perhaps be characterized by inquiry into the ways in which writing is mediated by space. This shift has entailed not so much an abandonment of process as an increased attentiveness to the ways in which the material, political, and metaphorical dimensions of space inflect the teaching and performance of writing. This “move,” so to speak, toward place has also built bridges between Composition and Rhetoric and various discourses of cartography (Brooke and McIntosh), cultural geography (Drew; Reynolds), eco-criticism (Buell; Weisser and Dobrin), Hawaiian studies (ho’omanawanui, “‘Ike ‘Āina”; McDougall, “Mālama nā Leo; McDougall and Nordstrom), sustainability (Owens), real estate (Mauk), travel (Drew), and urban studies (McComiskey and Ryan). In their introduction the 2006 NCTE anthology, Relations, Locations, Positions: Composition Theory for Writing Teachers, Peter Vandenb...
causes of social justice, but also helps individual writers to perform more successfully, theorizing that “rhetorical effectiveness in a given location depends on one’s interpretation of and attitude toward place” (13).\(^1\) Such statements can hardly remain abstractions at a site of research as demographically diverse as the University of Hawai‘i Writing Mentors Program, where mentors have repeatedly observed and documented the ways in which not only their own rhetorical effectiveness, but also the rhetorical effectiveness of the instructors and students with whom they collaborate, is strongly inflected by such “interpretations of and attitudes toward place” (13).

In the concluding section of *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*, Nedra Reynolds challenges future researchers to approach the study of writing through spatial concepts and in doing so, to uncover new conceptual maps of writing that “devote a layer to the where of writing—not just the places where writing occurs, but the sense of place and space that readers and writers bring with them to intellectual work of writing, to navigating, arranging, remembering, and composing” (176). This chapter takes up Reynolds’ challenge of mapping new dimensions of writing instruction by considering how adding a third member to the FYC classroom enables place-inflected pedagogies in ways that would not otherwise be possible without the mentor’s presence. Such research seeks to infuse traditional maps of FYC as a site involving one teacher and twenty-five or so students interacting primarily in a single classroom with new layers of possibility. In describing my research as “layers,” I work with Reynolds’ suggested metaphor of the palimpsest, an early writing technology in which each new layer overwrites another without erasing what preceded it (139; 176).\(^2\)
The palimpsest has proven a fecund and pliable metaphor in Composition Studies, offering a means of theorizing digital compositions and hypertext (Barber; Browning), feminist re-readings of historical texts (Glenn), and the representation of student work in portfolios (Yancey). As Michel de Certeau theorizes in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, the palimpsest offers a useful semiotic for any representation which reveals the “imbricated strata” of a space. I find this metaphor especially promising for a non-indigenous and non-“local” scholar at the University of Hawai‘i, a research site that reflects in many ways de Certeau’s depiction of stratified places:

However, beneath the fabricating and universal writing of technology, opaque and stubborn places remain. The revolutions of history, economic mutations, demographic mixtures lie in layers within it, and remain there, hidden in customs, rites, and spatial practices. The legible discourses that formerly articulated them have disappeared, or left only fragments in language. This place, on its surface, seems to be a collage. In reality, its depth is ubiquitous. (201)

Even minimal attentiveness to the names of streets that bisect and border the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa campus reveals hints of these “revolutions of history” and “economic mutations” that lie beneath the superficial “collage” or melting pot image of tropical paradise. For example, the street that cuts through campus and over “ceded” lands of the Hawaiian Kingdom bears the name of Sanford B. Dole, co-author of the “Bayonet Constitution” and head of the “Provisional Government” during Queen Liliu‘okalani’s imprisonment. And McKinley Street, named after the US President who oversaw the annexation of Hawai‘i, lies just west of campus, running parallel to Kamehameha Avenue, upon which sits the university system President’s mansion. These very street
names constitute a palimpsestic layer pointing to Hawai‘i’s history of illegal overthrow, unwilling annexation, and continued colonization, all of which reverberate across everyday spatial practices on campus today. Beneath these strata of street signs and pavement reside further ubiquitous layers of cultural and spiritual meaning. In their essay, “Ma ka Hana ka ‘Ike (In the Work Is the Knowledge): Kaona as Rhetorical Action,” which was recognized with the 2012 Braddock Award as the CCC’s outstanding article on writing or the teaching of writing, Brandy Nālani McDougall and Georganne Nordstrom explore this notion of layered meaning through the Hawaiian rhetorical device and intellectual tradition of *kaona*. Drawing upon the work of George Hu‘eu Sanford Kanahele, McDougall and Nordstrom explain *kaona* as “a highly developed, multilayered use of metaphor, puns, and allusion, with which *ka po‘e no‘ono‘o*, or intellectuals, traditionally composed or passed on *mo‘olelo*, or stories and histories” (100-101). Citing Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, they explain that to be considered well-written Hawaiian prose must engage multiple layers of *kaona* including a literal meaning, allusions to ancient times, integrations of chants and proverbs, as well as a potential layer “known only to the raconteur and one or two special members of the audience. . . while everyone else remains oblivious to the message” (qtd. in McDougall and Nordstrom 101: ix). As a researcher who seeks to understand the perspectives and performances that emerged from trinary FYC classrooms in the University of Hawai‘i Writing Mentors Program, I acknowledge that participant discourse engages multiple layers of meaning. Some are appropriate for a researcher such as myself to seek out and work to decipher; others are reserved for more sacred spaces and intimate audiences, embedded with *kaona* to which I am (and should remain) oblivious. In this chapter, I catalogue, illustrate, and theorize
three layers of place-related contribution that writing mentor researchers made to the site of FYC at the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa.

The chapter’s first palimpsestic layer makes an inductive argument for the relevance of place-based approaches to mentoring first-year writers, especially in Hawai‘i. I rely upon auto-ethnographic thick description, participant interviews, and programmatic artifacts to provide an accounting of salient place-related features of my site and study. And as in any ethnographic account, this layer reveals much about my own “interpretation of and attitude toward place” (Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon 13), including my belief that any effort to promote social justice in Hawai‘i must begin by acknowledging the historical and present injustices faced by Native Hawaiians and the responsibility of public institutions such as UHM to prioritize Native Hawaiian interests. The chapter’s first layer not only sets the scene for my subsequent analyses and interpretations of mentors’ work, but it also serves as a reminder of the degree to which this entire study is place-based, embedding place to some degree in all of the data which emerge. This layer focuses specifically on the influence of place within (a) one writing mentor’s theorization of her work in light of Native Hawaiian epistemologies; (b) many mentors’ approaches to their graduate educations more broadly and to the mentoring position specifically; (c) instructors’ course foci and requests to work with a mentor; (d) students’ transitions to UHM and their need for mentoring, regardless of writing ability; (e) and the mentor-student relationship. While this first layer is grounded in a fieldworker’s understanding of the place-based significance of trinary performances in which sub-topics are derived rather inductively from auto-ethnographic experiences, the second layer is much more quantitative and deductive.
Layer Two responds directly to the literature on place-based composition that calls for increased attentiveness to material spaces, tracking the various physical spaces into which mentors ushered students. Defining “place” as locations of mentor-student conferences that can be overlaid onto a campus map, this analysis draws upon the full set of mentor conference logs to illustrate the ways in which trinary collaborations extend the “place” of FYC beyond the four-walled classroom and across the university campus. I then offer mentor log narratives depicting writing conferences situated across various conferencing regions, including the FYC classroom, classroom periphery spaces, the program’s designated conferencing space, campus resource spaces, social and dining spaces, virtual spaces, and ambulatory conferences. In illustrating the kinds of interventions made possible within these conferencing spaces or “regions,” Layer Two enacts a methodology that could be classified in Burkean terms as an analysis of mentors’ work according to the scene-act ratio. As such, this methodology could be replicated at any site of research in which writing mentors are placed in FYC classrooms or trinary classrooms and given similar kinds of support.

While the mentoring interventions recorded in this second layer may not seem explicitly political at first glance, they respond to the challenge Julie Drew issues in “The Politics of Place: Student Travelers and Pedagogical Maps” when she notes that “Unfortunately, when we do attempt to account for the politics of place we tend to stall at the door of the classroom” (63). The “we” Drew is referring to here is composition theorists and instructors, as is the implied audience for implementing her recommended pedagogical strategies. This layer of my study suggests, however, that Drew’s goal of dispensing with “a notion of fixity and singularity in regard to where and how learning
happens” (66) can also be facilitated by dispensing with binary models of FYC and adding a third party to the classroom scene. Furthermore, in broadening and deepening first-year students’ interactions with university spaces and resources, mentors influence the quality of students’ dwelling on campus. Given that the motto of the Writing Mentors Program is to help every student excel, a point I have elaborated elsewhere, seeking to help all students dwell well in their new college environment, or campus polis, is also quite political. While the presence of a third classroom member does not guarantee successful dwelling for first-year students, it certainly opens more opportunities than do binary ideologies of “sink or swim.” In her chapter, “Learning to Dwell: Inhabiting Spaces and Discourses,” Nedra Reynolds defines dwelling as “a set of practices as well as a sense of place” (Geographies 140), which, despite its—or perhaps because of its—contradictions and tensions constitutes an important pedagogical goal. Reynolds continues:

Learning to dwell doesn’t necessarily mean ‘loving’ a place and settling happily in it for years at a time; it means paying attention to place, not just to the borders that surround it, and building thirdspaces. Learning to dwell means tapping into the circulation of practices that don’t show up on a map or in a photograph of a village. For many of our concerns in composition and literacy studies, learning to dwell or recognizing the spatial practices of dwelling are important for encountering discourses of otherness, unfamiliar texts or speech practices, or rhetorical moves that surprise us. (142-143)

Given the significance of learning to dwell, some of the most compelling interventions depicted in conference logs involve attempts by mentors to enhance students’
attentiveness to place, with “place” not only being defined as the university campus but also as Hawai‘i. As such, mentors not only called students’ attention to under-utilized university resources but also to the need, for example, of employing the appropriate diacritical markings in Hawaiian words. This concept of dwelling, then, is where the second palimpsest of this chapter overlaps with and gives way to the third.

Layer Three takes up mentors’ work in relation to dwelling in Hawai‘i. In defining “place” as Hawai‘i, this layer draws upon Kanaka Maoli understandings of land as ‘āina. Translated literally as “that which feeds,” Hawaiian epistemologies approach ‘āina as an ancestral, familial entity with the power to nourish, sustain, educate, heal, and more (Pukui; ho‘omanawanui; Meyer). Understood as ‘āina, Hawai‘i not only encompasses Burke’s pentadic element of “scene,” but also of “actor,” “agent,” “agency,” and “purpose,” deconstructing this Western dramatistic scheme. After this cultural (re)framing, the chapter takes up an analysis of eight FYC sections that were mentored by individuals who identified as Kanaka Maoli and who indicated that their approach to mentoring was influenced by this identification. My coding of these mentors’ conference logs and weekly memos revealed the presence of (at least) forty specific mentoring actions related to Hawai‘i that can be grouped under the broader categories of (1) supporting students’ place-based writing about Hawai‘i; (2) recognizing teachable moments regarding issues of language, politics, and culture in Hawai‘i; and (3) factoring trinary (geo)demographics into mentoring approaches. Examination of logs and memos from sixteen additional trinary classrooms with mentors who were not Kanaka Maoli but who professed scholarly interests situated in Hawai‘i and/or the Pacific revealed that a majority of these forty Hawai‘i-related mentoring actions occurred, albeit in varied forms
and from varied positionalities, across a broader contingent of mentored sections. And finally, I consider some perspectives shared by non-Kanaka Maoli mentors from both the continental US and Hawai‘i on how they have leveraged additional place-related elements of their identities to perform as writing mentors.

Ultimately, this chapter argues that trinary configurations offer Composition and Rhetoric expanded theories and practices for enacting place-based approaches. Specifically, the addition of a third party to the FYC classroom enables meaningful ways of (1) offering place-based writing support that is not driven by deficit models or linear placement exam results; (2) extending the place of the FYC classroom across the university campus; (3) engaging students’ interpretations of and attitudes toward the place of their college education; and (4) enacting Native Hawaiian epistemologies. In addition to enriching present understandings of trinary collaborations, I intend for this chapter to invite future layers of research and scholarship. To support the creation of such layers, I offer a number of appendices that I hope future writing mentors and composition researchers will re-read through their own situated interpretive practices, uncovering insights I did not or could not see.

Layer 1: An Auto-ethnographic Rationale for Theorizing Writing Mentors’ Work as Place-Based

*Place as Epistemological Grounding: Mentors, Mo‘o, and Hawaiian Knowledge*

In enumerating the institution’s core values, the UHM Strategic Plan begins with approaching the university as a “Hawaiian Place of Learning,” explaining that “The significance of Mānoa as a campus physically and conceptually grounded in Native Hawaiian knowledge and values cuts across each of our strategic goals. Hawaii’s unique
location and strength in indigenous scholarship sets us apart from other universities” (5).

Some examples of scholarship by indigenous authors at UHM about indigenous issues that are quite relevant to this chapter’s focus include the following: histories of the United States’ forceful and illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian kingdom (Osorio); recovered evidence of widespread Native Hawaiian resistance to the United States’ subsequent annexation of Hawai‘i (Silva); analyses of the ways in which educational policy has served to silence Native Hawaiians (Nee-Benham and Heck; Kaomea); ethnographies of contemporary Hawaiian communities (McGregor; Tengan); arguments about the ways in which various settler groups and institutions have appropriated power and further disenfranchised Native Hawaiians (Trask “From” and “Settlers”); analyses of Kanaka Maoli literature, literacy practices, and rhetorical strategies (ho‘omanawanui “Pele’s Appeal,”; McDougall, “O ka lipo o ka la”; McDougall and Nordstrom); work on Hawaiian epistemologies of place (Oliveira); and more. Such a list offers only a brief sampling of the range of recent scholarship at the university on Native Hawaiian issues and is far from exhaustive. While the degree to which the university itself can be described as a “Hawaiian Place of Learning” is debatable, numerous examples exist within my fieldnotes and the Writing Mentors Program records of mentors grounding their everyday work with students specifically in Native Hawaiian knowledge and values.

For example, following a bi-weekly mentor roundtable, writing mentor and then-first-semester Ph.D. student Marie Alohalani Brown shared with me the ways in which mentoring under her assigned instructor had allowed her to see first-hand the magnitude of work, talent, energy, deliberations, and creativity that go into teaching. She then described herself as "a bridge" between her students and instructor, explaining that she
took seriously the role of "humanizing the instructor" for her students, in part so that students will know how to effectively approach instructors in their future university lives. I volunteered that across the various participant groupings of the trinary, bridges were a frequent metaphor used to describe writing mentors. As Alohalani has a BA and MA in Hawaiian language, I asked her if she had in mind any particular concepts from Hawaiian culture when she described herself as a "bridge." Alohalani explained that while the word “uapo” translates as “bridge,” the concept she was operating from was that of the mo‘o deity. In their *Hawaiian Dictionary*, Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel Elbert define mo‘o as a “lizard, reptile of any kind, dragon, serpent; water spirit.” Alohalani explained that given the visible sequence of vertebrae on lizards, mo‘o also represent continuity. As such, Pukui and Elbert list as the second definition of the term, “succession, series, especially in genealogical line, lineage.” And the third definition, a “story, tradition, legend.” As our discussion continued, Alohalani invited me into her office and narrated a legend set in Nu‘uanu Valley on the Island of O‘ahu that speaks of Mo‘oinanea, a Hawaiian lizard deity. Martha Beckwith explains in *Hawaiian Mythology*, drawing upon an unpublished version of the legend told to Mary Kawena Pukui by her mother, that Mo‘o-inanea “stretches her body into a bridge across which Hainakolo walks to join her husband in Kuaihelani,” a mythical, hidden world (507). As a result, this couple is able to continue the next generation of offspring. The bridging depicted by this legend is physical (literally walking across the vertebrae), spatial (covering a great distance), sexual (in this case re-connecting a woman and man), temporal (connecting one generation to the next), and epistemological (spanning earthly and heavenly realms). Alohalani and I spoke of the many parallels to writing mentors’ work, including the role
of the mentor in supporting students’ movements into new campus spaces; bridging students’ home cultures and university cultures; facilitating the transfer of communication and knowledge from instructors to the next generation of 18-year-old students and vice versa; and translating sometimes-hidden assumptions and epistemologies undergirding assignments, genres, and university discourses. The concept of mo‘o even applies to mentors’ breaking down of assignments (such as the research paper) into a visible sequence of interconnected activities, walking students through the steps of a task that might otherwise constitute too great a leap. I had previously been thinking of bridges as a Western engineering phenomenon, and Alohalani opened my eyes to fact that bridging is also a key Hawaiian concept grounded in both the natural and supernatural worlds. As our discussion came to an end, Alohalani expressed enthusiasm about the potential for drawing upon Hawaiian knowledge to ground this project on mentoring writers in place, and she generously invited me to follow up with future questions and dialogue.

Over a year after this pivotal conversation, I contacted Alohalani to ask for permission to cite these ideas and for feedback on whether my accounting of our discussion and the legend of Mo‘oinanea seemed fair and accurate. Prior to sending her the draft, I learned that Alohalani had recently given a talk at the Bishop Museum titled “Kino Lau, Kino Mo‘o: Shifting Shapes of Legendary Lizard Deities.” The talk drew upon Alohalani’s M.A. thesis, written in the Hawaiian language, which the Bishop Museum website depicts as “the largest compilation of traditional and current information regarding mo‘o” (“Traditions”). Unbeknownst to me, when I emailed Alohalani this chapter draft, she was preparing for area exams, a trip to the island of
Hawai‘i as an invited speaker on *mo‘o* at University of Hawai‘i Hilo and the Kohala Center in Kona, and a colloquium for the English Department which I had the privilege of later attending. Despite these commitments, she responded to the draft within hours, encouraging my continued application of Hawaiian knowledge on *mo‘o* to writing mentors, suggesting alternate wordings and caveats to convey *mo‘o* lore more accurately, and sharing additional insights on the topic, including the qualification that only a family member could cross Mo‘oinanea’s back, given that it is sacred. Aloahlani noted that “in certain legends, evil *mo‘o* have been known to act as bridges just so that they can throw someone to their death” (e-mail correspondence). Such a qualification counteracts naïve assumptions of bridging as a feel good act of service on the mentor’s part, underscoring the agency inherent within the figure performing as bridge, including her power to offer, decline, or parody passage. It also highlights the potential danger to the would-be traverser, revealing the qualifications for safe crossing to be no less than familiarity and sacred trust. And it reminds me as a researcher to be careful in my use of Hawaiian knowledge.

*Place as a Driving Force in (Many) Mentors’ Scholarly Interests and Approaches to the Position*

While very few of the mentors thought explicitly of their work in terms of the Hawaiian figure of the *mo‘o*, mentors of all backgrounds brought to the position their own place-related scholarly interests, understandings of social justice, and pedagogical goals. While mentors approached their work from a variety of geo-demographic subject positions and cultural values, a frequently-shared goal across many mentors was to engage students in the place of their college education on as many levels as possible, with that “place” being not only the university but also Hawai‘i. Furthermore, mentors in 44 of
the 100 sections identified scholarly interests in Hawai‘i and/or the Pacific within their biographical blurbs on the “Meet the Mentors” page of the UHM Writing Mentors website or in other public scholarly presentations. Such interests ranged from creative work on Hawai‘i Creole English (HCE) or Pidgin, to cultural studies analyses of Asian settler colonialisms, to literary analyses of Pacific writers, to Hawaiian language translation projects. These scholarly interests no doubt inflected mentors’ interactions with students and depictions of their work in the program’s records. As the following examples of mentor discourse illustrate, mentors also found their own geo-biographies, cultural values, political commitments to be driving factors of their work:

• Another issue for me was who is falling through the cracks, like who is not coming to class. . . Noticing if the student was a student of color, or if the student was a Pacific Islander, it was more distressing than if they weren’t. . . Not being the professor, I saw my role in supporting students coming to class differently than her role. I felt that it was upsetting that a Samoan student wasn’t necessarily always coming to class, for example. [This extra sense of responsibility] is coming from myself and from my awareness of how. . . educational institutions tend to fail our students. And being aware that ordinarily retention of indigenous students and students of color is really poor, especially in their first semesters. . . (PCR)

• As a local person, I try to connect with the local students with my local identity in Hawaii. I also tell them about the obstacles I faced when I was learning to write in English 100, since I came from a local public high school that didn’t really prepare its students for college well. (MDS)

• [T]he experiences I had growing up in low income housing in a relatively small town on Oahu has very much influenced my self-presentation as a mentor and my pedagogy, to an extent. Although the students are adults and need to take responsibility for their education, each student has their own back-stories and experiences that need to be
considered when attempting to interact with them, especially when critiquing their writing. Some of the best teachers I had expected their students to perform at a high level and assuming responsibility, while at the same time connecting with their students and understanding that not everyone comes from a relatively privileged middle class background and/or with a normal well adjusted family. (MDS)

• Maybe it's just because of who I am and being from the mainland, but I would always have the sense that sometimes it seemed like mainland students would not necessarily be dealing with inequity but would be having a harder time in their first semester just because they don't have the support network on island, and a lot of the time the comments I would be getting from students from the mainland would be more expressions of alienation than I would be getting from the local students. (PCR)

• A lot of Hawaiian students that come from neighbor islands, they’re just as alienated as the non-residents. They actually vocalize that to me up front much more so than the non-resident students. . . It could be that they I let them know that I’m from here too, and that I’ve moved away and gone to college on the mainland. Maybe that relate-ability allows them to do that. (PCR)

For a fuller context of the roundtable excerpts above, please refer to Appendices AX and AY. Given mentors’ various proclivities and commitments, even in FYC sections that were not treating place as a theme, mentors still appeared to enact varying degrees of place-based work related to the university and to Hawai‘i. However, the scope of this work was frequently enhanced when their paired instructors employed place-based approaches.

**Place as a Focal Point of (Many) Instructors’ Course Themes and Pedagogical Goals**

A major impetus for mentors to perform place-related work came by way of the instructors with whom mentors were paired. Of the 100 mentored sections of FYC in this study, fully 68 indicated some degree of engagement with the politics of place in their
course descriptions, assigned texts, and/or writing assignments. These Hawai‘i-themed course descriptions often indicated an investigation of such issues as tourism, militarization, environmental degradation, and sovereignty. (For a fuller accounting of these sections’ degrees of engagement with place, please refer to Appendix AY.)

Georganne Nordstrom’s dissertation, Locating Students in the Teacher Research Classroom, highlights specifically the influence of location on students’ engagement with and resistance to such forms of critical praxis as assigning place-based narratives, writing about texts by Native Hawaiian authors, and acknowledging the presence of racism in Hawai‘i.

Given these challenges, many instructors who enact place-based pedagogies have recognized the ways in which a third party’s presence could complement their teaching approach and have requested to work with a mentor. In fact, the three professors whose published accounts of classrooms I reviewed in Chapter Three (Professors Bacchilega, Franklin, ho‘omanawanui) have all since teamed with mentors in their FYC courses in ways that have been highly successful by instructor, mentor, and student accounts. In the “eHarmentoring” survey that WPAs used to match mentors with instructors, we asked the following question: “What qualities and traits would you most value in a mentor?” In response, many instructors wrote specifically and vividly about their prospective mentor’s relation to place, as in the following example, which I quote in full:

* Maturity and deep passion to help students improve their writing
* Cultural, class, and gender sensitivity; openness to other viewpoints; willingness to listen, not just speak; strong oral and written communication skills
* Attention to detail - I'm not always super detail-oriented, so it helps to have that in a mentor, so she/he can remind me of things like instructions, deadlines, etc.
* A sense of place, history, and community—and how those factors might shape linguistic practices (especially in Hawai‘i and the Pacific, but also in other non-middle-class or non-Western contexts)

* Knowledge of different student learning styles and willingness to adapt and be flexible as to what helps students learn

* Desire to work closely on rhetorical issues (argument, evidence/support, audience, and so on), especially given that young local and American continental students might not get the nuances of language, information literacy, abstract reasoning, and critical thinking—in this age of information overload and illiteracy when students are not able to tell “good” from “bad” sources

* Basic Freireian approach to the classroom—seeing students as knowledge bearers who can contribute to the conversation, asking them to collaborate in their own learning, having students teach each other, motivating them by desire to learn rather than by fear, etc.—rather than top-down teaching

* Sense of humor; strong desire to learn about teaching; caring about students equally with (or greater than) one’s own career agenda; openness to debate and hearing multiple viewpoints on controversial issues; grasp of new media and multimedia; inventiveness and imagination (eHarmentoring survey response).

This instructor envisions her writing mentor counterpart being someone who connects a passion for helping students with a passion for engaging the politics of place. While the instructor’s description in many ways idealizes the mentor, it also points to the kinds of intellectual and cultural wherewithal demanded when mentoring in Hawai‘i. In this instructor’s description, “academic standards” are not depicted as universals but as situated moves contingent upon “a sense of place, history and culture.” Other instructor responses to this survey question included requests for writing mentors who were likely to complement the instructor’s place-based goals through such factors as a professed
interest in Hawai‘i, fluency in Hawai‘i Creole English or “Pidgin,” and familiarity with Hawaiian history and politics. And several instructors who were relatively new to Hawai‘i—including myself—have requested to be paired with mentors who were born and raised in the islands so as to offer students more potential avenues for positive identification with a member of the institution. While this chapter primarily addresses place-related interventions occurring between mentors and students, my own autoethnographic experiences and additional instructors’ evaluations across the mentored sections indicate that another chapter could be written on the ways in which mentors enhanced instructors’ knowledge of Hawaiian and “local” cultures, their communications with students from a variety of geographic origins, and their success in enacting place-based pedagogies.

**Place as a Factor in Students’ Transitions to The University of Hawai‘i Mānoa and as a Justification for All Kinds of First-Year Students Having Access to Writing Mentors**

Being a first-year composition student at UHM is fraught with all kinds of dynamics that are at root “place-based.” Perhaps more than most other universities, UHM is an institution in which the politics of place are unavoidably forefronted, from the sheer diversity of its student body, to the General Education requirement that students complete a course on “Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific issues;” to frequent campus speakers and conferences on Hawaiian culture and politics; to other visible forms of cultural display and performance. For example, some students literally bring the politics of place into classrooms on the t-shirts they wear, ranging from “DEFEND HAWAII” t-shirts bearing the image of a machine gun, to FBI “From Big Island” apparel, to the popular “ainokea” (or “I no care”) brand of clothing with its slogan, “I do what I like,” as illustrated in Figure 5.1 below:
While deconstructing these rich and problematic images is the work of another project, I introduce them here to underscore the everyday ways in which the politics of place figure unofficially into “the Mānoa experience,” a phrase that the university has adopted to coin its brand of education, claiming the university to be “like no other place on earth” (University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Strategic Plan 5).

Across the four years of bi-weekly program roundtables I attended, mentors frequently noted the kinds of challenges that students faced in performing within the complex dynamics of the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa’s FYC classrooms. As one continental US mentor who described himself as “pretty recently arrived to Hawai‘i” explained of his continental US first-year student counterparts, “I think a lot of students have an over-anxiety of not fitting in to the social fabric of Hawai‘i” (PCR). He described himself mentoring these students frequently in opening themselves to learning, listening more effectively, working to engage people they might not otherwise normally engage, and “trying to expand your conversation sphere” (PCR). While this writing mentor dismissed his advice to students as fairly unoriginal “common sense,” I would argue that few other institutional actors within the university individually address these realandimagined (Soja) issues of social, cultural, and transitional space with first-year
students. While transitional challenges may manifest in Hawai‘i in unique ways, they are by no means unique to Hawai‘i, for as Mike Rose asserted over twenty years ago in *Lives on the Boundary*, adjustment difficulties are an ongoing element of “the uncertainty and misdirection of a university freshman’s life” (172).

The recognition of the myriad of place-based factors first-year student must negotiate partly impelled the English Department’s shift from offering classroom-based writing tutors only to those students who scored poorly on the placement exam to offering writing mentors to first-year students of all writerly backgrounds, including Honors sections. As elaborated in Layer Three of this chapter, some students who scored quite well on standardized writing tests confessed to feeling quite out-of-place in UHM’s first-year composition classrooms as they struggled to decode the complexities of classroom cultures; interpreted reading assignments on race in Hawai‘i or Hawaiian sovereignty as personal attacks; or wondered how to muster the authority to research and write effectively about Hawai‘i-based topics. That first-year students of all backgrounds often struggle in their transitions to a new place—whether that place be the university, Honolulu, or both—opens productive spaces for place-based models of writing mentoring to supplant deficit-driven models of skills-based tutoring.

**Place as a Starting Point for the Mentor-Student Relationship**

Even when the politics of place did not figure explicitly into the instructor or mentor’s goals, they were central to the mentor-student relationship. Program administrators designated the initial out-of-class meeting between each mentor and student as an “intake interview” in which both parties clarified roles and built rapport. A strong majority of mentors reportedly began this conference with an exchange about
place, including such factors as where the student and mentor were from, where they each attended high school, and why they chose to attend UHM. In bi-weekly roundtables, mentors repeatedly spoke of re-theorizing what program directors termed the “intake interview” as a “talk story session.” In response to my (perhaps ironic) request for a stipulative definition of “talk story,” Marie Alohalani Brown offered the following: “A friendly, normally non-academic conversation, often without a precise scope in mind. It may occur between family members, friends, acquaintances, people you work with, or even strangers” (email correspondence). This move from the “intake interview” to the “talk story session,” mentors explained, shifted the interaction away from the trappings of a formalized, clinical procedure by which one party in power extracts information from the other. Rather, the “talk story” approach enacted a Hawai‘i-based practice of seeking connections through dialogue. As one mentor explained in a weekly memo, “I named the intake interview a ‘talk-story session,’ which I find dissolves the intimidation of ‘conference’ or ‘intake interview’” (WM 525).

In many cases the whole mentor-student relationship began with the question of “Where did you go to high school?” or in HCE, “What school you went?” In “What School You Went: Local Culture, Local Identity, and Local Language: Stories of Schooling in Hawai‘i,” Darrell H.Y. Lum explains that while this question is rooted in Native Hawaiian introduction protocols of sharing names, genealogies, and places of origin, it has become a common starting point for introductory conversations across the many sub-cultures claiming “local” status in Hawai‘i (2). As many UHM writing mentors observed, when both the mentor and student were from Hawai‘i, the conversation often moved to identifying a shared acquaintance or friend. When the mentor and/or student were not from Hawai‘i, the response sometimes entailed educating the other party about
some dimension of place. Mentors’ conference logs following the intake interview often reflected upon the place-related details and attitudes revealed in this first encounter.

Based upon these geo-dynamics, administrators encouraged mentors to write about ways in which they might further individualize their approaches to students, all the while being aware of the fine line between imagining and problematizing students' geographic origins and predispositions. The following log, completed after an intake interview, engages in such intellectual work. The mentor wrote:

Micah challenges me to think: what is a student? As I learned in Teaching Assistant workshops, one of the most important choices I can make as a facilitator is to approach difficult situations as “opportunities” rather than “problems.” So, instead of reacting to Micah’s disinterest in the course, his lack of participation, and his increasing disorganization as problems, I will re-orient myself in order to think of his behavior as an opportunity to re-interpret “student.” What is a student? More specifically, in this case, what is a college student at UH Mānoa? A local kid performing “the next step”/ “the last resort” as a way to avoid a particular future? A non-resident who only sees waves, babes, and good weather? An intellectual volunteer? A person who desires to learn in a specific context? What part does “desire” play in the role of a student like Micah at our university? “Is this the only school you applied to?” “Yeah.” “Why did you want to come to UH Mānoa?” “I dunno.” “Why do you want to be in college?” “Gotta, I guess.” “What do you like to learn?” “Nothing, really.” Where is Micah’s desire? I insist that desire plays a role in Micah’s decision to be a college student – in any decision there is desire. From my observations, Micah does not desire to be an active student. So where does his desire(s) function? Why is he here? Why do students like Micah apply to colleges, perform the steps of being a college student if they do not want to be a college student? How do I find and interact with the desire(s) that drives Micah to be here? (CL 4355)
The mentor’s eloquent theorizing on the question, “what is a student?” is strongly inflected by geography but not confined to it. After naming various geographic stereotypes of UHM students, the mentor probes deeper, insisting that the student, despite apparent evidence to the contrary, is capable of becoming engaged. She refuses to dismiss him as the stock figure of a disengaged “local male,” approaching him instead as an individual. (As an aside, subsequent conference logs depict “Micah” engaging substantially in his own writing and the course, for which he went on to earn the final grade of a B+.) As in this log, mentors frequently spoke of being responsive to where their students were coming from as one of the most critical and challenging elements of their work, given the variety of places from which students hailed and the goal of connecting with each.

Layer 2: The Places of Mentor-Student Writing Conferences

The second palimpsestic layer focuses on the material places in which student-mentor conferences occurred. Before proceeding, I should note that in selecting conference sites, mentors were operating from a few location-related guidelines from program administrators. Mentors were urged to establish face-to-face meetings as the primary mode of communication with students, utilizing email and other virtual means of interaction not as a substitute but as a supplement to the face-to-face. Mentors were also instructed to hold the intake interview, whenever possible, in the designated conferencing space within Sinclair Library or in the mentor’s office so as to facilitate students’ familiarity with and access to these spaces early in the semester. During research papers, mentors were encouraged to consider holding conferences in Hamilton Library so as to help students more directly with search strategies and finding sources. And finally,
mentors were encouraged to accompany referrals to campus resources, whenever possible, with an offer to walk alongside students to the given site. In determining any conference site, mentors were to be conscious of their own personal safety and professional boundaries. Otherwise, it was generally left up to mentors, students, and in some cases instructors to determine the most productive location(s) for any given conference. In a handful of cases, for example, mentors wanted to hold conferences in outdoor social and dining spaces, and instructors expressed disapproval of this option as not setting an appropriate tone for the mentor-student relationship. As different mentors had different levels of maturity, it may well be that an instructor was rightfully concerned about the influence of location on the kinds of professional boundaries mentors needed to establish. More commonly in these situations, program administrators found themselves siding silently with the mentor while advising them explicitly to honor the instructor’s wishes. In most cases, however, instructors encouraged mentors to base their conference locations on perceived opportunities for intervention, whether those occurred in the hallway after class, campus center lounge, course chatroom, or any other of the myriad of locations in which conferences took place. The following sections offer summary data, conceptual figures, and examples from mentor conference log narratives that illustrate the ways in which mentors extended the teaching and learning spaces of FYC beyond the immediate classroom.

*Methods and Presentation of Overall Research*

To create this layer of research findings, I descriptively coded (Miles and Huberman 57) all 6,602 mentor conference logs across the 100 sections according to campus sites in which mentors interacted with students. Using a spreadsheet of the logs, I
employed a sort function to the column containing mentors’ responses to the fill-in-the
blank prompt that asked for “Location of Conference, i.e., Sinclair, Classroom,
Kuykendall Hallway, Email, IM.” I then overlaid all locations of mentor-student
conferences on an official UHM campus map. Conferences locations are indicated by
stars, and mentor-student movements from one campus locale to another are indicated by
dashed lines:

![University of Hawai'i at Mānoa campus map](image)

Fig. 5.2. University of Hawai'i at Mānoa campus map (Pacheco) overlaid with locations and
movements of mentor-student conferences, as reported in writing mentors’ conference logs across
the hundred mentored sections of first-year composition in study.

This palimpsestic figure illustrates the ways in which mentors quite literally extended the
teaching and learning domain of FYC beyond the classroom’s walls. Such student
engagement with the university campus is especially significant at a commuter institution
like UHM, where many students spend very little time on campus outside of class and
may not otherwise avail themselves of these campus resources. The map indicates three
major nodes of activity around the following: (1) Kuykendall Hall, the location of the
English Department, as well as the site of almost all FYC classrooms, instructors’ offices,
and several mentors’ offices; (2) Sinclair Library, the undergraduate library housing the
Student Success Center, and the program’s designated conferencing space; and (3)
Hamilton Library, the campus’ main research library featuring an extensive a Hawaiian
and Pacific collection.

I next submitted the conference logs to a second round of coding, this time
analyzing the conference locations by spatial categories. In interpreting the categories
that emerged, I found that almost all of the logs specified one of six types or “regions” of
meeting spaces that are diagrammed conceptually in Figure 5.3:

Fig. 5.3. Regions in which mentor-student conferences occurred.
The white square at the center of the figure represents the four-walled classroom: the space in which students and mentors first met, interacted two-to-three times per week throughout the semester, and initiated future conferences that took place beyond the literal classroom. The next box surrounding the classroom represents those periphery spaces that border the FYC classroom or its home building, including such conferencing locations as hallways, staircases, and foyers. The box’s translucence represents the liminality of this space and its frequent use in connecting mentors and students to the other conferencing regions. The three overlapping circles represent conferencing spaces designated by program administrators, campus resource spaces hosting various student support services, and campus social and dining spaces. Each of the five campus conferencing regions connects to all of the other campus conferencing regions, representing the movement and overlaps that occurred across spaces. And finally, the light grey circle circumventing the entire figure denotes both synchronous and asynchronous virtual conferencing spaces. This “virtual” space is positioned on the exterior of the figure because many of these interactions originated off-campus, yet the circle also envelops all other spaces, signaling the ways in which virtual communications exist across all the regions. While this figure does not attempt to represent the relative percentages of conferences conducted in any given region, a complete breakdown of mentor-student conferences by location category and sub-category can be found in Appendix AZ.¹⁰

Next, I highlight a few key features of selected conferencing regions, analyzing the ways in which mentors’ engagement of such spaces extends the place of the classroom and offers bridges to researching and writing within the university.
The First-Year Composition Classroom

The vast majority (96%) of recorded conferences occurred outside the walls of the designated FYC classroom. However, as Chapter Four demonstrates, mentors interacted with students in a remarkably wide variety of ways during class, most of which they did not conceptualize in terms of a formal conference, and thus did not log. This category, then, is likely under-represented in my data. Inversely, the published literature on classroom-based tutoring tends to focus on the classroom as the primary site for tutor-student interaction (Spigelman and Grobman), so this study opens up room for considering the ways in which classroom-based tutors, when conceived of as writing mentors enacting place-based work, extend the classroom. The classroom “conferences” that were logged frequently took place on draft workshop days in which the mentor partnered with a student or joined a small group, offering individualized feedback on student drafts. Other logs depicted mentors in teaching roles leading all-class workshops, discussions, or lessons. And in yet other cases, mentors logged one-to-one interactions that occurred when they arrived early to the classroom or stayed with a student or students in the room after class, taking advantage of teachable moments by kairotically engaging the classroom space while also extending the classroom temporally.

Beyond the individual and small group “conferences” that occurred between mentors and students within the four walls of the classroom, I would argue that the very presence of a third actor made the classroom a different kind of place. One mentor theorizes on her seating position and presence in the classroom in the following weekly memo:

I know that many mentors and instructors had different methods when it came to seating arrangements. I heard in the mentor round table sessions that most mentors would either
always sit near the tired, unmotivated, or loud students, or simply change their location every week to stimulate class dynamics and discussions. I, on the other hand, stuck to the same seat throughout the semester. Though I see the many benefits of the other methods, I think my method was a decent strategy as well. My location was next to the instructor on the left of her desk, and this enabled me to appear as a co-instructor or a member of the instruction team. I know the mentors were supposed to align themselves more with the students in terms of classroom hierarchy, but I think this seating arrangement enabled me to appear trustworthy and approachable in a slightly different manner. For starters, the students would often look at me (I would say 90% of the time) when beginning to speak in class discussions. It was as if they had an individual they felt more comfortable making eye contact with and therefore more comfortable speaking to, at least initially. They would focus on me especially when they brought up points they thought weren’t completely in line with the instructor’s views or desires for the discussion. In other words, the option of looking at me, as opposed to the instructor, instilled a sense of confidence in their speaking, and even arguing, abilities. I was extremely enthusiastic when students would speak (I’m naturally enthusiastic about classroom discussions with my peers) and the students grew to understand that speaking would receive much encouragement in the form of nonverbal agreement or interest. They knew that saying something (regardless of the content) was much better than worrying over sounding naïve and therefore saying nothing. Other classroom dynamics still caused students to feel shy about speaking, but I believe that my position at the head of the class circle only helped to eliminate, and never caused, this shyness. This position also enabled me to show my intense interest in the instruction. I often, out of the corner of my eye, saw students notice my attentive and engaged responses to the instructor’s lessons—which, I’m sure, helped them take note of the important parts of the lecture. It gave me credibility, and made me visible to all students at all times—a visibility that I believe made them feel all the more familiar and comfortable with me. The position enabled me to actively participate in all class discussions (nonverbally for the most part, of course) and
The mentor theorizes that a third party who plays the role of an engaged, supportive, and visible listener can change the classroom environment, making it a different kind of space for classroom discussions. Another mentor in the participant check roundtables explained that he too found the students and instructor literally turning to him throughout the class period. He noted that in his classroom, the instructor was quite new to Hawai‘i and the students, like him, were almost entirely graduates of Hawai‘i high schools: as such, both parties frequently “looked at” him, which he explained was a nonverbal cue inviting him to “translate” what was said in ways that bridged the generational, geographical, and epistemological divide (PCR).

**Classroom Periphery Spaces**

The second meeting category of “classroom periphery spaces” consisted of 200 logged conferences. It included conferences in spaces that bordered the FYC classroom or building, such as hallways (n=45), breezeways (n=24), staircases and elevators (n=3), lounges (n=41), and building lobbies (n=110). For example, one mentor described a conference location as “leaving class” (CL 6490) and another as “the bench by Kuykendall building, near the stairs” (CL 3092). These conferences often occurred immediately before or after class as impromptu meetings. In this first example, the mentor initiates the 7-minute interaction in the hallway immediately after class:

I followed up with Reyn today about the email I sent him. He'd missed peer review, which meant that he would get a zero for his paper, which he didn't realize. Because I hadn't heard back from him, I cornered him a bit after class and got him away from his friends so we could speak privately. He was shocked to hear that he wouldn't get any credit for
the paper, but I clarified that at least if he revised his paper (based on the feedback the instructor would still give him), he could at least get an average of the two grades. Still, I encouraged him to speak to/email [Instructor’s first name], as she might be willing to negotiate with him (she told me should would, privately, if his circumstances demonstrated that he really had to miss class). (CL 4026)

Here, the time immediately following the class session and the periphery space of the hallway present an opportunity for intervention, which the mentor utilizes to “corner” the student, distancing him enough from the other classroom actors to gain a semi-private audience. Although the instructor is not literally present in the conversation, she figures into it as the initiator, interpreter, and enforcer of the grading policy in question. In this liminal space of the hallway, the mentor educates the student about his own liminal predicament, helping him to understand himself as poised somewhat precariously between an impending zero and the possibility for negotiation and partial credit. In other cases, students recognized the situation of being on the border of the classroom space and in the presence of the mentor as an opportunity to raise questions or concerns.

As I was leaving class today, Tisha asked if she could talk to me about leading the class discussion on Monday. She said she had no clue how to begin. I suggested she begin with the title of the piece and the name of the author, and to provide a brief synopsis of the text. Tisha then informed me her text is a poem (The Negro Speaks of Rivers, by Langston Hughes). We talked briefly about some of the differences between the text of an essay and the text of a poem - how meaning is conveyed to the audience in poetry versus in an essay. The instructor just so happened to be walking with us, and she suggested to Tisha that she also provide some facts about Hughes when beginning her discussion - I winked at Tisha, and she got the message! I ended by telling Tisha I would read the poem this weekend and email her my thoughts. (CL 6490)
This example reveals how certain student questions that are not asked in the space of the classroom become broach-able in the classroom periphery. In this liminal space, the student reveals her own lack of footing with the quickly approaching assignment, confessing, as the mentor represents it, that she has “no clue how to begin.” Given the time and space of the interaction, not only the mentor but also the instructor were present to respond to the student’s questions, and the mentor functions as an intermediary between the student and instructor. The student initially directs her claims to ignorance to the mentor only, but as the mentor engages the student’s question in the instructor’s presence, the instructor’s response is implicitly invited. Following the instructor’s suggestion, the mentor describes herself enacting the archetypal anthropological gesture of the wink. This fleeting gesture, made in the waning moments of an impromptu conference, conducted in the narrow space and time bordering the classroom session, speaks not only to the ephemeral nature of this conferencing region, but also to the performative dimensions of mentors’ work within it, including their sophistication at interpreting cultural codes across the teacher-student binary as well as their roles in helping students with these interpretations. This conferencing region is perhaps the most under-represented of all those within the program records, as multiple mentors at the participant check roundtables noted that when they became backlogged, so to speak, these kinds of impromptu conferences were the first ones not to be logged.

**Meeting Spaces Designated by Program Administrators**

Conferences in those meeting spaces designated by the program administrators constituted the most frequently cited category, accounting for 5,117 or 77% of the total conferences logged. While some (n=1,206) of these conferences occurred in assigned
offices spaces within the English Department building, most (n=3,904) took place within the newly renovated Student Success Center of Sinclair Library, adjacent to the Writing Center. Even though this mentoring location came pre-designated by program administrators, there was still a degree of *ad hoc* place creation that occurred between mentors and students. The process of beginning any conference involved forms of place negotiation, as students and mentors staked out a meeting spot; grabbed and reconfigured chairs; and arranged notebooks, laptops, drafts, and assignment sheets between them. The excerpted weekly reflective memos below depict the ways in which one mentor theorized, claimed, and created place:

My number one priority for the intake interviews was to get the student comfortable with me and with the surroundings. I tried to keep the intake interviews as relaxed as possible, focusing more on the student and his/her interests and I tried to keep the conversation as "back and forth" as possible, instead of turning it into a question and answer session. . . Although I did ask some questions about their writing habits and what they perceived to be their weaknesses and strengths, it was not the focus of the interview. Rather than do a "formal" interview, where I would sit across from the student with a table in between us, I basically hijacked the cushioned chairs in the Writing Center and had the student sit not directly across from me, but towards the side. (WM 187; WM 29)

This narrative indicates the high priority the mentor assigned to getting the student comfortable with the mentor and surroundings, treating such comforts as interconnected. This mentor’s choice of the term “hijacked” indicates a use of space that borders on being institutionally transgressive in its student-centeredness and boundary crossing, as does the mentor’s rejection of formal interviewing arrangements across the barrier of a table in lieu of cushioned chairs positioned side by side. As illustrated in Figure 5.4, the placement of mentor and student at a ninety-degree angle, and often around the corner of
the designated mentoring tables, proved the most popular arrangement among mentors for its perceived effect of fostering a comfortable and collaborative environment.

Fig. 5.4. Photograph of a writing mentor (left) and first-year student (right) conferencing around the corner of a table in UHM’s Sinclair Library Student Success Center. Written permission has been granted by both mentor and student to use this photo.

In the invited workshops put on each August by the UH Counseling and Student Development Center for the writing mentors, extended discussions ensued about how to create a mentoring space that enhanced student comfort. Topics included the configuration of chairs, placement of writing equipment and artifacts, physical proximity of mentors and students, degree of eye contact, and more. Far from a trivial discussion, it was clear to me that mentors were carefully theorizing how the arrangement of even a designated conferencing space inflected students’ relationships with them as mentors, with the course, and potentially with the institution.12

**Campus Resource Spaces**

On the whole 374 conferences were held in campus resource spaces, including Hamilton Library (n=264), the Writing Center (n=43), the First-Year Composition Center (n=33), computing labs and information technology services (n=14), academic departments across campus (n=14), the Queen Lili‘uokalani Student Center (n=3), and
Student Health Services (n=2). Multiple logs describe mentors coaching students through the process of checking out their first-ever university library book and theorizing that if the mentor had not physically accompanied the student through the necessary steps, this significant literacy act might not have occurred for the student in the context of the FYC course.

In addition to accompanying students into campus resource spaces, mentors also frequently referred students to university resources through oral explanations and/or emails with links for students to follow. To prompt and track such referrals, the conference log template asked mentors, “Did you refer the student to any other campus resources?” Coding mentor responses to the first question across the 6,602 logs, I created a full catalogue of referrals made by mentors, which can be found in Appendix BA. This list reveals that mentors made (at least) 1,169 referrals to 142 different resources. To make a referral effectively requires an awareness of students’ individual interests, needs, and perceptions of the resource in question as well as knowledge about campus resources, representatives, and modes of communication: as such, it constitutes a form of bridging. A well-timed, well-delivered referral could potentially influence a student’s quality of dwelling on campus dramatically, altering a student’s very habitus. At a commuter campus such as UHM, for example, many students arrive for class and then depart soon thereafter for off-campus jobs, obligations, and pursuits. Johnathon Mauk describes this scenario as characteristic of many commuter campuses, including his own un-named Midwestern US community college, while also theorizing students’ “unsituatedness in academic space” (199) to be part of today’s broader landscape of higher education in which “college students are increasingly steeped in the activity systems beyond academic
life” (219). The act of referring a first-year student to the university’s listing of student employment opportunities, which UHM writing mentors reported doing in 45 cases, could potentially lead that student to secure an on-campus job with more flex time to engage with library resources, professors’ office hours, group projects, and other campus activity systems.

To triangulate the referrals within mentors’ conference logs, I consulted students’ anonymous end-of-semster surveys, tabulating their responses to the question, “Did your mentor help you connect with any campus resources or representatives?” A total of 565 students (or 39%) responded “yes.” The list of resources named by students, which can be found in Appendix BB, overlaps with 53 of the 142 resources named by mentors. This number is quite high given that students completed these evaluations at the end of the semester, drawing upon their recollections of earlier conferences. Here is a brief sampling of students’ depictions of the ways in which their mentors connected them to campus resources:

- Since I’m a freshman, I didn’t really know my way around, but [mentor’s name] helped me locate the different libraries. (SE 1222)
- She took us to the HAWN section of Hamilton Library and set up a tour for us. (SE 1682)
- He really helped me explore the online library resources like JSTOR and LexisNexis which I didn't really know how to navigate. I'm really thankful that he helped me with search keywords and what to look for in articles to support a paper because those were important skills I needed to learn. (SE 1744)
- [Mentor’s name] helped me connect with the writing center when I was not able to meet with her due to personal reasons. (SE 1242)
- She helped me with finding specific information about faculty here at Manoa by using the university's homepage. (SE 1101)
While UH Writing Mentors Program archives include extensive accounts of such connections being successfully forged, they also record instances in which mentors were unable to connect students to the resources they needed to succeed. The following conference log narrative, submitted in the opening weeks of the semester, describes such a situation:

I called Derrick, who was supposed to meet with me today, to find out if he was lost. He said that he dropped the course because the drive from Waianae was too far and he was getting parking tickets and the gas was too expensive. He said he really loved the class and wanted to keep coming to school, but that this was the only class he was able to register for and that he, sadly, was dropping out. I told him I hoped I might see him around and wonder if there are other resources I could have referred him to. It seems to me that someone like Derrick, who went to Waianae High, would be the very kind of “at risk” student that retention programs, like mentoring, would be reaching out to hold onto. I don't want to seem dramatic, but I feel I failed him. (CL 906)

Mentors have reported that the commute from Waianae to UHM can take up to 1.5 hours by car or 2.5 hours by bus each way, traversing what a recent national study identified as the most congested corridor of freeway in the US (Nakaso). As one mentor who made this daily commute explained, the distance is physical but also cultural, and many of the students who come from Waianae to UHM are the first in their families to attend college. While the mentor recognizes that perhaps she could have done more to help this student (who according to institutional records is Native Hawaiian) to stay enrolled in FYC, the narrative also speaks to the limitations of mentors’ bridging work in light of the structural and personal obstacles many students face in pursuing a college degree.
Campus Social and Dining Spaces

Mentors logged 221 conferences (or 3% of the total) held in social and/or dining spaces on campus. Sites included the picnic tables in the Sustainability Courtyard adjacent to the English Department (n=108); benches and tables outside of libraries and other buildings (n=99); cafeterias, catering trucks, restaurants, and coffee shops (n=25); the Campus Center lounge and other indoor lounges (n=18). Conferences in these spaces often took the form of small group discussions or draft workshops facilitated by the mentor, as in the following log excerpt:

Julie had signed up for this conference, but as we left the Hamilton library workshop, several of ACE/COP students (Joe, Lexa, Michelle) followed us to Paradise Palms. Julie didn’t seem to mind, since they are all friends and frequently come to conferences in pairs. As a result, the conference, although focusing on Julie’s outline for paper #1, turned into a group discussion. My main focus was to meet the assignment’s requirement of having a clear claim supported by evidence. Julie had chosen the American Dream as her topic, but could not formulate a claim. I asked her what the American Dream means to her, upon which she reflected on immigrant families and college education. At that point Lexa interjected that there is no such thing as the American Dream anymore since there are no jobs. I told Julie to think of Lexa and her concerns in trying to formulate a claim. . . and arguments that might convince her. (CL 5012)

Illustrating one of Karen Burke LeFebre’s strategies in Invention as a Social Act, the mentor “take[s] into account writers’ inextricable connections to social realms beyond the classroom” (133), including the social dynamics of students’ ACE and COP learning communities and the social setting of the conference, engaging students in “invention by interaction” (68). Instead of asking Julie to construct counterarguments by imagining a disembodied antagonist, the mentor directs her to an embodied audience in the form of a
skeptical classmate about whom she cares, but with whom she disagrees. The mentor utilizes social space and social interaction to help the student begin to refashion a commonplace description of the American dream into an argument, creating within the (problematically-named) Paradise Palms food court a kind of Burkean parlor for this group of FYC students.

Interactions in social spaces also introduced some potentially problematic scenarios. In a participant check roundtable, one mentor volunteered a story of his meeting up with another mentor at the campus bar adjacent to Sinclair Library. By the time they had finally purchased drinks, his scheduled writing conference with a female first-year student was about to begin, so the mentor exited the bar, found the student in the library, and invited her to join them at the bar to “watch us drink beers, ’cause you’re like 18.” The mentor explained, “I was judging how she was reacting, cause if she was not reacting well, I would be like, ‘Okay, I’ll just do the conference now.’ But she was into it, and we hung out, and like 20 minutes after that we did the conference, and it turned out really well” (PCR). In another case, an instructor informed me that only weeks after her assigned mentor had reported to her that a female first-year student in the course has been “hitting on him,” she observed the mentor walking hand-in-hand across campus with this very student and learned that they had become “an item.” The instructor expressed concern that, among other issues, mentors were positioned to capitalize unethically on students’ tendencies to interpret intellectual engagement as intimacy, particularly given mentors’ access to students’ phone numbers and the fact that meetings took place in spaces outside the gaze of instructors and administrators. While I believe that both of these examples constitute what Victor Vitanza (drawing upon Kenneth Burke) terms “misrepresentative anecdotes” (167), they indicate potential abuses of power that can occur when mentors (who are
entrusted to use their judgment in determining conferencing spaces and deploying various mentoring roles) do not theorize reflexively enough the intersections of institutional position, space, and gender.

**Virtual Spaces**

Overall, 337 logged conferences (or 5% of the recorded total) took place in virtual spaces. These mentor-student interactions were mediated by a variety of technologies, including email (n=297), the course website and its assigned chat room (n=16), cell phone (n=13), Instant Messenger (n=5), and text message (n=4). Mentors reported that they most frequently used the “space” of email to issue reminders (to the entire class or individual students), send notes of encouragement, or reach out to students who had been absent. Mentors observed that emails initiated by students often displayed an urgency of tone and an informality of language:

Keeley wrote: "I'm so confused. I don't know where to start. I wrote my freewrite but after reading it, it makes no sense, it doesn't even have a point to it. So I've been trying to start a completely new essay. I tried writing an outline and I kinda know what I wanna talk about but it feels like I'm not getting anywhere, literally! Huh, it's so frustrating because I've been working on this essay the whole weekend. I don't know what to do. Any advice??"

I replied with a long explanation of the assignment and the instructor's expectations. I also talked about writer's block, writer's frustration, and techniques that help counter these feelings. I tried to give as much advice as I could think of concerning Keeley's situation.

She then replied to my reply email with the following: "Haha! Thanks. I think I did okay. I tried to form another outline to see if that could help me. I think it did a lot! haha! Well I'm hoping my essay is going to be okay. . . I went back with my original idea about
the name brands (which wasn't apart of my freewrite b/c I was confused about answering
the two questions and not focusing on my original ideas) so I think it turned out alright.

Thanks for the advice! See you tomorrow!" (CL 976)

Mentors in the participant check roundtables theorized that students often seemed to
display greater degrees of “honesty” in emails, opening up about “the real challenges that
they’re having in the classroom with their work, with grammar, with comments they got on a paper
that they maybe didn’t feel comfortable enough to come up to me in class and ask me or the
instructor” (PCR).

While every mentor relied upon email communications to some degree, the use of
such virtual conferencing spaces as text messages, cell phones, and social networks were
topics of ongoing debate across the mentor roundtables. Some mentors felt it necessary to
establish professional boundaries by not giving out their phone numbers to students or
accepting students’ Facebook friend requests, often noting age and gender to be factors in
these decisions. Other mentors routinely exchanged phone numbers with their students,
accompanying this opening of access with a set of stated boundaries. Some mentors
limited cell phone use strictly to communicating last-minute cancellations or changes in
meeting location, whereas others framed their cell phone guidelines with humor, telling
students: “I don’t wanna get drunk text messages at two in the morning because you’re lonely”
(PCR). Mentors’ deliberations on such matters were centrally concerned with socio-
spatial concepts of perceived availability, professional boundaries, and personal space, as
inflected by technology.

The Ambulatory Conference

I attribute the idea for this section to writing mentor Alicia Maedo whose
presentation at the 12th Annual Student Conference of the College of Languages,
alerted me to the salience of conference mobility as a category of analysis for trinary configurations. Of course, the practice of walking and talking has long been recognized for its pedagogical value: Plato, for example, depicts Socrates and Phaedrus strolling together outside the city walls leading up to their famous dialogue. Although this shared activity does not likely happen regularly across the teacher/first-year student binary in contemporary research universities, multiple logs (n=45) depicted mentors and students walking together from one campus site to another. This conferencing category also generated the most interest and conversation in my participant check roundtables, as several mentors reflected on experiences in which walking with a student resulted in mentoring “breakthroughs:”

I really feel like most of the time, the walk from one location to another is the most open space. And I feel like students are really willing to... share a lot more than in meetings, at least in my experience. Like for example, last semester I had this student who was really reserved. He didn't speak up in class. And, on our journey from Hamilton to Sinclair, he just told me about his whole life dreams, goals—just a whole bunch of details I don't think he ever would have said if we were just sitting down at a meeting. (PCR)

When asked to theorize why movement opened up such dialogue, mentors speculated that a walking conversation may feel more confidential because passersby can only hear snippets rather than eavesdropping on the entire conversation. Furthermore, walking changes the dynamics of eye contact such that the two parties do not feel as though they’re “staring at each other” (PCR). Given the differences in eye contact norms between Western and Asian-Pacific cultures, mentors felt that by giving both parties other objects
at which to direct their gazes, walking made the encounter feel more casual and comfortable, especially in cross-cultural mentoring situations.

The logs representing conferences that took place *between* spaces, such as the classroom and the library, or the library and student counseling also indicate one of the ways in which the fluidity of mentors’ work challenges traditional definitions of a writing conference. These ambulatory conferences address Johnathon Mauk’s challenge for the Composition and Rhetoric profession to approach academic space “as transportable and mutable—as something that is tied to being, rather than to exclusive material surroundings” (213-214). Mauk claims that such an approach to academic space is requisite if the profession is to engage a generation of college students whom he characterizes as being marked by a “growing evasiveness and transience” (218).

Conferences involving physical movement occurred far more frequently than official programmatic data indicate, as many logs listing only one location address multiple locations in the narrative. Such is the case in the following conference log narrative, which I quote in full for the ways in which it documents a mentor assisting a student as she negotiated her first encounters with several campus resources. The 75-minute conference began in Hamilton Library, a resource whose size and scope (as well as the fact that certain library holdings are stored on almost the opposite side of campus at Sinclair Library) offers many opportunities for mentoring, as the following account illustrates:

This was the first meeting of my Library Research Workshop. Sarah was unsure of her topic, so we spent some time discussing her interests. The project involves researching aspects of historical or contemporary Hawai‘i. Sarah, being from the Mainland & a 2nd semester student, was unsure about the sorts of issues facing Hawaii.
Relying on discussions she had in her Sociology course, Sarah decided she wanted to research homelessness in Hawaii. I asked her to try to narrow this topic down a bit--perhaps looking at Native Hawaiians, veterans, mentally ill, specific homeless communities or legislative/gov't support of the homeless epidemic. At first she wanted to focus on veterans since her father is a Vietnam Vet and she could interview him. She was also very interested in mentally ill patients who end up homeless. I suggested doing a Voyager search on both of these and see what we end up with before she decides on a topic.

Sitting side-by-side at computer terminals we spoke about search terms and the various searching options provided by Voyager. Sarah had never used this type of resource search before and needed some coaching to get started. Once she figured out the different options she was able to search on her own. I followed along with her searches and made suggestions as she went along. We left the Voyager system to check out local newspapers online and found an excellent resource in HawaiiReporter.com which spoke specifically to Sarah’s topic of homeless veterans. All of the sources we located were available online which required no borrowing.

In our searching we also found some video sources. After completing our searches at Hamilton Library, we walked over to Sinclair and I showed Sarah how to check out audio/visual material from Wong [the campus Audiovisual Center on the third floor of Sinclair Library]. I went through a "mock" request to show her how to request the video she was interested in, even though she was not ready to check it out yet. I explained the viewing stations and how to use this area of the library. She did not know that the library provided these services to students and had never been in Sinclair library before; she didn't know there was a second library on campus.

All in all, I thought the conference went well. Sarah left with some valuable resources and some new information about the library system. The Library Essentials workshop at the start of the semester I think is too detailed for the students. The librarians, who are very patient and thorough, focus too much on journal searches. Many
of the students in English 100 will not need this sort of resource until later, or perhaps for a more advanced course. It is simple searches for texts, gauging online resources for reliability and narrowing down topics of research which I find much more valuable for them. (CL 3165)

This conference expanded the student’s limited map of the campus and its resources to include a second library, academic search engines, local newspaper websites, and audiovisual resources, offering the student new routes as a researcher. To chart the physical and virtual path the mentor took with the student would read as follows:

Hamilton library lobby, to computer terminal, to UH library website, to Voyager search engine, to local newspaper websites, to Hawaii.Reporter.com, out of Hamilton Library, across the campus quad, into Sinclair Library, up to the third floor, into Wong Audiovisual Center, onto the A/V computer online request portal, to the A/V viewing stations, and perhaps more. This incremental succession of steps, like the vertebrae of the mo’o, offers the “unsure” student a bridge into the world of university research. An analysis of the log’s opening paragraph alone indicates several kinds of bridging. The first sentence speaks to the bridging work mentors enact in helping students connect the instructor’s research assignment to their own interests. The mentor also enables bridging at the level of coursework, encouraging the student’s intellectual connections between her Sociology discussions and her FYC assignment. (As Lee Ann Carroll’s and others’ work on longitudinal writing development have indicated, revisiting a topic of interest across courses and over time can help students to develop greater sophistication and authority as writers.) The log next addresses the importance of developing an appropriate scope, a task even doctoral students such as myself find challenging. As a form of bridging, this scope-related mentoring creates a more navigable path for the student-researcher by
anticipating and circumventing potential hazards. The next connection the mentor facilitates is between the student’s familial resource of a father she could interview and those sources available through the university library website. One significant element of the conference log narrative that I have not yet analyzed is the ways in which the mentor also offers a kind of geographical bridge to a student who is new to Hawai‘i and struggling to find the means of authority to engage a research topic specific to Hawai‘i as place. I take up this subject in the next section.

**Layer 3: Mentors’ Place-Based Work in Relation to Hawai‘i**

This third layer addresses mentors’ work in relation to Hawai‘i. Its aim is to detail ways in which the trinary arrangement enables interventions in the politics of place, as pertaining to Hawai‘i, in ways that would likely not otherwise be possible without the mentor’s presence. Working primarily with conference logs and weekly reflective memos from a sampling of eight sections with Kanaka Maoli or Native Hawaiian mentors, I document and analyze ways in which these mentors described themselves intervening in reading and writing assignments, research requirements, terminologies, and (perceived) attitudes related to Hawai‘i. I have chosen to prioritize a fuller treatment of select Kanaka Maoli mentors’ work over a more comprehensive coverage of the various demographic categories of mentors, following sampling protocols elaborated by Miles and Huberman in which “Choices of informants, episodes, and interactions are being driven by a conceptual question, not by a concern for ‘representativeness’”(29). In the paragraphs below, I explain my process at arriving at this conceptual question. Following my analyses of Kanaka Maoli mentors’ work, I consider some additionally significant perspectives offered by non-Kanaka Maoli mentors who graduated from high schools in
both the continental US and Hawai‘i, illustrating the ways in which individuals from multiple backgrounds have leveraged various elements of their identities to mentor students in relation to Hawai‘i.\(^{17}\)

In my initial readings of conference logs for their references to mentoring students in relation to Hawai‘i as place, I became aware of the way in which several of the *Kanaka Maoli* mentors referred to Hawai‘i with the collective pronoun “our” (as in “our islands”) and as “land” (as in “this land”). ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui’s chapter in Fujikane and Okamura, “‘This Land is Your Land, This Land Was My Land:’ Kanaka Maoli versus Settler Representations of ‘Āina in Contemporary Literature of Hawai‘i” helps to explain these patterns in *Kanaka Maoli* mentors’ logs. As ho‘omanawanui argues, literature by *Kanaka Maoli* authors and literature by “local” Asian or other settler authors exhibit key differences in their representations of land and language, differences that exist “because Kanaka Maoli and settlers are operating from different cultural paradigms and different language bases” (117). ho‘omanawanui contrasts settlers’ references to Hawai‘i as “landscape,” “geography,” and “environment” with *Kanaka Maoli* understandings of Hawai‘i as ‘āina, citing Handy, Handy, and Pukui’s explanation of the term as deriving from the “verb ‘āi, meaning food or to eat, with the substantive na added, so that it may be rendered either ‘that which feeds’ or ‘the feeder’” (ho‘omanwanui 124).\(^{18}\) ho‘omanawanui highlights numerous etymological connections between Hawaiian words for people and land, such as maka‘āinana (“steward of the land”) and kama‘āina (“child born on the land”) (125). To illustrate the familial nature of the relationship between the Hawaiian people and ‘āina, ho‘omanawanui narrates:
In one creation story of Papahānaumoku [Earth Mother] and Wākea (Sky Father), a keiki alualu (miscarried fetus) is born to them. After the child is buried outside the home, a kalo [or taro] plant, which they name Hāloa-naka, “quivering stalk with long breath,” grows from the spot. The next child born to them is also named Hāloa and is said to be the progenitor of the Kanaka Maoli people. Thus Kānaka Maoli aren’t masters over the land, as in the Judeo-Christian traditions set forth in the book of Genesis in the Bible, but are the subservient younger siblings of the ‘āina and the mea ‘ai, “fruits” of the land, most directly, the kalo plant Hāloa-naka, our elder sibling. (125)

Hawaiian understandings of ‘āina as familial and sustaining, ho‘omanawanui explains, undergird the core cultural values of mālama ‘āina (“caring for the land”) and aloha ‘āina (“love for the land”) (124). Ho‘omanawanui notes that aloha ‘āina is also a political concept, an expression of loyalty to the Hawaiian Kingdom and a commitment to the self-determination and sovereignty of Hawai‘i and its people (130-131). Professor of Education Manulani Aluli Meyer also examines aloha ‘āina as central to Hawaiian epistemologies of teaching and learning. Envisioning a future built upon educational and cultural movements grounded in aloha ‘āina, Meyer writes:

How else will our youth experience land as more than a commodity, more than an unaffordable parcel of real estate, and more than something that separates families? We will heal and we will be educated by ‘āina. This is key. We will, once again, be “fed” by the tides, rains and stories of a place and people made buoyant because this is how culture survives. This is how children learn best. This is how we all will survive. (Ho‘olau 59)
Re-reading mentors’ logs in light of ho‘omanawanui’s and Meyer’s scholarship on ‘āina pushed me to consider the question: What might it mean to mentor first-year student writers in relation to Hawai‘i from an understanding of ‘āina as ancestor, as family? Even based upon my very limited understanding of this concept, I can see that cultural approaches to ‘āina position Hawai‘i as so much more than a backdrop for FYC classrooms, students’ college educations, or writing mentors’ work.

The implications of this epistemological shift are illustrated vividly through Kenneth Burke’s dramatistic pentad. From a non-indigenous perspective of place, Hawai‘i is classified as scene, which Burke defines as “setting,” “background,” and that which “contains the act” (Grammar 3). And in Western drama, the backdrop rarely if ever speaks to the actors; such an “aberration” might be labeled as the pathetic fallacy or a scientific failing. However, according to Hawaiian epistemologies, the ‘āina lives: it feeds, heals, educates, conceals and reveals secrets, and asserts its will on one and all. Thus, ‘āina cannot be abstracted exclusively as “scene” but must also be understood to encompass all of the dramatic “properties” (a term rendered ironic in this context), including those of “actor,” “agent,” “agency,” and “purpose.” Suggesting that “agent” and “agency” can be non-human entities deconstructs the Burkean pentad and expands the vocabulary of dramatism.19 Approaching Hawai‘i as ‘āina also invites an entire rethinking of the “trinary” concept, for the relationship is no longer one of instructor-student-mentor, but of instructor-student-mentor-‘āina. Or perhaps more accurately, ‘āina-instructor-student-mentor, as the ‘āina existed long before the university campus was constructed.20
Methods and Presentation of Overall Research

Across the four years of my study, fourteen total sections had Kanaka Maoli mentors who granted me permission to draw upon their work in my dissertation. The process whereby I arrived at eight of these sections for closer analysis follows established ethnographic practices in which the researcher, after taking stock of local cultural dynamics, selects a limited number of “key actors” to consult further (Fetterman 49-52). I found that six of the fourteen sections included very few references at all to Hawai‘i-related mentoring, due perhaps to instructors’ non-place-based approaches to the course, or to mentors’ interpretations of the conference log and its administrative audience as not being amenable to discussions about the politics of place, or perhaps to the sentiment one Hawaiian mentor expressed in a demographic survey, instructing me: “feel free to note my ethnic background, but please don’t imply that it in any way relates to the way I approached my responsibility as a mentor” (MDS). Representing a different orientation to this spectrum of cultural attitudes, another Kanaka Maoli mentor explained, “my place-based approach... is my responsibility as a Hawaiian” (PCR). The eight sections I have selected for analysis come from mentors whose responses to demographic and mentoring surveys indicated that being Hawaiian did in fact inform their approaches to mentoring, though of course not in uniform ways.

Instructors’ course descriptions revealed that five of the eight sections had a central focus on Hawai‘i, one had a tangential focus on Hawai‘i, and two had no explicit treatment of Hawai‘i. However, within the two sections that had no mention of Hawai‘i in the course description or listed reading materials, mentors at the instructors’ invitations taught a Hawai‘i-themed unit. Furthermore, several of these sections paired a Kanaka Maoli instructor with a Kanaka Maoli mentor, a dynamic which one mentor explained
required its own kind of careful performance of identity: “I wanted to make sure that we introduced ourselves as Hawaiian... without making everyone hyper-aware of that, being intimidated, that we’re just going to be all Hawaiian and that's all we’re good for.” Such pairings, the mentor explained, require “mapping” strategies for “establishing that role in a way that's constructive” (PCR).

I first read all 486 conference logs and 41 weekly memos from these eight sections, identifying any that seemed to exhibit some kind of Hawai‘i-specific mentoring for further analysis. Were I able to read these logs entirely from the same cultural framework in which they were written, I no doubt would have recognized additional levels of *kaona.* In my subsequent rounds of coding, I worked with the 134 logs and 20 memos I had identified as being directly applicable to the study at hand, coding these artifacts of mentors’ work according to the place-based actions related to Hawai‘i that mentors depicted themselves performing. Logs and memos were coded at the unit level of the clause; as such, a single log or memo could and frequently did address more than one mentoring action related to Hawai‘i. I presented mentors at the participant check roundtable with an initial list of 31 Hawai‘i-related mentoring actions, and the ensuing discussion helped me to identify several categories to be added or further subdivided. For example, one topic I had failed to recognize as a place-based mentoring action was helping students to learn one another’s names and to approach each other as cultural informants. A Kanaka Maoli mentor in the roundtable explained that FYC students in her sections frequently have not known each other’s names well into the semester. When given an opportunity to teach, this mentor has begun by facilitating a class-wide roundtable, modeled after Hawaiian introduction protocols, in which students share their names, a story behind their names, what they want to be called in class, and their paper
topics. The mentor explained that forging these relationships across peers constitutes an important element of her mentoring pedagogy in relation to Hawai‘i, as she works both inside and outside of class “to keep students aware of one another, because it’s easy to get lost in the mentor-student, instructor-student relationship; to remind them that they have peers that are either local, or Native Hawaiian, or not so; to remind them that they do have cultural informants in addition to the mentor or the instructor” (PCR). When I re-coded all logs and memos with this additional category in mind, fully 22 instances surfaced in which mentors depicted themselves facilitating students’ learning of one another’s names and/or approaching their peers as sources of teaching and learning. The entire coding process was recursive, and the codes that emerged are the result of re-reading these logs and memos on at least eight different occasions and adjusting the categories based upon each additional reading. Ultimately, I compiled a list of 40 mentoring actions related to Hawai‘i across the eight sections in this sub-study. This list of mentoring actions, including the combined totals of logs and memos associated with each, is displayed in Table 5.1.
### Table 5.1
List of Mentoring Actions in Relation to Hawai‘i from Conference Logs and Weekly Memos Across a Sub-Sampling of Eight Sections with Kanaka Maoli Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Action related to Hawai‘i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Directing students to cultural and scholarly sources by Native Hawaiians and/or to UHM’s Hawaiian and Pacific Collections (n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encouraging students to learn each others’ names and to approach each other as resources for teaching and learning (n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facilitating connections between research from Hawai‘i-based sources and students’ own experiences and values (and vice versa) (n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working to stoke student interest and engagement in Hawai‘i-based research and writing assignments (n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Working to assist, encourage, and build confidence in students facing educational and/or economic disadvantage (n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Offering background, suggesting ideas, and proposing possible directions for students’ writing assignments grounded in the mentor’s knowledge of Hawai‘i and the student (n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Addressing criteria for what makes a reliable source when writing about Hawai‘i (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teaching a class or giving a classroom presentation on a Hawai‘i-based topic (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching about the Hawaiian language (diacritical markings, meaning of words, etc.) (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “Talking story” with students to build rapport and to learn more about their backgrounds, interests, and perspectives (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Observing student resistance toward engaging with Hawai‘i in FYC (in the form of complaints, body language, displays of emotion ranging from boredom to anger) (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sharing Hawaiian knowledge and ways of knowing with students (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Questioning hegemonic (geo)political perspectives about Hawai‘i (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Assisting students at framing their work in larger (geo)political concepts and critical analyses (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Observing complexity and encouraging space for respectful disagreement (with instructor, mentor, assigned texts) about Hawai‘i-related issues (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Noting students’ enthusiasm for and interest in Hawai‘i-centered topics and texts (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Coaching students on how to balance their schoolwork with their responsibilities to family, while coming from a place of understanding and supporting the value of prioritizing family in Hawaiian and other &quot;local&quot; cultures (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Directing students to additional reliable (though generally unspecified) sources for Hawai‘i-related topics (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Analyzing (and sharing insights on) the cultural dynamics of Hawai‘i’s classrooms (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Inquiring into students’ reasons for students choosing to attend UHM, while reflecting on how problematic motives and initial impressions might be addressed through mentoring (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Considering and/or addressing how context shapes language use and interpretation, particularly the context of Hawai‘i (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Refraining from outright critique of perceived ethnocentric comments by students in favor of less direct approaches intended to foster rapport-building and possibilities for long-term teaching about Hawai‘i (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Reflecting upon how Hawaiian values and perspectives inform the mentor’s own practices (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Suggesting Hawai‘i-centered topics to stoke students’ interest in reading, writing, and research (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Directing students to English language newspaper sources based in Hawai‘i (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Helping students understand the relevance of course materials that are not specifically Hawai‘i-based (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Setting forth Native Hawaiian and/or Pacific Islander authors as models for writing (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Dialoguing with students about differences between their home cultures and the cultures of UHM (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Recognizing difficulties faced by students from the continental U.S. in finding the means of authority to write about Hawai‘i-based research topics (n=3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. Discussing a student's learning about Hawai‘i in other UHM courses (most frequently Hawaiian Studies and Ethnic Studies) (n=3)
31. Being problematically singled out as a representative for all Hawaiians (n=3)
32. Correcting factually inaccurate statements or other misinterpretations about Hawaiian history and present-day Hawai‘i (n=2)
33. Encouraging continental US students to research and write about their hometowns as storied places with indigenous histories (n=2)
34. Reaching out to students who expressed feelings of missing home or who indicated that they were having difficulty transitioning to living in Honolulu (students could be coming from neighbor islands, other Pacific Islands, the continental US, or additional countries) (n=2)
35. Encouraging students who told the mentor that they were planning to drop out of college altogether to continue their educations in one of UH's community colleges (n=2)
36. Coaching Native Hawaiian students on how to take advantage of opportunities fund their education through scholarships for Native Hawaiian students (n=1)
37. Conversing in, talking about, or encouraging students’ written and oral uses of Hawai’i Creole English (HCE) or Pidgin (n=1)
38. Helping students to revise work for submission to Nā Mana’o: A Journal Devoted to First-Year Composition at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (n=1)
39. Listening to continental US students who confide that they feel personally attacked and/or alienated by assigned readings or class discussions addressing the politics of place (n=1)
40. Working to support students who intend to transfer off-island to pursue their professed educational goals and/or life interests, while often underscoring the value of the current FYC course and/or the Mānoa experience (n=1)

In the next section, I present in greater detail on these Hawai‘i-related mentoring actions, grouping them according to three overarching categories: (1) supporting students’ place-based writing about Hawai‘i; (2) recognizing teachable moments regarding issues of language, politics, and culture in Hawai‘i; and (3) factoring trinary (geo)demographics into mentoring approaches. After presenting each category, I offer examples from Kanaka Maoli mentors’ conference logs and reflective memos that illustrate the rich ways in which these mentors wrote about their work in relation to Hawai‘i.

**Analyses of Mentoring Actions Related to Hawai‘i Performed by Kanaka Maoli Mentors**

**Supporting Students’ Place-Based Writing about Hawai‘i**

The category addresses those interventions aimed at supporting students’ place-based writing about Hawai‘i. Specific mentoring actions included the following: directing students to cultural and scholarly sources by Native Hawaiians and/or to UHM’s Hawaiian and Pacific Collections; directing students to English language newspaper
sources based in Hawai‘i; directing students to additional reliable (though generally unspecified) sources for Hawai‘i-related topics; addressing criteria for what makes a reliable source when writing about Hawai‘i; setting forth Native Hawaiian and/or Pacific Islander authors as models for writing; facilitating connections between research from Hawai‘i-based sources and students’ own experiences and values (and vice versa); offering background, suggesting ideas, and proposing possible directions for students’ writing assignments grounded in the mentor’s knowledge of Hawai‘i and the student; helping students to revise work for submission to Nā Mana‘o: A Journal Devoted to First-Year Composition at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa; and working to stoke student interest and engagement in Hawai‘i-based research and writing assignments.

The most frequently-repeated mentoring activity across the eight sections was directing students to sources that are rooted in Hawai‘i, a finding which corresponds to the Hawaiian value of seeking culturally appropriate sources, as reflected in the Hawaiian proverb, “nānā i ke kumu” or “look to the source.” When prompted to list the mentor’s roles in the class, one student wrote “Directed me to resources. Gave me background on sources. Helped generate ideas, especially on Hawaiian places and folklore” (SE 498), and another student note “She took us to the HAWN section of Hamilton Library and set up a tour for us” (SE 1662). As these student comments indicate, mentors often guided students to Hawai‘i-based sources through all-class visits or mentor-student trips to Hamilton Library’s Hawaiian and Pacific Collection. In other cases, mentors recommended specific texts to students, even sharing books from their personal libraries. In the example below, the mentor recounts a conference that occurred in her or his office and that was initiated when a student came by to pick up a course reading:
I used this opportunity to ask how her research was going on her wahi pana paper. She mentioned that she had brought a thumb drive to show me a rough draft of her paper to ask my advice on resources and if she was doing the assignment correctly. We looked at the paper together. She has gathered some good resources. I showed her some of my Hawaiian research tips, i.e. how to search for information on ulukau.org and wehewehe.org. I spoke with her about her sources and how to choose them wisely, i.e., a story she is using has earlier versions (Fornander, 1916) which are in Hawaiian and translated into English. I mentioned a book she might use which she hadn't considered and why the book was helpful and also a good source (Pukui’s work on Hawaiian proverbs). I mentioned that she should keep the topic narrow as the wahi pana is Mānoa (her choice) and to make sure the winds and rains she chose were associated with Mānoa and not the surrounding areas. I told that she could send another draft with questions via email and I could help her if she needs it. She thanked me for spending time with her talking about her paper. (CL 2659)

Some variant of the wahi pana paper, an assignment inviting students to research Native Hawaiian knowledge about storied places, has been used across multiple place-based sections of first-year composition at UHM. In many cases, the assignment asks students to work with a suite of sources they were previously unaware of, and in the case of this log, the student is able to check the validity of her sources with the mentor. After confirming the student’s research to date, the mentor offers her “some of my Hawaiian research tips,” including pointers for utilizing electronic search engines for Native Hawaiian sources and a specific book that would be of help to the student. (I should note here that I myself learned of ulukau.org and wehewehe.org from this mentor’s log, and I have utilized these resources on multiple occasions in composing this dissertation.) In pointing the student toward additional sources, the mentor offers her some Hawai‘i-specific guidance for “how to choose them wisely,” including the importance of a work’s
dates and its translation history. The mentor also elaborates on an appropriate scope for this Hawai‘i-specific writing genre, cautioning the student to select rains and winds associated with the selected wahi pana of Mānoa “rather than the surrounding areas.” On the most immediate of levels, the mentoring this student received enabled her to perform more successfully on the assignment at hand, an assignment that demanded the student to enact all three of Jon McKenzie’s categories of organizational, cultural, and technological performance.23 Furthermore, the student left with strategies for future Hawai‘i-centered research as well as with an awareness of Hawaiian knowledge regarding the uniqueness and significance of the rains and winds she would experience over the course of her college education in Mānoa valley.

An additional example of mentors supporting and enriching students’ place-based writing came in a different FYC section, with a different mentor, but a similar assignment. The following series of two logs relates the mentor’s work with a student who was struggling with the assignment. The first conference took place in Sinclair Library and lasted 20 minutes:

Mayumi came in because she was having trouble finding stories about the place she chose. I showed her that she would find stories easier if she looked under the Hawaiian name instead of the English, and then I helped her find sources which might shed more light on the stories. Once we straightened out some of these things, Mayumi had a much better idea of what she was supposed to do. (CL 4963)

Approximately one week later, this student returned for another 30-minute conference in Sinclair Library on the same assignment:

Mayumi was very confused about the angle she was supposed to take for her paper. We had discussed a few ideas the last time we met, but then they turned out to be a little too broad or a little too obscure for her to adequately cover in the timeframe of the paper.
She lives in Hawai‘i Kai, and so I explained what some of the names in Hawai‘i Kai meant or how they were changed in newer times, and she kept saying how it was interesting how she had lived in Hawai‘i Kai her whole life and didn’t know any of these stories. We talked about how maybe that would be a good approach to take to her paper, and she hit upon the idea of telling the stories of the main geographical features she could see from her house and then discussing what factors allowed her to live in the area for so long without learning any of the stories I told her. (CL 2915)

The student is clearly outside of her comfort zone with this assignment, approaching the mentor with difficulties finding Hawai‘i-based sources, confusions about what angle to take, and challenges connecting the assignment with her own experiences and values. The mentor shares Hawaiian stories related to geographical features the student could see from the location of her family’s home, to which the student responds with surprise at never having heard these stories before. The mentor, then, is able to help the student find in her own personal response an angle for her paper. The mentor’s follow-up discussion with the student on “what factors allowed her to live in the area for so long without learning any of the stories,” not only facilitated connections between Native Hawaiian knowledge and the student’s own experiences and values but also helped the student to frame her own lack of awareness of Hawaiian place knowledge in larger (geo)political concepts and analyses, a mentoring strategy I analyze in the next section.

Recognizing Teachable Moments Regarding Issues of Language, Culture, and Politics in Hawai‘i

The second overarching category of Hawai‘i-related mentoring addresses those situations in which mentors recognized teachable moments regarding issues of language, politics, and culture in Hawai‘i. To make this list of actions more readable, I present them according to each of the sub-categories of language, culture, and politics, while
acknowledging that any separation of these mutually-informing categories is, of course, artificial. Examples of mentors discerning teachable moments regarding issues of language in Hawai‘i include teaching about the Hawaiian language (diacritical markings, meaning of words, etc.); conversing in, talking about, or encouraging students’ written and oral uses of Hawai‘i Creole English (HCE) or Pidgin; and considering and/or addressing how context shapes language use and interpretation, particularly the context of Hawai‘i. Teachable moments that mentors recognized on issues of culture include analyzing (and sharing insights on) the cultural dynamics of Hawai‘i’s classrooms; encouraging students to learn one another’s names and to see each other as cultural resources for teaching and learning; sharing Native Hawaiian knowledge and ways of knowing with students; teaching a class or giving a classroom presentation on a Hawai‘i-based topic; and discussing a student’s learning about Hawai‘i from other UHM courses. Examples of mentors recognizing teachable moments on political issues related to Hawai‘i include correcting factually inaccurate statements or other misinterpretations about Hawaiian history and present-day Hawai‘i; questioning hegemonic (geo)political perspectives about Hawai‘i; encouraging continental US students to research and write about their hometowns as storied places with indigenous histories; assisting students at framing their work in larger (geo)political concepts and critical analyses; observing student resistance toward engaging with Hawai‘i in FYC in the form of complaints, body language, or displays of emotion ranging from boredom to anger; refraining from outright critique of perceived ethnocentric comments that may alienate the student in favor of less direct approaches intended to foster rapport-building and possibilities for long-term teaching about Hawai‘i; observing complexity and encouraging space for respectful
disagreement (with the instructor, mentor, fellow students, assigned texts) about Hawai‘i-related issues; and inquiring into students’ reasons for choosing UHM, while reflecting on how problematic motives and initial impressions might be addressed through mentoring. As the list indicates, the mentors’ recognitions of teachable moments resulted in a variety of responses, ranging from direct instruction, to indirect forms of teaching through stories and parallel examples, to reflections and analyses on potential future opportunities for teaching and learning about Hawai‘i.

The following series of two logs relates a mentor’s work with a student from the northeastern US. The first log narrative describes a 30-minute “intake interview” which took place in the mentor’s office during the second week of the semester:

Her calendar squares were homemade and highlighted. Perfect little shapes. While I could not readily identify her color system, I knew the classic Sharpie pink, green, and blue had important academic meaning for Hillary Jones. “You’re just like me,” I told her excitedly, opening my own black planner to pages of squares. Laughter. Perfect little shapes.

At our first meeting in my office, she was eager to share her life. Coming from what she called the “judgmental halls” of [City, Northeastern State], Hillary immediately warmed to Honolulu’s aloha spirit and hopes that her “friends” (her own quotations) will be adventurous enough to visit Waikiki.

I plucked The Value of Hawai‘i from my desk and asked, “How are you liking this book?” [The instructor] began the semester with the new anthology.

“I’m liking it, but...” her fingers twisted in her lap. “But, um, I don’t know – it’s like making us... like we’re bad.”

“Who is we?” I asked, wanting to guide her to her own specificity.

“People from the mainland.” At first, I wanted to re-situate the term “mainland.” I wanted to re-examine the concepts of “main” and “land” and suggest that in Hawai‘i the
“main land” is this land. However, her twisting fingers and nervous green eyes led me elsewhere.

“You will find helpful challenges in this book,” I told her. Since Hillary is also taking Introduction to Women’s Studies. . . I decided to connect the “helpful challenges” she will encounter in that course to those she will learn not only in our English 100 course but also in her daily life as a new student from the continent.

“I trust you,” she said. . . We ended our conversation on a playful note. Discussing her revision weaknesses, she explained that writing a sentence is easy but making it read better is harder. I assured her that everyone “in the zone” writes like that, and in my role as her mentor I would help her to build a larger vocabulary and to learn grammatical variety so that her “zone language” is never punished. We want to make t-shirts: Zone Language. (CL 5593)

In this first extended mentor-student conversation, the mentor works to establish trust, highlighting the connections between herself, a Native Hawaiian graduate student mentor, and the Caucasian first-year student from the continental US. The mentor claims early in the conversation, “you’re just like me,” and then works to build identification through their shared time management strategies, mutual interest in Women’s Studies, and the playful imagining of a collaborative t-shirt making project. Given the mentor’s apparent success at building rapport, I wondered if the student’s use of the term “we” was a form of over-identification, a blurring of the student’s and mentor’s subject positions. However, as the mentor probes the student’s use of the term, a process the mentor depicts as “guiding her to her own specificity,” it becomes apparent that “we” represents an imagined connection to people from the continental US and a kind of mainland orientation toward Hawai‘i more generally. Although the mentor explains that she “wanted to re-examine the concepts of ‘main’ and ‘land’ and suggest that in Hawai‘i is
the ‘main land’ is this land,” she consciously refrains from such outright critiques of the student’s ethno/geo-centric terminologies. Given the mentor’s reading of the student’s body language as “nervous,” the mentor favors instead a more gradual approach that might open future possibilities for teaching about Hawai‘i. In the brief space of the present conference, however, the mentor invites the student to begin processing her initial feelings of defensiveness in response to the assigned readings, encouraging her to approach both the course text and her additional coursework as “helpful challenges.” Amidst the many mentor-student connections forged, the mentor’s narrative maintains a distinct critical distance between the mentor’s and student’s ideologies, foreshadowing the kinds of mentoring that could occur in the space between their geopolitical orientations.

Approximately two months later, during the semester’s tenth week, the mentor conducted such a conference with “Hillary.” The mentor’s log indicated that this was their third conference of the semester, and that it took the form of a 50-minute meeting on a place-based writing assignment set in the mentor’s office. The mentor writes:

In their place-based narratives, students are struggling to connect their stories with what they’re learning about the value of place in Hawai‘i. As one of the few continental students in class, Hillary admitted to making no such connection in her draft. As I read her writing out loud, I immediately noticed a section that could springboard into a productive discussion. Describing [Town, Northeastern State], Hilary used Internet sources to report on its “history,” claiming that the first person to discover and settle the land was, in her own words, a “white fisherman” who established [Town] in the 1870s. Careful to channel my political instinct into a mentor opportunity, I re-read Hillary the sentence that made this claim.
“What is missing here?” I asked. Hillary made several guesses: a comma, an apostrophe, the white fisherman’s name. I re-read the sentence. Still, Hillary made grammatical suggestions.

“Do you think [Town name’s] land began in the 1870s?” Blankness. I made sure to speak slowly. “According to the story you found on this website, which you decided to use in your narrative and, thereby, connect you to this claim, there was no one on the land before this white fisherman. In the 1870s.” Hillary tilted her head as she nervously poked a zebra-striped fingernail into her mouth. Her eyes darted left to right. The “Aha!” moment was stirring in her mind.

“Did you think about what that means?” I asked her, almost softly. Her eyes stopped darting. “What is missing here, Hillary?” She removed her finger from her mouth and let it fall in her lap.

“Indians.” In our draft work, Hillary wrote “Natives” and “History” on one post-it. On another, she wrote phrases to indicate the four different points she planned to make in her next draft: 1) leaving out Native Americans; 2) Why didn’t it start earlier than 1870, the land is earlier; 3) information is absent; 4) name books/teachers who taught me about HI.

“I never thought about this like this,” she told me. “Thank you so much.” (CL 5561)

As in the first conference narrative with “Hillary,” the mentor depicts the interaction as an exercise in restraint in which the mentor is “careful to channel my political instinct into a mentor opportunity.” I also would argue that the mentor’s repeated references to “land” in this and the previous log are informed by Hawaiian understandings of ‘āina. To some small degree, the student was introduced to an understanding of land as ʻāina, or at least as having an indigenous history existing long before “the white fisherman” made his claims to it in the 1870s. The mentor also encouraged the student to read history for what is “absent” and who it is “leaving out,” an interpretive strategy that will serve the student
well in her concurrent Introduction to Women’s Studies course. The student’s fourth point of revision, to “name books/teachers who taught me about HI” indicates that she is beginning to make some of the critical connections that were absent at the conference’s beginning. This log also exemplifies how mentoring in relation to Hawai‘i prompted continental US students to research and write about their hometowns as storied places with indigenous histories. Perhaps this mentor’s work might inspire other educators working in locations outside Hawai‘i to make similar pedagogical moves.

While these Kanaka Maoli mentors held committed positions on issues of language, culture, and politics in Hawai‘i, they did not appear to demand that their students’ papers echoed positions identical to their own. Because of mentors’ non-grading roles, students were ostensibly less likely to feel the same kinds of pressure to write to (their perceptions of) mentors’ beliefs than they might to those of the instructor. The following conference log, written about a student addressing the U.S. military’s presence in Hawai‘i, evidences the ways in which mentors worked to help students form their own positions:

In her argumentative paper, Kristin attempted to negotiate a delicate balance between support for and critique of the military in Hawai‘i. With her [family member] working for Pearl Harbor and relatives participating in de-militarization groups in Okinawa, Kristin brought a particular ambivalence to her paper, which was reflected in its unsupported statements, poor transitions, and half-hearted conclusion. However, by reading her paper out loud and drawing attention to various contradictions made in her argument, Kristin and I were able to identify sections that needed to be moved, removed, or revisited with better research. Rather than discourage Kristin from her “in the middle” position, I acknowledged her privileged access to the different sides of the military
question and persuaded her to use her information both critically and creatively. (CL 6179)

Although my previous discussions with this mentor compel me to believe that the mentor would side unmistakably with the student’s family members engaged in de-militarization projects, the mentor encourages the student to highlight her own ambivalence, utilizing her “privileged access to the different sides of the military question” as a subject position from which to write. Endeavors to observe complexity and encourage space for respectful and well-researched disagreement (with the instructor, mentor, fellow students, assigned texts) about Hawai‘i-related issues formed a common thread across all of the mentors in this sub-sampling.

Factoring (Geo)demographics into One’s Mentoring Approaches

The third category addresses the ways in which mentors factored trinary (geo)demographics into their work. While the previous examples from mentors’ conference logs have addressed this facet of mentors’ work to varying degrees, this category focuses specifically upon how mentors combined their understandings of privilege and difference in Hawai‘i with their knowledge of individual students’ circumstances in order to respond to the challenges students encountered in their transitions to college writing and cultures. Examples include dialoguing with students about differences between their home cultures and the cultures of the university; coaching Native Hawaiian students on how to take advantage of opportunities to fund their education through scholarships for Native Hawaiian students; working to assist, encourage, and build confidence in students facing educational and/or economic disadvantage; coaching students on how to balance their schoolwork with their
responsibilities to family from a place of support for the value of prioritizing family in Hawaiian and other “local” cultures; encouraging students who told the mentor that they were planning to drop out of college altogether to continue their educations in one of UH’s community colleges; recognizing difficulties faced by students from the continental US in negotiating new surroundings and finding the means of authority to write about Hawai‘i-based research topics; listening to continental US students who confided that they felt personally attacked and/or alienated by assigned reading or class discussions addressing the politics of place; reaching out to students who expressed feelings of alienation or who noted difficulties transitioning to Honolulu; and working to support students who intended to transfer, while often underscoring the value of the current FYC course and/or the Mānoa experience. Additional mentoring actions addressed the potential mentors saw in drawing upon place-based approaches to engage students, and particularly students who graduated from high schools in Hawai‘i. Examples include “talking story” with students to build rapport and learn more about their backgrounds, interests, and perspectives; noting students’ enthusiasm for and interest in Hawai‘i-centered topics; suggesting Hawai‘i-centered topics to stoke students’ interest in reading, writing, and research; and helping students understand the relevance of course materials that are not specifically Hawai‘i-based. And finally, the category encompassed mentors’ reflections about how Native Hawaiian values and perspectives informed their own mentoring praxes and well as their observations about the problematic event of being singled out (either by students or the instructor) as representative of all Hawaiians.

Multiple examples in this category related to mentors working with students in the College Opportunities Program (COP), a summer and first-year residential program that
offers entrance to the university for “individuals who are Hawai‘i residents and who may not meet the minimum requirements for admission to the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM), are academically under prepared, economically disadvantaged, represent a positive role model to communities underrepresented at UHM, non-traditional, or in need of a structured college entry” (www.hawaii.edu/cop/). Mentors frequently described themselves going out of their way to assist COP students, as in the following conference log which describes a series of mentor-student interactions that took place after the semester was over:

Gayle was one of my most frequent visitors from last semester. She came to see me 8 times last semester, and I also looked at and commented on numerous drafts via email. She is a very hard worker and is very dedicated to getting her education, but I don't think she got the writing skills she should've from high school and then from the COP program [College Opportunities Program]. She graduated Summa Cum Laude from [Public School], so I know she got good grades, but when you look at her writing, you see that she was not given the necessary tools for writing at a college level. Anyway, I told all of my students from last semester that if they needed help, they could still come see me, so Gayle came to me with her essay for a scholarship application. I made the mistake of letting the discussion remain a strictly email discussion, and so we went through a series of emails over three weeks that consisted of an endless series of comments and revisions that only stopped because the essay was due. . . We would've had to meet several times regardless of whether it was via email or not, but I really feel it would've been much more beneficial to meet face-to-face because there were so many issues with her essay that it might've been easier just to sit there and talk them out. Her essay was a lot better by the time we were done, but I think we could've done a lot more work on it if we met. She intends to apply for the Hawai‘i Community Foundation scholarship as well, so I'll be sure to have her come in and meet for that one. (CL 4186)
Realizing the ways in which this student’s public schooling had failed her as well as the extent of the student’s efforts to improve her writing, the mentor voluntarily offers writing assistance beyond the instructor’s assignments and the sixteen-week period of semester. This mentoring is not only aimed at improving the student’s long-term writing abilities but also at assisting her in the very real rhetorical purpose of writing to fund her college education.

Another significant theme was encouraging students to engage in FYC through writing about Hawai‘i-centered topics. In the following example, the mentor works with a Native Hawaiian student to generate interest in a writing assignment:

As with the other students I saw this week, K____ 24 wasn’t sure what he wanted to write his argumentative essay on. He said he wanted to work on a Hawaiian issue but he wasn't sure which one. I asked him if anything pissed him off in the news lately. He brought up one of the situations on Kauai with iwi and we talked about how he could work that into a topic by trying to isolate some arguments in the case and evaluate them. He didn't leave with a thesis or anything, but I think we got enough of a framework going so that he could figure out what he wanted to write about. (CL 4996)

The mentor draws upon his rapport with the student as well as his knowledge of local current events to help the student pinpoint the topic of iwi (or the treatment of Native Hawaiian ancestors’ bones) on the student’s home island of Kauai, to identify arguments in the case, and to develop a “framework” for a paper topic that the student actually “wanted to write about.” In several cases, students from Hawai‘i confessed to mentors that they did not perceive any meaningful connections between English 100 and their personal interests. The following conference log depicts such a situation:

N____ also felt like reading and writing weren't really connected to her interest in Hawaiian language and culture. I think this is a feeling that is common to many of the
Hawaiian students that I have met with, so I think the strategy of showing them that the
skills that they learn in this class are important for their studies of Hawaiian stuff and that
the things they are interested in are worthy of study will be a good tack to take. (CL 4164)

The mentor works to bridge the student’s interest in Hawaiian language and culture with
the literacies required in FYC by adopting the “strategy” of demonstrating that FYC
skills are transferrable to Hawaiian topics and that Hawaiian topics are considered
“worthy of study” in the context of FYC. Another mentor in this sub-grouping also
observed this trend of students not engaging with certain topics—either because
assignments were not place-based enough to seem immediately relevant or because they
were so intensely place-based that they were perceived by certain students as alienating,
imimidating, or provincial. This mentor used a weekly memo following her first round of
student meetings to problematize students’ orientations to writing as topic-centered:

One of my main observations this week is how often the “If I Like It or Not” response
appears in Intake Interviews. There are variations, of course: “It depends on if I like the
topic,” “If I’m interested in the topic,” or “If the topic isn’t boring.” Still, when asked if they
like to write, many of my students replied with a lukewarm answer that automatically
characterized writing as topic-centered and, therefore, easily alienating. From a general
perspective, topics do shape writing in definitive ways. Yet as each student left my office
this week, I wondered: why do they think that writing begins and ends with a topic rather
than a question? For instance, in the case of our English 100 course, the foundational
text for the first formal essay is Jon Osorio’s “Hawaiian Issues” from The Value of
Hawai‘i. Therefore, according to one student, the topic is “Hawaiian stuff,” and whether a
student can write well about “Hawaiian stuff” depends not on the extent of research done,
previous knowledges acquired, or commitment made to editing and revision but to “If I
Like It or Not.” “If I like the topic, I can write,” a female student explained to me. The key
word in her statement is “can.” Should I make the effort to distinguish between “can” and
“will” or is that going too fast? Perhaps my first step should be to remove the easy relationship between “topic” and the act of writing. How can I show my students that writing isn’t just teachers suggesting a topic and students reacting “I like it” or “I don’t like it”? How can I energize their approach to writing as a comprehensive experience that involves questioning, rethinking, exploring, creating, and re-creating? How do I get away from writing as mere topics? Since my question involves finding a way to give flesh and spirit to the act of writing - which, as it stands now in my English 100 course, is just “writing” without any specific act or series of acts - what I may do is go step by step through a hypothetical situation in which I am given a topic that does not necessarily interest me. I may show various ways I try to find an interesting question I have about the topic and, from there, build a path into writing. (WM 65)

The mentor theorizes that much of the alienation student writers attribute to the geo-demographic nature of a prompt can be traced to students’ tendency to feel as though they are writing in response to the instructor’s paper topics rather than in response to their own self-sponsored questions. While this mentor-researcher had not previously read composition scholarship that illustrates how successful student writers reframe instructors’ writing prompts as their own self-invented lines of inquiry (Bartholomae “Inventing the University;” Bawarshi “Sites of Invention”), she arrives at similar conclusions to this groundbreaking work from her own observations of and interactions with student writers. However, the mentor extends Bartholomae, Bawarshi, and others’ work by proposing the pedagogical approach of walking students through a hypothetical performative scenario in which she (the mentor) is presented with a writing topic that does not initially appeal to her and then of modeling ways of asking interest-generating questions about the topic. Leading students step-by-step through the mentor’s own processes in order to help them “build a path into writing” is again a form of bridging, a
tribute to the *mo‘o* described by Marie Alohalani Brown in the chapter’s first layer. When I asked the author of this memo whether she had been thinking of her mentoring in relation to *mo‘o*, she initially replied no, “not specifically,” but quickly qualified this statement by claiming that she loved this way of approaching her mentoring and explaining that *mo‘o* on both conscious and unconscious levels inform almost everything she does.

While these examples may seem a bit one-sided at first glance, as though the mentor is somewhat uni-directionally conveying cultural and writerly knowledge to students, the mentors in these examples were able to glean geo-demographic insights from their unique positionalities about how students respond to issues of place generally and to classroom discourses related to their ancestral homeland of Hawai‘i specifically. One Kanaka Maoli mentor addressed the place-based learning afforded by the mentor-researcher position with the following illustration of a teacher’s attempts to explain the process of the colonization of Hawai‘i to first-year students:

The teacher asked everyone their ethnicities, then proceeded to tell all “non-Hawaiians” (these ID categories were never troubled/interrogated) that although they and their families might live in Hawai‘i, they belonged in their “homelands” and should consider tracing their ancestry “back home.” Scanning the room, I noticed a look of confusion on most faces, especially the ones who were told, after attempting to “justify” their presence in Hawai‘i by citing 3rd/4th/etc. generation status, that they still “belonged” in places on earth that many of the students had never seen. . . Since this classroom experience, I’ve tried to encourage students to interrogate all the markers (e.g. ethnicity, gender, etc.) we’re encouraged to take as givens, to think and act locally AND globally, beyond the imagined boundaries of space, and to rely on their actual lived experiences instead of
abstractions of what we think we know about ourselves and other human beings.

(anonymous email correspondence with permission)

The experience of witnessing this classroom performance from the third classroom actor’s position, carefully observing both teacherly production and student reception, prompted this writing mentor to reflect upon how s/he might approach similar topics in future classroom scenes in more nuanced and pedagogically productive ways that are not rooted in binary geo-demographic logics.

While many of the mentors in the participant check roundtables claimed that the Hawai‘i-related mentoring approaches analyzed in this section did not apply to their work or applied in only limited ways, a few mentors claimed that this layer of the palimpsest was indeed reflective of their approaches. Here is what one mentor said of the section’s resonance:

I thought it was really helpful for me and makes me feel better that I can, as a mentor, relate to a lot of those experiences. Especially in the sections that you have in here about mentors’ experiences, Kanaka Maoli mentors. And I’ve been kind of using that as an advantage, to inform people who are not from here about things. Like that palimpsest metaphor is really good for that, too. To inform them of layers underneath what they are trying to write about. An example I have, one student who is writing about the Mauna Kea telescopes. He’s not from here, but he mentions the Hawaiian cultural perspective in it very briefly. So I kind of point him towards Native Hawaiian testimonies, and I also point him to Kanaka Maoli perspectives that are for telescopes, too. It’s not just black and white. I think it’s good to complicate things for them. So I like that fractal quality of that palimpsest metaphor working with Kanaka Maoli mentors, too. (PCR)

For this mentor, the palimpsest metaphor offers a way of conceptualizing his intellectual and cultural work of revealing to students the “layers beneath” their paper topics, including the complexity of perspectives within Native Hawaiian communities. The
mentor theorizes further that the palimpsest metaphor has a “fractal quality,” and in the example of the student writing on the Mauna Kea telescope controversy, the mentor leverages his positionality to introduce the student to Native Hawaiian sources that add depth to an otherwise cursory mention of Hawaiian cultural perspectives. While I had originally thought of this chapter as adding layers to discussions of place-based composition, the Kanaka Maoli mentors in particular taught me how place-based work also reveals those enduring inscriptions beneath.

**Additional Perspectives on Mentoring in Hawai‘i**

It is important to clarify that many of these actions were also performed by non-Kanaka Maoli mentors. To probe the degree to which these mentoring actions in relation to Hawai‘i occurred across a wider sampling of sections, I took the list of mentoring actions from the eight sections with Kanaka Maoli mentors and used it as the basis for coding the 1,289 logs and 142 memos from sixteen additional sections with non-Kanaka Maoli mentors. Eight of these sections had mentors who graduated from high schools in the continental US and/or Canada, and eight had mentors who graduated from high schools in Hawai‘i.25 The memos and logs from the eight sections with North American mentors included evidence of just over half (n=24) of the 40 Hawai‘i-related mentoring actions, whereas the memos and logs from the eight sections with “local” mentors evidenced over three-fourths (n=31) of the 40 categories. A table summarizing these findings can be found in Appendix BD. While the relative percentages of these actions were quite different across groupings, I place little emphasis on numerical trends (due to the relatively small sample size and non-random sampling), highlighting simply the presence of these various actions.
The next sections were inspired by the participant check roundtable discussions in which non-\textit{Kanaka Maoli} mentors reflected on ways they have deployed their identities to mentor in Hawai‘i. I consider first how certain (mostly Caucasian) mentors from the continental US have drawn upon their own transitional experiences to Hawai‘i in working with students. I analyze second how mentors who were born and raised in Hawai‘i, but are not \textit{Kanaka Maoli}, inhabit the role of interstitial agents in complicating binaries related to identity and place. In writing about mentors from the continental US, I found myself frequently reflecting on my own arrival to Hawai‘i in 2006 and identifying with many of the experiences mentors shared about their own early encounters with politics of place in graduate coursework, the FYC classroom, and other off-campus events. I also found myself feeling a strong sense of indebtedness to all those who have mentored me, and continue to mentor me, in relation to Hawai‘i.

\textit{Mentors from the Continental US: Drawing on One’s Own Transitional Experiences to Mentor Students in Relation to Hawai‘i}

Mentors who graduated from high schools in the continental US accounted for 26\% of the total sections in my overall study. While some of these mentors claimed to embrace the ways in which mentoring in Hawai‘i was inflected by the politics of place, others confessed to feeling “very intimidated by trying to breach issues of place” with students, particularly given that many of them had lived in Hawai‘i for a very short time.

\textsuperscript{26} As one mentor admitted, “Place definitely does matter here, and it’s something we do have to negotiate constantly, even if we’re uncomfortable with it” (PCR). Another mentor wrote about experiencing similar anxieties in a weekly memo titled “A white/mainland mentor in Hawai‘i.”
My biggest fear upon entering the mentoring program was my ethnicity and position in relation to my students and this Hawai’ian27 environment. I was very worried about the ways I would come across to my students if they were local individuals. . . I was careful with the local students during our discussions, whether they were Caucasian or not. I encouraged them to write about their own experiences, and listened when they discussed their lives before entering UH. I also found myself in the position of explaining a lot of Hawai’ian culture, not in terms of definitions and meanings but in terms of complications and ongoing discussions in the academic setting, to many of the students from the mainland. In other words, I tried to explain the ways in which many ongoing issues in Hawai’i are very complex and the students should be careful to research everything they can before writing about, and therefore representing, these issues. With each student, regardless of their position in relation to their topic, I stressed research above all else. I warned of the consequences of misrepresenting individuals and cultures. I realized that I had to do this work in similar forms during each of my mentoring meetings. Therefore, I saw my role as a mentor encompassing something similar to a cultural translator, or cultural advisor. Part of enabling the students—again, regardless of their ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds—to enter the university setting (especially at the University of Hawai’i) involved this cultural ambassador-esque work. (WM 668)

The author of this memo depicted herself learning about Hawai’i from her “local” students, while teaching about Hawai’i to her continental US students. Across all the demographic groupings of students, the mentor “stressed research above all else,” underscoring the importance of representing individuals and cultures with the greatest degree of accuracy, complexity, and respect possible. In a moment of particular reflexivity, the mentor explains that she worked to follow assiduously the very cultural advice she gave students, realizing the importance of her own example in this facet of mentoring. The mentor also names several significant place-based roles that she
understood herself to be performing: that of cultural translator, cultural advisor, and cultural ambassador. These roles, she theorized, facilitated students’ entrance into the university generally, and the University of Hawai‘i specifically. While this mentor believed that her being Caucasian and from the “mainland” did not interfere noticeably with rapport-building, another mentor of this same demographic observed “a disconnect with the Hawaiian students in the class,” and speculated that the distance may have something to do with “a cultural barrier where they don’t feel that they can connect to me or talk to me” (PCR). However, several mentors from the continental US wrote and spoke about their newcomer status as a potential strength, leveraging their own recent and ongoing transitional experiences to mentor students with greater compassion, approachability, and reflexivity.

Across the eight coded sections with mentors from North America, mentors repeatedly (n=14) described themselves learning about Hawai‘i from their students. In addition to learning from the papers students composed, mentors also wrote about instances in which students explained to them facets of island geography, meanings of Hawaiian words, complexities of local politics, and suggestions of hikes and snorkeling spots. One mentor who had lived in Hawai‘i for only a few weeks concluded an intake interview by asking a local student about “things to do in the area.” This question, she explained, invited the student “to take on this role of teacher.” She further theorized, “I think this allowed him to see me more as an equal, so it was good for rapport building” (CL 3963). Program administrators encouraged mentors to look for ways to theorize their work not as a one-way transfer of writing skills and college wisdom to “kids,” but rather
as a reciprocal engagement in teaching and learning. Discussions with students about place afforded many mentors such a possibility.

These mentors also occasionally found local students wanting to learn from them about “the mainland” and in some cases (n=6) to discuss their ambitions of transferring to a “mainland college.” Mentors from Hawai‘i who either attended college on the US continent or lived there for a stint also addressed students’ interest in their off-island experiences. One mentor explained that he approached local students’ occasional positioning of him as “mainland expert” with caution:

At least in my experience, if you’re from the mainland it can be both advantageous and disadvantageous. I guess disadvantageous if they feel that you’re an outsider, you’re not part of it, and so forth. And then advantageous, but in a troubling way, where a lot of students have expressed to me the interest of moving to the mainland as this aspirational goal. And then, in a way not only are we mentors, so they look up to us, but on top of it if you’re from the mainland they think you’re even greater than you are. So that, to me, has placed me occasionally in this troubling position where I feel like students are clinging to my every word or advice, and I don’t like that. So I’ve tried to be conscious about it, and try to ask questions rather than tell them what to do. Or just to be thoughtful about it. But the dynamic can work in different ways, and I guess that has an impact on my mentoring approach. I’m a little more cautious about it when I sense that attitude. (PCR)

The dynamic this mentor pinpointed—that of sometimes feeling put on a pedestal by local students who aspired to move to the continental US—demonstrates the kind of reflexivity about place and positionality demanded by the position of writing mentor in Hawai‘i. Paradoxically, many of these same mentors recognized that they themselves came to Hawai‘i out of a desire to “get away from the mainland.”
In a participant check roundtable, one Caucasian mentor from the continental US shared an extended example of how her (geo)demographic background opened avenues for place-based mentoring. Because this example indicates what I believe to be an important contribution of trinary classrooms, I quote at length from the dialogue between this mentor (M) and myself as researcher (R): 29

M: In the class I’m currently in, it’s a pretty even diversified class, and so you have maybe 1/3 from the mainland, 1/3 that are ESL students, and 1/3 that are local. It’s the mainland students who are having the most trouble in the classroom. It’s not their work is having the most trouble, but it’s the communication, it’s the local authors that are being brought in, and they don’t feel like they can comment on those authors, and on those works. And so a lot of my meetings have to do with that dynamic, which is interesting.

R: So are they bringing up those things to you?

M: Yes, yes. Just especially recently in the last two-and-a half weeks. It’s been, um. Because we’re reading about the Queen [Lili‘uokalani] and the overthrow, and lots of those kinds of works. And so there’s a certain uncomfortable dynamic for those students, not knowing where their place is in the classroom.

R: Do you have a sense that when they’re reading those, they’re taking them as a personal affront rather than a political category of analysis? 30

M: Definitely. Absolutely.

R: What kind of space do you feel that you have, or are able to use as a mentor, to help them process this in more productive ways, perhaps. Or--

M: I think experience is, is something I have to offer them. And also having some sense of place here, because I’ve been here for over three years. So I went through it as a grad student, going into my first class and reading some of these things and being like, “Oh my god! [Laughter.] You know. Should I even be here? Right?” And so I could really identify with that, and really tried to enable them to look at this as a, as a
political piece, or as a creative and political piece, and not as a threatening— not as a threatening thing, but also as a learning tool, you know, to learn about where you are in cultures, and how exploitation works, and generations of this. And to look at this as a growing thing, you know. So--

R: So you talked about maybe starting by identifying with them. And saying, you know, “I’ve experienced this similar”—

M: Right.

R: How, then, when you shift the dynamic to helping them take it as a challenge, or reconsider, or something. How, how do you make that move?

M: Um, well, I’m doing that now. I’m kind of getting through just letting them talk about being frustrated, or feeling like they don’t have a voice.

R: So a lot of it is listening, just letting them know--

M: Definitely, yeah. But in their writing, now, um, you know it’s so black and white at that age, I think. It’s like, “you take a side.” You either agree that you don’t belong here, or you defend why this isn’t you, you know, and “this argument isn’t relevant,” or something. And so I’m now trying to, right now, take them through the blending process. That there are both sides, and that it doesn’t have to be a biased argument, you know, on the blogs and on some of the papers in class. So, I’m hoping that through that I’ll help them, maybe through an exploratory paper, or a research paper, see all the different perspectives. Not to go into the paper with just one opinion, I guess, one thesis. To write the thesis at the end. So that’s where I’m at now, hoping that will help with the communication in the classroom. . .

I’m not sure if I looked local-- I’m not sure. I’m sure, actually, that they wouldn’t have brought that up to me. Because I think that they maybe felt safe saying, “I can’t--.” You know, we have participation points. And so most of the students from the mainland, um, don’t participate. And they’re really bright, and they do well on their papers. And so I asked them, and those were the comments that came out. So it was like, “I don’t
feel like I deserve a voice in the class because of this conversation.” And, and that’s a challenge.

R: Yeah, that is. It’s making me think that I hadn’t really looked at the dynamic of a mentor who doesn’t read to students as “local,” and then what that allows students to open up about . .

M: Right. And one thing I’ll just add to that, so that that's clear is the instructor is in no way-- I mean, she’s choosing local literature for lots of really creative reasons. And in no way is her teaching, sort of, taking a bias with it. She really opens--

R: She’s not polemical about the way she approaches—

M: No, she’s not. So it did surprise me how constricted some of the students felt. (PCR) The mentor is convinced that her non-local status allowed the continental US students to feel comfortable enough to discuss their discomfort with the course subject matter and material. As UHM Professor Cristina Bacchilega explains in Legendary Hawaiʻi and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism, classroom assignments which ask students to “confront power differentials” are “undeniably grounds for discomfort” (21), and I could draw examples from program records of mentors from virtually all demographic groupings helping students from virtually all demographic groupings to process such discomforts. Judy Rohrer’s analyses in Haoles in Hawaiʻi shed light on mentors’ observations about the specific kinds of discomfort continental (and usually Caucasian) students experience in classroom discussion about race in Hawaiʻi.31 Rohrer explains:

As continental white people, we also have internalized the idea that it is not nice to talk about race, at least not publicly, and especially not in racially mixed company. It is commonly believed that talking about race or noticing race is a sign of racism—and above almost all else, we want to avoid being called racist.
That does not mean we do not talk about race (especially when in the company of other white people), but we know that the polite thing to do is to be “colorblind,” to ignore race (regardless of what we actually think about it). By not talking about it, we are also able to continue to pretend race— and therefore racism—do not exist. And then we get to Hawai‘i, where we are suddenly in the racial minority, which is uncomfortable or at least unusual for most of us, and all around us people are using racial terms and talking about race. (2-3)

Rohrer pinpoints many of the reasons why Caucasian first-year students from the continental US who have little-to-no previous experiences in publically discussing race are particularly uncomfortable with classroom discussions of the topic, compared to their local counterparts who have grown up in mixed-race situations where race is frequently discussed. Since the mentor in the extended dialogue had processed similar feelings of discomfort in her own graduate coursework, she felt well-positioned to listen sympathetically, share her own experiences, and encourage students to engage in classroom discussions of Hawai‘i-centered topics.32

The mentor admits to initially reacting to discussions of identity and place in her own graduate courses with the question: “Should I even be here?” Given, however, that the mentor and her continental US students are in Hawai‘i, at least for the present semester, the mentor is able to model ways of thinking about one’s presence in Hawai‘i in more complex terms. As Judy Rohr argues, the mentor’s and students’ responses are typical of many Caucasians who come to Hawai‘i from the continental US:

The moment at which white people who move to Hawai‘i are first racially marked as haole is pivotal. Confronted with the unfamiliar label “haole,” we respond from
what we know, and that is usually our experience of race on the continent. And so we are surprised because in Hawai‘i we are made aware of our whiteness, whereas on the continent, for the most part, we were oblivious to it or took it for granted. Unlike the continent, whiteness in Hawai‘i is always marked and often challenged. (2)

Although Rohr’s collective “we” certainly does not apply to the experiences of all white people on the continental US, many Caucasian first-year students from the continent who come to UHM do experience that “pivotal” slap-in-the-face moment of being made aware of their whiteness and having their racial privilege challenged for the first time, and sometimes in the context of FYC. Students often do not know how to process this challenge productively, particularly amidst the swirl of other transitional challenges they face in their first year of college.

As the mentor explained, her own students who felt threatened by such challenges tended to take black-and-white, either/or, approaches: “You either agree that you don’t belong here, or you defend why this isn’t you, you know, and ‘this argument isn’t relevant.” In both of these binary reactions, students consider the readings on a personal level only, a limiting response that Haunani-Kay Trask has also pinpointed as a problematic trend in the reception of her own work on colonialism. In an interview with UH English Professors Cynthia Franklin and Laura E. Lyons, Trask narrated the story of a talk she gave at UC Irvine in which a “haole woman” in her audience who had married a Hawaiian man broke into tears. Trask responded:

“Well, I don’t understand how talking about the overthrow, the loss of land, the 6.5 million tourists a year, makes you feel bad. It makes us feel bad. It’s our
land.” She just kept crying about her children, and the conversation continued like this. In fact, we didn’t have a conversation. . . People could not address what I had just said about American colonialism. All they could think about was their own lives, petty and small as they must be! (241).

In the binary speaker-audience configuration of this public talk, a dynamic that parallels the teacher-student binaries of many college classrooms, the “haole woman” and Hawaiian scholar find themselves at a conversational impasse. Trinary configurations, by contrast, map promising new routes through and around such impasses in dialogue. The mentor in the extended example theorizes her work as an attempt to “help with the communication in the classroom” by engaging students in behind-the-scenes writing conferences. There, she coaches students to approach the readings as a “growing thing” that can foster “learn[ing] about where you are in cultures” and “how exploitation works” across generations, integrating the personal with the political. The mentor claims a kind of thirdspace pedagogical goal of “taking [students] through a blending process” in order to arrive at multi-perspectival approaches to issues they had previously understood to be simple two-sided arguments. Although “writing as a mode of learning” (Emig) is a commonplace tenet of composition studies, mentors have found that first-year students often approach argumentative assignments as a “side” to be fortified and immobilized through research rather than as a means of learning from perspectives that may indeed move them to change their initial positions. The mentor’s strategy of encouraging students to “write the thesis at the end” suggests a more dynamic telos for research and writing. Such trinary performances enhance the quality of conversations about place that
obtain in FYC and indicate a significant area of contribution, both of trinary classrooms and of place-inflected research and action.

The mentor’s final observation that students, despite the instructor’s openness, felt constricted in their arguments about place was a common theme across the three participant check roundtables I conducted on this chapter. One mentor from the continental US explained his strategies for engaging students in writing beyond their perceptions of instructor’s politics in this way:

I have a similar sort of situation where *Value of Hawai‘i* is the primary text we’re working with. . . Some students think they have to agree with what they perceive to be the instructor’s—you know, what the instructor expects out of their assignments. And I tell the students, “As long as you follow the guidelines of an assignment, you can critique an essay. You don’t always have to support it. But if you do critique it, you have to critique it in a logical way and provide evidence.” So it’s trying to enable dissenting voices, but in a way where it’s not just a firebrand response, but something more academic. . . But kind of just talking through that to get them to critically think about why they’re not agreeing with the text, that usually helps them make their criticism a little more accurate. I don’t want them to think they can’t express their true opinion just because they think there’s this answer they have to give because the book is taught. (PCR)

This mentor explained that engaging students in academically rigorous dissent—rather than “firebrand response”—was a challenge he embraced, despite his claims at the outset of the roundtable that his mentoring was not particularly place-based. Of course, this approach was not exclusive to mentors from the continental US, as mentors of all ethnicities and geographic backgrounds repeatedly depicted themselves working to reassure students that the instructor wanted to see students exploring their own opinions rather than writing to what they believed the instructor “was looking for.” The following
section focuses specifically on how mentors who graduated from high schools in Hawai‘i but were not Native Hawaiian deployed their geo-ethnic positionalities as “interstitial agents” within trinary configurations.

**Non-Kanaka Maoli Mentors from Hawai‘i: Performing as an Interstitial Agent**

The demographic of mentors who graduated from Hawai‘i high schools but were not Kanaka Maoli constitutes the largest number of sections in my study at 46 of 100. As writing mentor Li-Anne DelaVega theorized in a participant check roundtable, mentors such as herself in this third demographic are uniquely positioned in Hawai‘i’s trinary classrooms as “interstitial agents.”

The OED defines an interstice as “an intervening space (usually, empty); esp. a relatively small or narrow space, between things or the parts of a body; a narrow opening, chink, or crevice” (1a). A frequently-used concept in the physical and natural sciences, an interstice in anatomy, for example, refers to “the fine connective tissue lying between the cells of other tissues” (2b). DelaVega applied this concept to place-based mentoring in the following way:

> Instead of looking at it from merely a kind of insider as Kanaka Maoli and an outsider as someone who has not self-identified that way or is not from here, it might be interesting to look at maybe local [mentors] who are neither of those things. . . I see myself as more of an interstitial agent. . . because I don’t quite identify obviously with a Kanaka Maoli student and I’m obviously not an outsider as well. Students see me in all these different sort of ways, so I can relate to students who are international or from the mainland because I try to relate everything they are learning to their own experiences. Looking at The Value of Hawai‘i, which is what we are learning: As an outsider, how do you approach the topic? How do you see this topic? How do you bring your own experiences into understanding that? Likewise, maybe local students can feel a little more comfortable talking with me about certain things. Maybe some Hawaiian students might feel a little
easier talking to me than if I was a complete outsider. . . So I kind of feel like I have a different mentoring perspective than both sides, because I feel like. . . I have some limited ability to relate to students from all different places, so it's not so black and white.

(PCR)

DelaVega theorizes herself as able to connect, at least in a limited way, with students across UHM’s various (geo)demographic groupings by mentoring from a space between insider-outsider formulations of place-based identity. Leveraging her own “local but not Hawaiian” identity as a kind of interstitial habitus, she works to unravel binaries that would reduce classroom discussions and student writing to “black and white” positions. DelaVega’s observations about the kinds of rhetorically significant work accomplished within interstitial spaces parallels those of Nedra Reynolds, who draws upon the writings of Gloria Anzaldúa to envision the project of geographic rhetorics, in part, as “learning to inhabit los intersticios” (177) or the “spaces between the different worlds” (qtd. in Reynolds 177: 42). Of course, mentors’ interstitial agencies did not only function according to the categories of geographic origin and ethnicity, as mentors across (geo)demographic groupings recognized themselves to be leveraging interstitially such factors as their institutional position, age, gender, social class, familiarity with popular culture, orientations toward new media, personalities, academic interests, travel experiences, and more.

This third grouping of mentors, however, frequently described themselves both inhabiting and engaging a variety of interstices within Hawai‘i-related politics and cultures, including (a) finding the interstices in place-based classroom discussion topics that might otherwise solidify around simple pro/con arguments and encouraging otherwise silent students to offer complicating viewpoints; (b) functioning in the space
between students’ interpretations of teachers’ pedagogies to disrupt mis-readings of the instructor’s politics as viewpoints to be echoed if one intends to succeed in the course; (c) working in the spaces between students’ disparate coursework on Hawai‘i-related topics to help students make connections across otherwise-disconnected learning; (d) responding to local students’ displays of “been there, done that” attitudes regarding Hawai‘i-based topics, in part by reflecting on times in mentors’ own intellectual journey when they felt similarly; and (e) encouraging “unlikely” student collaborations and friendships that bridge geo-demographic categories. An important part of this interstitial agency, one mentor explained, is learning to be “comfortable with being uncomfortable,” and then working to foster such a disposition in one’s students (PCR).

Non-Hawaiian mentors who graduated from high schools in Hawai‘i depicted themselves working to engage the interstices in place-based classroom discussion topics that might otherwise solidify around simple pro/con arguments. One mentor explained the tendency for classroom discussions of assigned readings from The Value of Hawai‘i to solidify into binaries:

The non-Hawaiian students in the class were repeating whatever they thought they should say (instead of trying to sort out their own feelings) and the Native Hawaiian students were left silent about their own culture and experiences. Instead of having an actual discussion, everyone was too afraid to share what they thought because one side didn't want to offend the other. I [don’t] mean to sound as if the outsiders (mainlanders and locals) were being ostracized in the classroom space; rather, that the shallow understanding of the complexity of the situation leaves Native Hawaiians without a chance to voice their point-of-view without sounding antagonistic when everyone else clings to a “poor Hawaiians” narrative that washes out any chance for thoughtful engagement with issues like sustainability or sovereignty. . . (email, “Anonymous”)
In response to these problematic tendencies in classroom discussions, the mentor described herself utilizing out-of-class conferences with students to learn about their more complex perspectives and lived experiences and encourage them to share these in class. This mentor said she particularly worked to engage Native Hawaiian students in this way, explaining, “some of my outside mentoring is spent talking to students who are Native Hawaiian and encouraging them to speak up in class so that there are at least counterbalancing points of view” (PCR).

Another way in which mentors drew upon their positionalities as interstitial agents was to engage students’ readings of the instructor in order to dispel students of the notion that they must echo the instructor’s views in order to earn successful marks on their writing. One “local” mentor who was paired with a Pacific Islander instructor explained the dynamic in these terms:

People feel that they have to write a certain way or take a certain side, because they know that it’s “the side that she wants,” even though she doesn’t want that, and she expresses that frequently in class. And so for me, in my mentoring, I’m like: “Well, what do you really think about this topic, and let’s try to unpack that and work through that, as opposed to their being like, “Well, this is obviously what she wants me to write and so I’m gonna just take this position.” Looking at the way you relate to the topic. I feel like I’m trying to make that connection a little easier. (PCR)

Here, the third classroom actor was able to help students to re-interpret their readings of the instructor’s pedagogical goals and of the consequent possibilities for taking positions. In this case, the mentor believed that her status as “local,” among other factors, allowed her to function in an in-between space that facilitated such mentoring work. As the mentor explained, “The students know that I held the same views as the instructor, but I think my ethnicity, age, position, my local-but-not looks, made it easier for non-Hawaiians to open up to
me than to my instructor” (email correspondence). Conversations such as these—in which students are encouraged to examine how they relate to uncomfortable topics by a non-grading individual who is intimately familiar with the course materials, the day-to-day classroom scene, and the instructor—are simply not possible in a binary classroom.

Mentors observed that while some students struggled to connect personally with place-based topics within the context of FYC, students were even less likely to connect place-based learning across college courses. As mentors observed, many first-year students encounter place-based assignments not only in FYC but also in courses taken to fulfill UHM’s Asia/Pacific graduation requirement from Hawaiian Studies and other departments. The following conference log depicts a “local” mentor forging cross-course learning by drawing upon her familiarity with the politics of Hawai‘i, the university campus, and the undergraduate curriculum:

Travis had emailed me prior to our meeting about his frustration with selecting a topic for his research project. I made some suggestions to get him started, but I wondered if he was able to select something. When we met in the library Travis was still undecided. We spoke in the lobby for several minutes about his interests and where and what he wanted to learn more about since the paper is focused on Hawaii. (Travis is from the mainland.) He spoke about his interest in a documentary he viewed in his Hawaiian Studies class last semester about how a hotel being build encountered bones during construction. He was fascinated by this and was happy to learn that the hotel later relocated its construction in order to preserve the cultural practice of the Hawaiian people.

I was elated. We continued to discuss this topic and narrowed it down to some key points of interest—preservation vs. development and knowledge vs. cultural practices. Travis wanted to view the video again to refresh his memory and I explained to him the Wong A/V Center and how we were liable to find it there.
We began by searching for the video. He located it in the Wong A/V Center and I told him we could venture over there after doing more searches if he was interested. The Voyager System was not as helpful as the local newspapers and websites devoted specifically to the removal of Native Hawaiian bones for construction. After this we left for Sinclair Library to find his video. I explained how to borrow media from the library. Travis did not know that we UH had 2 libraries. I hope that Travis will stick to this topic and continue to work on it. (CL 5868)

This author of this narrative was operating as interstitial agent on multiple levels, connecting Hawaiian Studies 107 to English 100, the student’s first semester of college to his second, and the student’s previous knowledge about Hawai‘i to the place-based research assignment at hand. This example also speaks to the ways in which this mentor’s work, even within a single conference, bridged layers two and three of the chapter’s palimpsest on mentoring students in relation to the university and Hawai‘i.

Mentors also spoke about students confiding that they were disappointed with their FYC section’s place focus, projecting a “been there, done that” attitude toward Hawai‘i-based reading and writing assignments. One mentor observed that students from Hawai‘i in his Honors section generally seemed much less interested in engaging with Hawaiian culture than the local students he had mentored in non-Honors courses. Another mentor responded this made perfect sense to her when considering her own perceptions of Hawai‘i as an undergraduate:

I feel like I was that person at a point in my life where you have academic ambitions, and you’re from here, but you kind of think of stuff not here as being the important thing to be thinking about and stuff here being somehow less intellectually rigorous. And that’s an interesting thing, interstitially: sometimes I have to deal with that kind of student. And it’s like “I understand you, but I want to change your opinion, but then I also feel like a hypocrite.” [Laughter] So do I encourage your interests in things that are not related to
here, because you have a right to pursue your interests? Or do I try to be that annoying
person who brings it back to Hawai‘i in a way that I think is useful, but they might just find
annoying? (PCR)

This mentor described the challenges of engaging such students as an ongoing struggle in
her mentoring, confessing that she could not think of any cases in which she experienced
a clear breakthrough concerning students with this attitude. In the end, she concluded that
students may simply need time and space to explore other interests, just as she did, but
admits that she still works to “humbly suggest” the value of intellectual interests that are
close to home. Freed from summative evaluations and the pressure to produce
demonstrable evidence of student learning outcomes, this third classroom actor takes a
long-range perspective on students’ intellectual journeys and maturation processes. Of

Of course, the challenges she depicts are not exclusive to Hawai‘i, as many first-year
students dream of leaving home for a prestigious and novel college experience, and for
any myriad of reasons find themselves enrolled at a local university or community
college which they had previously considered to be a “fall back” school. I would argue
that writing mentors who can identify with such students and earn their trust have the
opportunity to exercise interstitial agency in directing these students toward institutional
resources and strengths they might have otherwise overlooked.

A final example considers the ways in which writing mentors were positioned
interstitially to appreciate and encourage “unlikely” student collaborations and
friendships that bridge geo-demographic categories. The following conference log,
narrated by a local mentor who identifies as Filipina, illustrates such interstitial agency on
an interpersonal level. After a paragraph reflecting upon what the mentor, who had lived
in Hawai‘i all her life, learned about Hawaiian culture from this meeting, the mentor observed:

K_____ and Matthew had their intake interview together. They know each other through ACE [the Access to College Excellence learning communities for first-year students]. They mentioned that the two of them plus two other students in the class are really good friends now. It was interesting to see the interaction between Matthew and K_____, because (and I hate to say it) many local students don’t usually make friends with white students. . . K_____, however, singled out Matthew because he says that Matthew seems really interested in learning about Hawaiian culture, unlike most people from the mainland who come here just to “go beach and surf.” In fact, they said they were watching the Merrie Monarch videos before they came to see me. K_____ also brought another friend, U_____. At first, she was waiting outside the hallway, but I told her to come in and join the conversation. She’s also Hawaiian (and a Hawaiian studies major) so I learned a lot of things from her too as well. It was, overall, a good meeting (although we strayed from the mentoring aspect a bit). (CL 5375)

The mentor admits that cross-cultural friendships are rare among her FYC students, and she is well poised to appreciate the significance of the exchange that took place in her office. Although the mentor does not see herself as responsible for this friendship or the ensuing discussion, the mentor’s understanding of local cultures may have contributed to her willingness to invite the student’s friend (who was not part of the FYC section) in from the hallway to “join the conversation,” enhancing the teaching and learning that took place in this conference.36 I would disagree, however, with the mentor’s assessment that “we strayed from the mentoring aspect a bit,” arguing that the mentor’s facilitation of such conversations enacts the very kinds of psycho-social support that are, by definition, part of mentoring (Nora and Crisp; Roberts) and constitutes a valuable dimension of the place-based work enacted by mentors within trinary configurations.
Conclusions

Trinary configurations offer exciting new possibilities for engaging FYC students with place—possibilities that go beyond the options available to instructors and students operating in binary classroom structures. While pedagogical applications presented by place-based scholars often come in the form of recommended place-based writing assignments, these assignments are still generally held in place by a teacher-student binary: for example, the assignment is generally composed and presented by the instructor, completed by the students, assessed by the instructor, revised by the students, and so forth. As this chapter demonstrates, a third classroom member has the potential to shift these and many other binaries productively, introducing avenues for enhanced movement and dwelling within (and beyond) FYC. The writing mentors in this chapter performed multiple and significant kinds of place-based work. Such mentoring work occurred even in FYC sections that had little-to-no overt focus on place, where mentors held conferences in campus spaces in which students might not have otherwise engaged, referred students to a myriad of university resources, walked with students across campus, and provided a supportive audience for students who were struggling to adapt to a new environment. All of these mentoring actions expanded the place and scope of FYC beyond the four-walled classroom, engaging students more meaningfully with the place of their education—both as the university and Hawai‘i.

Courses with a focus on Hawai‘i tended to enlarge mentors’ scope of place-based work. In these scenarios, mentors guided students to sources unique to Hawai‘i, engaged students in more nuanced representations of Hawai‘i-based issues, and complicated students’ mis-readings of instructors as holding hard and fast positions about place to
which student must write. Given the diversity of Hawai‘i’s student body, writing mentors offered students additional potential points of identification with a classroom member and additional potential means of connecting with course materials, particularly in cases where mentor/instructor pairs had different geographic origins. As mentors repeatedly observed, place constitutes a potential site of engagement and disengagement for students: some students reported to mentors that they were thrilled with a course focus on Hawai‘i and confident in their ability to perform in such a course; other students were disappointed, hoping that college would expose them to issues beyond Hawai‘i; and yet others were intimidated and self-conscious, struggling to find the means of authority to engage with assigned readings, writing prompts, and classroom discussions. Across these expansive FYC classroom (geo)demographics, mentors often found issues of place to be deeply personal, echoing Nedra Reynolds’ observation that: “Aversion to place does not always develop from firsthand encounters or from visual evidence. Drawing upon hearsay, family stories, ‘common knowledge,’ or media images, notions about a place build up over time, become difficult to undo” (Geographies 146). Mentors’ work indicates that, particularly in the case of Hawai‘i, the same could be said about attraction to place. Given the rapport mentors depicted themselves building with many (but certainly not all) of their students, mentors were frequently able to leverage these personal connections with students to engage their beliefs about place, potentially bridging the personal and political. And mentors theorized these performances in light of such thirdspace figures as the mo‘o, cultural ambassador, and interstitial agent.

As rhetorical agents of place-based work, UHM writing mentors engaged students uniquely in the place of their education, not only enriching student performances but also
enriching the institution itself. Mentors’ scope of work included what Johnathon Mauk depicts as “the complexities of orienting students into academic spaces,” with such orientation processes addressing “not only the geography of that particular space (or campus) but also the geopolitics of the culture(s) surrounding that space” (201). As Mauk rightly concludes, these multi-faceted orientation processes are far too complex for any singular campus office to oversee (201) or for any one-size-fits-all student orientation prior to the semester to “cover.” UHM Writing Mentors Program data suggest, however, that such geographic and geopolitical orientation processes can be engaged meaningfully through mentoring relationships in which students are introduced first-hand (and in most cases individually) to campus spaces and resources as they become kairotically relevant in the context of students’ research, writing, and transitional exigencies.39

This chapter has approached place from multiple perspectives and on multiple levels: place as an (auto)ethnographer’s depiction of her research site; place as quantifiable locations of reported mentor-student conferences overlaid onto a campus map; place as the various kinds of spaces (i.e. classroom, social, virtual, etc.) in which trinary collaborations occurred; and place as Hawai‘i, including the politics this location forefronted within FYC classrooms. In Burkean terms, while Layer Two could be classified as a place-based analysis of mentors’ work according to the scene-act or scene-agent ratios, Layer Three could be read, in part, as a place-based deconstruction of the Western dramatistic pentad in light of Kanaka Maoli epistemologies of land as ʻāina.

The mentoring archives contributed by Kanaka Maoli mentors within the eight sections in my sub-study document just a few of the many ways in which the mentoring that took place in this program was theorized and practiced in ways unique to Hawai‘i.
As such, the chapter’s third layer on mentors’ work in relation to Hawai‘i is less comprehensive than suggestive. It suggests that individuals of all backgrounds and geographic origins can leverage their own identities to mentor successfully in Hawai‘i’s FYC classrooms. And it also suggests that those first-year students who had the privilege of being mentored by individuals who identified as Kanaka Maoli and regarded Hawai‘i as a living ancestor potentially experienced place-based approaches to mentoring that they could not have found elsewhere.

By introducing an additional institutional actor to the classroom scene, trinary configurations expand the potential for teaching and learning about place in multiple directions: mentor-to-student, student-to-mentor, mentor-to-instructor, instructor-to-mentor, student-to-instructor, instructor-to-student, and student-to-student. (Or in many cases, student-through-mentor-to-instructor, student-through-mentor-to-student, and so forth.) Many student writers who would not likely have been pre-selected for tutoring through a standardized placement exam received mentoring on all manner of issues related to dwelling in their new university setting and/or in Hawai‘i. And mentors frequently recognized the kinds of place-based expertise that students of all backgrounds brought with them to FYC, noting how much students were able to teach them as mentors about place. As one mentor wrote:

As a newcomer to Hawai‘i, I have a lot to learn about this space, and I really appreciated how savvy our class was about local culture. They were also incredibly willing to break things down--be they cultural beliefs or metaphors--and teach me. Though I knew my role as a writing coach would be one where I would have the knowledge to offer, I was not at all surprised to see how much I had to learn from the students otherwise. (ME 2)
Such reciprocal forms of teaching and learning offer a productive counter-model to notions of mentoring as a one-way transfer and to models of writing support rooted in deficit models of linear performance.

Trinary configurations also offer promising avenues for researching students’ geographies of writing. As Nedra Reynolds claims, researchers of writing largely “haven’t yet tapped [students’] spatial imaginations or studied their moves” (176). Future layers of trinary research might investigate the spatial composing practices that mentors have already documented student writers performing, while also engaging writing mentors in further study along these lines. The very fact that mentor-student interactions occurred in spaces that instructors generally do not enter with their students (including library stacks, campus centers, text messages) indicates that mentors were privy to student writing performances that few teacher-researchers will ever witness firsthand. Given the myriad of locations in which mentors worked and the in-between spaces mentors inhabited, trinary configurations mark the inception a new kind of researcher who is uniquely positioned to add important layers to place-based composition scholarship and to composition scholarship more generally, while also engaging those inscriptions and meanings beneath the surface of their own places of research.
Notes

1 As I apply the notion of rhetorical effectiveness to mentors’ work, I bear in mind both classical Aristotelian concepts of rhetoric as persuasion that come into play in coaching students on strategies of successful argumentation as well as Burkean notions of rhetoric as identification (Rhetoric xiv) that inform the development of rapport across trinary actors.

2 The “without erasing” qualification is not insignificant, particularly as I am researching a location in which, as one mentor explained to a first-year student, “significant Hawaiian places get forgotten and overwritten” (CL 2558).

3 Hundreds of mentor logs specified such conference “locations” as email, cell phone, text, and IM, highlighting the limitations of this layer’s definition of “place” as finite, specifiable locations within the university campus.

4 As Nedra Reynolds observes, “places are hugely important to learning processes and to acts of writing because the kinds of spaces we occupy determine, to some degree, the kinds of work we can do or the types of artifacts we can create” (Geographies 157).

5 Kenneth Burke recommends pentadic analyses according to the scene-act ratio for situations in which actions are generally consistent with the designed purpose of a given scene, defined as the “setting” or “background” within which actions occur (Grammar 3). When scene and action are understood to be interdependent, explains Burke, “one could not deduce the details of the action from the details of the setting, but one could deduce the quality of the action from the quality of the setting” (Grammar 7). My study categories of virtual and ambulatory conferences challenge Burke’s modernist notions of the scene as a “container” of actions (Grammar 3).

6 Recent academic discourses in Hawai‘i inflect Nedra Reynolds’ reference to “settling” with strong political (and controversial) overtones: In Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i, Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura propose the term “settler” as a political category that demands accountability for the ways in which all non-Hawaiian groups living in Hawai‘i participate in the continued colonization and disenfranchisement of Native Hawaiians. Whether framed as an issue related specifically to settler colonialisms or not, the act of mentoring students on dwelling in Hawai‘i with greater cultural awareness, respect, and responsibility can be understood as a form of resistance to dominant cultures (Reynolds 141; hooks).

7 The UHM Department of English also requires its graduate students to take at least one course with an Asia/Pacific focus (The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Graduate Program in English Handbook). Thus, all mentors come into contact with readings and classroom discussions related to issues of place in their own graduate educations, even as they mentor students in these arenas.

8 A scene from early in the program’s evolution illustrates the ways in which participating faculty understood place as offering a theoretical foundation for mentoring. At a departmental colloquium in Spring 2007, Professor Henry and I presented on early findings from programmatic research. Among many findings, the presentation addressed ways in which we saw mentoring benefitting populations of first-year students identified by university administrators as being most “at risk” of dropping out of college.
these observations, a widely respected senior faculty member raised the question of whether honors sections of FYC would be assigned mentors. He noted that this population was also known for its high attrition and argued that mentors were needed just as much in honors sections, particularly since those sections were often comprised largely of students from the continental US. Faculty members exchanged knowing glances and nods of agreement, and I interpreted these nonverbal cues as an indication that the unstated premise of this professor’s argument was already well established across this audience of FYC instructors: that students coming to Hawai‘i from the continental US, no matter how academically prepared, could benefit from mentoring that helps them adjust to being in an unfamiliar place.

To offer some longitudinal perspective on how this mentor-student relationship evolved, the mentor’s third of four logs with Micah illustrates the student taking an active role in his learning and reads: “As I have discussed in previous posts, Micah is a surprisingly complex student who continues to challenge my previous assumptions of who he is and what he wants, inspiring me to be a more patient, creative, and open-minded educator. This morning, after class, Micah handed me a four-page draft with a working bibliography... Together, we went through his essay point by point. Micah named the different sections of his essay by topic and purpose. At one point in our conference, to my extreme delight, I suggested to Micah that he consider moving a block of text to a more appropriate part of his essay. Without hesitation, he pointed dramatically to the third page. ‘Right here. Right here,’ he exclaimed, articulating his exact plan for the next draft. . I am very proud of him” (CL 2656).

When examined more closely, the six-part scheme of conferencing locations quickly begins to blur, underscoring not only the contingent nature of space but also the ways in which even a seemingly straightforward coding protocol can never be purely descriptive. According to my coding protocols, 90 conference logs were un-codeable, either because no location was listed (n=51) or because the location was too broad to group in the categories that emerged (n=39). For example, mentors frequently designated “Kuykendall,” the home building of the English Department, as the conference location. As this building includes classrooms, offices, and informal meeting spaces, such a designation could imply any of these uses. In these cases, I consulted the mentor’s conference narrative, the corresponding weekly memo, and/or followed up with the mentor for clarification. In one case, I emailed a mentor who had graduated several years ago, and she replied within hours that she knew “exactly” what “Kuykendall” meant, describing her conferencing site in elaborate detail. In a follow-up email, she granted me permission to quote our exchange and explained: “We either sat on the wall, or used the table (the one just behind the elevator). I also used that space because it was outside, and more often than not, the weather was too good to waste. But, more importantly (perhaps?), I used it to escape the stuffiness of the classroom/indoor office. It seemed a "friendlier" space to me. First-year students are already intimidated enough with academia; hopefully, they felt more relaxed in my ‘office’” (Email correspondence). That such a specific memory of her conferencing space and rationale persisted over the three-plus years since these conferences occurred seems a noteworthy example of the well-established connection between memory and place in classical rhetorical theory and practice. While I ultimately coded this mentor’s conferences under the category of “campus social and dining spaces” due to the mentor’s intention to create a “friendlier” space by situating it outdoors on the wall and/or picnic tables, the description overlapped with the category of “classroom periphery spaces,” as these conferences occurred immediately outside of Kuykendall Hall and beside the
elevator. And the mentor’s classification of the space as her makeshift “office” could have also justified categorization in “designated conferencing spaces”—designated in this case not by program administrators but by the mentor herself. More than a methodological illustration, this example points to the ways in which mentors not only utilized but also created conferencing spaces and theorized their choices of conferencing location in quite intentional, place-informed, and student-centered ways.

11 Anthropologist Gilbert Ryle first discussed the significance of this gesture as a marker of cultural codes, noting the difference between “winking conspiratorially to an accomplice” and “an involuntary twitch” (480) and analyzing the ways the differences between these two gestures can be perceived, interpreted, parodied, and rehearsed (483). Clifford Geertz (and later anthropologists) works extensively with Ryle’s rich anecdote, paraphrasing Ryle’s analysis of the rhetorical situation of the wink as follows: “The winker is communicating, and indeed communicating in quite a special way: (1) deliberately, (2) to someone in particular, (3) to impart a particular message, (4) according to socially established code, (5) without the cognizance of the rest of the company” (Geertz 6). In the context of this three-way conference, the wink denotes a conspiratorial signal from the mentor to student made without the cognizance of the teacher. As an intended recipient of this conference log, I as a program administrator and graduate researcher am let in on the advent of the wink, but I am ultimately left with only educated guesses of what “the message” might have entailed. By recording the details of this incident, the mentor is not only winking literally at the student, but also metaphorically at program administrators, perhaps as if to demonstrate her ability to bridge the student-instructor binary, while simultaneously increasing rapport with both parties, presumably unbeknownst to the other party.

12 As the following student comment illustrates, situating the program’s main conferencing space within Sinclair Library offered students an avenue for becoming more “accustomed” to unfamiliar campus resource spaces: “She helped me get accustomed to the Sinclair library and its resources by offering her aid there” (SE 1499).

13 In many cases, mentors listed more than one resource in a log. Thus, mentors reported making referrals in 855 total conference logs, but on the whole 1,169 referrals were made. The conference log also included a second follow-up question about referrals: “Did the student follow up on your referral?” Mentors responded “yes” in 285 cases, “no” in 28 cases, and “not sure” in 457 cases. (In 87 cases in which referrals were noted, this question was left blank.)

14 I highly doubt that this story would have been shared at the participant check roundtable (a) if the current program administrators had been present in the room and (b) if I had still occupied the position of graduate student WPA. I must confess, however, that I had some difficulty responding to the story as a researcher and not a WPA, given that situations like this not only place students in potentially compromising situations, but also potentially jeopardize future mentors’ freedom to utilize conferencing locations beyond the classroom or designated library space, limiting the important kinds of place-based mentoring addressed in this chapter.

15 The instructor further explained that she felt too uncomfortable to broach this issue with the mentor directly, given that she and he were both graduate students of
approximately the same age. This instructor has granted written permission to share this account anonymously.

16 This log was submitted in the program’s first year when conferences were generally held in a 7\textsuperscript{th} floor office of the English Department rather than in Sinclair Library, explaining why this conference was the student’s first trip to this library and underscoring the importance of re-designating the mentoring space to Sinclair Library beginning in the program’s second year.

17 Missing from this scheme are those thirteen sections with international mentors from Europe and Asia: this grouping of mentors were almost all multilingual and addressed issues of multilingualism with students in ways deserving of future scholarly attention.

18 Dr. ho‘omanawanui offers the following equation to illustrate “the difference between Kanaka Maoli sentiments about ‘āina and haole thinking about land:”

\begin{align*}
\text{Hawaiian:} & \quad ‘āina \rightarrow \text{food} \rightarrow \text{nurturing/sustaining} \rightarrow \text{value of family} \\
\text{haole:} & \quad \text{land} \rightarrow \text{real estate/commodity} \rightarrow \text{buying/selling} \rightarrow \text{monetary value}
\end{align*}

(\text{ho‘omanawanui 124})

19 In explicating “the means and ends of this grammar,” Kenneth Burke writes: “our concern is primarily with the analysis of language rather than with the analysis of ‘reality.’ Language being essentially human, we would view human relations in terms of the linguistic instrument. Not mere ‘consciousness of abstracting,’ but consciousness of \textit{linguistic action generally}, is needed if men are to temper the absurd ambitions that have their source in faulty terminologies. Only by such means can we hope to bring ourselves to be content with humbler satisfactions, looking upon the cult of empire as a sickness, be that empire political or financial” (\textit{Grammar} 317).

20 This four-party relationship, I believe, is particularly appropriate in light of Hawaiian practices of counting by fours. As a student in Kumu Carol Silva’s beginning Hawaiian Language class, I witnessed several students throughout the semester asking her to teach us how to count in Hawaiian. She deferred these requests, later explaining that Western modes of counting one through ten were good for keeping track of money, but that Hawaiian ways of understanding quantity did not work according to a base-ten logic and were not an appropriate early language lesson. In one of the final class sessions, she taught us to count in foursomes, beginning with the number four, signifying the number of spaces \textit{between} fingers on the hand, and ranging through forty thousand, signifying the number of Hawaiian deities or infinity.

21 On the question about ethnic self-identification within my demographic survey, each of these mentors noted multiple ethnicities but listed their Hawaiian ancestry first, often including a note about identifying as Hawaiian in one of the spaces provided for additional comments. Each of these mentors also graduated from high schools in Hawai‘i.

22 As McDougall and Nordstrom explain, “If the composer has skillfully crafted the kanoa (as demanded by the audience), those audience members who are the most knowledgeable of the kaona’s subject would find the most layers of meaning” (101). I hope that the data I propose making available to future mentor-researchers in the dissertations’ conclusions might be re-analyzed by future Kanaka Maoli mentors to document elements of mentoring in relation to Hawai‘i that I was unable to perceive or that I perhaps even mis-read from my limited knowledge of Hawaiian culture.

23 What it means to perform successfully as a FYC student across McKenzie’s categories of organizational, cultural, and technological performance is itself place-based. An
example that illustrates all three of McKenzie’s categories is that of teaching about the proper use of Hawaiian language diacritical markings, a place-based mentoring topic that was depicted across multiple conference logs. Organizationally speaking, these diacritical markings can be described as a function of proper spelling and of adherence to UHM’s official policies regarding the use of the Hawaiian language (http://www.hawaii.edu/site/info/diacritics.php). On the level of cultural performance, employing these markings may indicate some level of awareness and respect for Hawaiian culture, including the renaissance of the Hawaiian language. As such, performing culturally in terms of these diacritical markings indicates participation in what Richard Schechner has termed “restored behavior,” a concept McKenzie glosses as “the living reactualization of socially symbolic systems” (McKenzie 8). And as several mentor conference logs explain, successful technological performance in this arena also requires aptitude regarding the keystrokes, fonts, and/or software packages necessary to produce diacritical markings.

24 As elaborated in the methodology chapter, instead of changing Hawaiian names, I list the name’s first letter, followed by a line.

25 There were exactly eight sections in my study with non-Kanaka Maoli mentors who graduated from high schools outside of Hawai‘i and whose scholarly interests related to Hawai‘i and/or the Pacific. The mentors in this geographic sub-sample identified ethnically as Caucasian (6 sections), Chinese/Caucasian (1 section), and mixed race (1 section). To select sections mentored by individuals who graduated from high schools in Hawai‘i but were not Native Hawaiian for further coding, I began with the list of twenty-four sections with mentors in this demographic who claimed scholarly interests in Hawai‘i. I then inspected my fieldnotes for recorded instances in which these mentors spoke about their work in light of the politics of place, selecting eight sections I felt were likely to include discussions related to my research topic of mentoring in relation to Hawai‘i. Ethnically, the mentors in these eight sections identified, in their own words, as Caucasian (2 sections), “Chinese-Japanese American born in Hawai‘i” (1 section), Filipino (2 sections), Japanese (1 section), and “mixed Asian/Caucasian” (2 sections). The breakdown of twenty-four sections by the degree of place focus in the course description was comparable across the three groupings. For table summarizing these demographic data, see Appendix BC.

26 Several mentors from the continental US claimed not to have consciously mentored students in relation to Hawai‘i at all, but rather in relation to the university as a place. For other continental US mentors, a place-based goal was to help students deepen their connection to any place, whether it be Hawai‘i or not. As one mentor explained: “My experience hasn’t been so much to tie the students to Hawai‘i as to find a place that they can connect with. So I had a student who was from O‘ahu but she was Filipina, and she wanted to connect with that more, and she was writing about it in her paper. I was kind of lucky, my roommate is in Filipino Club, so I turned her on to the club, and she’s still involved in it now—actively involved” (PCR).

27 The mentor’s improper use of the ‘okina in the word “Hawaiian,” a mistake someone was generous enough to point out to me in my first semester at UHM after I exuberantly placed the marking in several words in which it did not appropriately belong, also reflects the paradoxes of being new to Hawai‘i, where an attempt to demonstrate respect for and
awareness of the Hawaiian language may simultaneously demonstrate the author’s ignorance of the subject.

28 A secondary, Hawai‘i-inflected reading of this comment might argue that the mentor is not so much positioning the student as a “teacher” but more problematically as a tour guide.

29 In transcribing this section of the focus group interview, I was a bit surprised by how quickly I turned the interaction into a dialogue between this mentor and myself, suspending my usual commitment to allowing participants to follow their trains of thought with minimal interruptions and to discuss issues amongst one another. I attribute this somewhat-atypical performance to my excitement at hearing such an insightful example of this place-based aspect of trinary dynamics I had been aware of, but not yet able to document in this way.

30 I do not mean to imply that the goal of mentoring should be to guide students into reducing such readings to political categories alone, for these texts also offer valuable opportunities for the kinds of reflective and reflexive thinking that can lead to more conscientious forms of dwelling in Hawai‘i. One non-Kanaka Maoli mentor who was born and raised in Hawai‘i theorized the challenges and opportunities of engaging students in this space between the personal and political as follows: “I had another class where there was one student who really responded to this assigned reading by Haunani-Kay Trask, and everybody else kind of just reduced her to like, ‘yeah, racism is bad.’ So I feel like the difficulty is always making them not take it personally, a; and b, having not taken it personally, engage with the issues intellectually instead of just reducing it to a simple message, like ‘yeah, I’ve heard this moral before all throughout elementary and high school: don’t burn Jews, don’t be racist against black people. . .’ So to make it not reducible to that— and help them think through it, and think about themselves. Not as a personal affront, like ‘I guess I should leave.’ But, ‘no, you can stay here, but as long as you think about it and talk to me about it.’ That’s the difficult part, because some people aren’t really willing to go there. And then they’re like, ‘I have this essay to write, so can you just please correct my grammar.’ So I don’t know. I feel like the struggle is making them care about this thing. And then maybe also too, I start to question, is this just me and my interests and my desire to talk to them about this stuff, when really mentoring is about meeting them where they want to be? Maybe I’m being polemical, I don’t know. That’s been my difficulty” (PCR). I have used italics in my transcription to underscore the performative nature of this mentor’s rich example.

31 To indicate the strong reception of this book by at least two UHM scholars who are recognized for their significant work on Native Hawaiian issues, I offer excerpts from two reviews. UHM Political Science Professor and author of Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism Noenoe Silva writes: "Judy Rohrer has written an extraordinary and long-needed examination of the historical and contemporary place of haoles in Hawai‘i. This study goes far beyond the typical ways that haoles are talked about: as wrong-headed and evil colonizers, dumb malihini who don’t know how to act, or, more recently, victims of reverse discrimination. . . Rohrer writes that the aim of this long overdue study is ‘to begin to imagine how [people] might become haole in different and better ways.’ Haoles will gain a better understanding of why they sometimes get "stink-eye," and everyone else will gain a greater understanding of the workings of power in Hawai‘i nei. Everyone in Hawai‘i should read this book!” (book cover) Another review by David Stannard, UHM Professor of American Studies and author of Honor Killing: How the Infamous "Massie Affair" Transformed Hawai‘i,
claims: “Although it is certain to appear on many college and university reading lists, this is a book that everyone should read. It will make Hawai‘i a better place” (book cover).

32 This mentor noted that she could identify with her students’ discomfort in discussing place-based literature, explaining that even after living in Hawai‘i for several years, she still feels self-conscious about her pronunciation of Hawaiian words.

33 Because I believed her application of the interstitial agent concept to mentoring first-year writers in Hawai‘i to be so smart and original, I sought and gained Li-Anne DelaVega’s permission to attribute this insight to her.

34 The field of Composition and Rhetoric has increasingly engaged with the work of Gloria Andaldúa specifically and postcolonial theory more generally, as seen in Andrea Lunsford and Lahoucine Ouzgane’s 2004 anthology, *Crossing Borderlands: Composition and Postcolonial Studies*, but these accounts draw largely from continental metaphors in their focus on borders and leave much to be desired in terms of understanding a writing program in Hawai‘i. While compositionists have often encouraged crossing borders, there has been less emphasis on honoring *kapu*, or on recognizing and respecting borders demarcating sacred indigenous spaces.

35 Another area of interstitial agency which merits further work is mentors’ use of Hawai‘i Creole English (HCE) or Pidgin, which itself can be seen as an interstitial language for the ways it blends terminologies and expressions from the multiple nationalities brought to Hawai‘i’s as plantation labor (including China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Portugal, Puerto Rico, and other countries) with elements of the Hawaiian and English languages (www.hawaii.edu/sls/pidgin.html). The eight sections of logs and memos I coded by non-Kanaka Maoli mentors from Hawai‘i included numerous (n=11) instances of mentors conversing in, talking about, or encouraging students’ uses of Hawai‘i Creole English (HCE) as a kind of bridge between students’ home cultures and the traditional discourses of the academy. For an example of published Composition and Rhetoric scholarship on HCE, see Lee Tonouchi.

36 Many university administrators would quickly recognize in this conference the fulfillment of The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) outcome of “having serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own” (nsse.iub.edu/html/survey_instruments.cfm).

37 For example, the concluding sections of work by place-based scholars Julie Drew, Johnathon Mauk, and Nedra Reynolds present pedagogical applications in the form of innovative assignments and courses with a focus on place (Drew 63-66; Mauk 214-216; Reynolds *Geographies* 158-162). While I am in no way discounting these valuable contributions, I hope to illustrate the significance of approaches that highlight a new classroom actor rather than new classroom assignments.

38 For more on movement and dwelling, see Nedra Reynolds’ *Geographies of Writing*.

39 Similar place-based wisdom has been illustrated by studies emphasizing the kairotic elements of teaching of grammar *in situ* (Kolln; Constance Weaver).

40 Future study might also consider the spatial composing practices and metaphors that writing mentors introduced to FYC students. Take, for example, the mentor who wrote of modeling for her students how, when faced with an assignment they might initially deem uninteresting or intimidating, to “build a path into writing” (WM 65). Or the mentor who helped a student to see for himself how best to arrange various “blocks of text” by
physically laying the pages of his essay across the table “like a map” (CL 2656). Or the mentor who provocatively merged spatial and temporal metaphors in advising a student on how to use an academic planner as a means of “mapping her time” (CL 264).
CHAPTER SIX: Conclusions

Implications Beyond the UHM Writing Mentors Program

This program could not have evolved in quite the same way at any other place than the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa, and the ethos of the program was shaped indelibly by the diversity of UHM’s student body; the cultural values mentors brought to the position; the UHM English Department’s unique commitment to having all faculty teach FYC; the visible manifestations of the politics of place in everyday campus life; and Native Hawaiian epistemologies. Yet while my research is strongly place-based, it certainly offers meaningful implications beyond UHM. Ultimately, I would argue that the only college courses that would likely not stand to benefit from the introduction of a well-supported third classroom actor from a well-administered trinary classroom initiative are those in which (a) the instructor is not willing to perform as a team with the mentor, and in doing so to surrender some degree of autonomy; and/or (b) the instructor approaches the course as a one-way transfer of knowledge or what Brazilian educator Paulo Freire has famously term the “banking model” of education. However, if mentoring were vertically integrated beyond FYC and into majors, it is also possible that students would experience mentoring fatigue or over-saturation. Thus, while an important question is how and where should mentoring be expanded, an important corollary is at what point (if any) does mentoring become over-utilized as an approach? In the space below, I offer a synthesis of my major research findings and consider the implications of these findings beyond the UHM Writing Mentors Program. I specifically take up five areas of implication, beginning with the most concretely immediate applications for
similar programs at other universities and moving toward the more political and theoretical implications of trinary thought and action.

Perhaps the most direct applications for this research are within already-existing trinary collaborations at other institutions of higher education. My literature reviews of writing fellows programs, classroom-based tutoring programs, and course-embedded supplemental instruction programs (such as the one at the University of South Carolina) indicate that hundreds of trinary classroom initiatives are already in place. My research also suggests that theories of place and performance offer novel and promising apparatuses for other programs to leverage in their own administrative and research agendas. This dissertation has demonstrated how theorizing the third actor’s role as a “mentor” and applying such mentoring across Jon McKenzie’s three registers of organizational, cultural, and technological performance offers an alternative to deficit-based models of writing support and might serve to help other programs distance themselves from such limited and limiting models. And the concept of team performance as illustrated in Chapter Four offers an accessible and provocative way to introduce the trinary configuration to all three parties and to foster productive collaborations. The lists of mentor roles and behaviors; mentor paradoxes; and conferencing locations might especially spur other programs serving first-year students to broaden their scope of work and to address additional dimensions of students’ transitions to the university. Furthermore, these various empirical findings, along with the dissertation’s 56 appendices, might assist other WPAs in piloting, researching, and securing funding for their own trinary initiatives.
Many university courses come already equipped with three different institutional actors: a professor, one or more graduate student teaching assistants (TAs), and students. Such TAs fulfill multiple duties, from leading recitation or lab sections to delivering an occasional lecture for the professor (Goodlad; Muzaka; Shannon, Twale, and Moore). However, these TAs’ primary function is usually to decrease the professor’s workload, and their primary responsibility is usually to grade student work (Park). Thus, while the writing mentors in my study exhibited at least ten different roles from “lead student,” to “research coach,” to “resource for individual support,” to “classroom interpreter,” to “third party perspective,” to “participant observer,” many university TAs are confined to the two most instructor-like of the roles: that of “classroom supporter” and/or “co-instructor.” As such, even though many college classrooms come equipped with three institutional actors, if the third actor performs only instructor-like roles, these classrooms function more like a binary than a trinary. As Jim Henry and I have argued, “TAs constitute the future of the professoriate and often bring to their positions a strong interest in teaching, [such that] TA-ships could be more intentionally configured to meld their instructional duties with research on learners’ performances in situ” (309). This dissertation research offers numerous ways for TA-ships to be reconfigured so that TAs can perform a wider array of roles, enact greater degrees of teamwork with both students and instructors, and experience more learner-centered perspectives on the classroom. If Centers for Teaching Excellence across university campuses were to incorporate some of this research into their TA training and encourage professors to cast their TAs in additional non-grading roles, such binary arrangements might shift in the direction of trinary collaborations.
While my research suggests that multiple university courses organized around a teacher-student binary would benefit from the introduction of a third classroom actor, the two types I will address here are those with controversial themes and those for first-year students. As analyzed in Chapter Five, students frequently confessed to mentors that readings, writing assignments, and classroom discussions related to issues of race in Hawai‘i and to Native Hawaiian sovereignty made many of them feel uncomfortable, even voiceless. Out-of-class conferences with a mentor afforded students a space and audience for voicing these concerns and beginning to understand these topics as something more than a personal attack. Mentors also observed in students a tendency to write to what they believed to be the instructor’s opinion—opinions that were sometimes presented directly by instructors but were more frequently inferred by students based upon instructors’ selections of readings, ethnicity, and other demographic factors. Mentors found that even when instructors did not want students to feel constrained by their stances and stated as much to the class, students often believed that taking what they perceived to be the instructor’s “side” was the most direct path to a successful grade. In these instances, mentors were able to re-interpret the instructor’s pedagogical vision and assignment prompts for students, helping students to engage their own interests and arguments in ways that still rigorously met the assignment’s criteria. These examples suggest that a third classroom actor has much to offer any course that addresses political issues, or topics about which the instructor is passionate, or a social justice agenda of any kind—particularly when an instructor desires to disrupt the over-determined conclusions that are so frequently drawn by students within binary classroom configurations. In *Conflicting Concepts of Curriculum*, Elliot Eisner and Elizabeth Vallance identify “social
reconstructionism-relevance” as a valid and longstanding curricular approach, explaining that calls for educational institutions to serve as agents for social change constitute “a refrain [that] runs through much of the history of educational reform” (10). However, when instructors perform such curricular approaches within college classrooms (e.g. through critical pedagogy), they often encounter reluctant or resistant students, a trend that Georganne Nordstrom has identified in the pre-existing literature on critical pedagogy in college classrooms (31-36) and in her own qualitative teacher-research conducted within compositions classrooms in Hawai‘i. My dissertation research suggests that trinary classrooms offer a promising way to enact this pedagogical approach more productively in tertiary settings.

My research also suggests that a third classroom actor could prove beneficial to many courses designed for first-year students, so long as these courses pursue not only the goal of teaching an academic subject but also of engaging in what compositionist Johnathon Mauk calls “the complexities of orienting students into academic spaces” (201). As Mauk explains, these orientation processes must address “not only the geography of that particular space (or campus) but also the geopolitics of the culture(s) surrounding that space” (201). Chapter Five illustrates the ways in which writing mentors were able to facilitate students’ entries into campus libraries and other resources spaces as well as to engage students in explorations of classroom, university, and Hawai‘i cultures—while teaching and learning about the complexities of these topics alongside students. And Chapter Four identifies the third classroom actor frequently playing the role of a “resource for individualized, comfortable, knowledgeable, and seemingly always available support.” Within this rich role, students attributed thirty-four different
behaviors to mentors. The potential import of adding a third classroom actor to a course for first-year students might best be illustrated by the following programmatic finding: when asked “Did your mentor help your transition to college?,” 71% of mentored students across the four years claimed “yes” (SE). Such transitional support is particularly valuable for first-generation college students, a point which my review of the literature on college student retention illustrates and which comments from first-generation students in the Writing Mentors Program vividly demonstrate (see Table 3.3). As Mauk argues, students’ orientation processes are far too multi-faceted for any singular campus office to oversee (201) or for any one-size-fits-all student orientation prior to the semester to “cover.” Trinary classrooms offer a meaningful avenue for extending such orientation processes and promoting first-year students’ successful transitions to the university. I would argue that if mentors could only be assigned to a single first-year course, it should be FYC, as mentoring relationships grounded in the act of writing have the strongest potential of extending into additional areas of transitional support. And while Composition Studies has a rich tradition of approaching teaching and learning in student-centered ways (Joseph Harris) that are highly compatible with mentoring, I believe that classroom-based mentoring could certainly prove rewarding across a variety of non-writing subjects beyond FYC, as evident in the University of South Carolina Supplemental Instruction Program that embeds “student leaders” within non-writing intensive courses and a course-based mentoring initiative for first-year science students at the University of New England in Australia (Quinn, Muldoon, and Hollingworth). Indeed, a repeated student suggestion (n=12) for how to improve the program would be to expand mentoring across the curriculum. As one student explained, “Perhaps the program could be expanded to other introductory courses, Biology, History, Mythology, aside
from getting extra support from someone who isn’t grading you, seeing where you could be in 3-5 years shows you where you could be going. The person you could become” (SE 853). Given that the person many first-year students envision themselves becoming is often not a writer, mentors from other disciplines may connect with certain students in ways that mentors from English do not, while also being well-positioned to illustrate the central role of writing in disciplines beyond English.

Perhaps most importantly, this research speaks back to the larger enterprise of first-year composition that Marilyn Valentino in her 2010 CCCC’s Chair Address likened to a cattle drive. Chapter Three elaborates the deplorable conditions of this factory-like scene, citing the troubling statistic that only 2.1% of first-year writing courses in doctoral-granting institutions nationally are taught by full-time tenured and tenure-track professors (ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Staffing Table 10). The remaining 98% of FYC instructors in these institutions frequently face heavy teaching loads, low wages, little classroom autonomy, few benefits, and almost no job security (Bousquet 204). Furthermore, a significant percentage of this workforce consists of graduate student laborers, many of which are beginning MA students who must teach FYC for the first time during their first semesters of graduate school, a challenge that Jessica Restaino ethnographically documents to be formidable and even unfair. While far from perfect, the UH Writing Mentors Program offers a stunning foil to this increasingly standardized national scene: all full-time English faculty teach FYC regularly; Ph.D. students are provided with a full semester’s teaching apprenticeship and experience as a writing mentor before moving in the ranks of instructors; and MA students are given the rich opportunity to serve as writing mentors across multiple FYC classrooms. This third classroom role affords MA students with unique experiences in team performance,
unique insights into instructor and student positionalities, and unique opportunities to experiment with and research in depth their future teaching careers. Given the in-between positions in classroom hierarchies they occupied, the wide range of roles they shifted among, and the many different temporal and spatial stages on which they interfaced with students and instructors, writing mentors were granted access to elements of student and instructor performances to which few other composition researchers have been privy. Mentors’ observations re-present the familiar mise-en-scène of the FYC classroom from new angles, illustrating among many things the high performative stakes faced by instructors, particularly in the register of cultural performance. These third actors’ renderings reveal the institutional position of “first-year composition instructor” to be both remarkably challenging and institutionally invaluable— and a position that is worthy of status and support. Furthermore, such accounts offer grounds for elevating FYC to the place it deserves: as, to borrow from a recent argument made by UH Vice Chancellor Reed Way Dasenbrock, the institution’s core competency rather than its cash cow. The story of the UH Writing Mentors Program’s inception just prior to a major economic recession and the program’s survival and institutionalization during an era of unprecedented university budget cuts, as narrated in Chapter Three, offers administrative strategies, supporting data, and hope to the profession.

On the most theoretical level, this dissertation introduces new ways of thinking about three party collaborations as “trinaries.” And it re-presents numerous threesomes that might serve to offset the stasis of binary writing pedagogy concepts. These three-part constructs include the classroom roles of student, mentor, and instructor; Jon McKenzie’s categories of performance as organizational, cultural, and technological; Dan Morgan’s
characterization of mixed methods research as abductive, intersubjective, and transferrable; Hannah Arendt’s depictions of the human condition as labor, work, and action; Henri LeFebvre and Edward Soja’s theories of spatiality as conceived, lived, and perceived; and even the academy’s mission of teaching, research, and service. One might add to these threesomes the classic rhetorical triangle of *ethos, pathos,* and *logos.* In these formulations, the three constituent elements are not related according to a strict linear hierarchy, but all features are meant to interface with, circle amongst, bridge, modify, and ultimately find a dynamic balance in relation to one another. Such a dynamic balance, however, is far different from the stasis of binaries. Those who might never have an opportunity to teach in a trinary classroom still have the opportunity to teach with trinary concepts, creating group projects with three distinct roles, challenging students to find a third side to an argument; asking student to writing about the paradoxical spaces in their own lives, requiring students to triangulate sources, and so forth. Multiple everyday literacy acts involve three parties: the cc-d email, the three-way Skype chat or conference call, the three-person committee, and more. How might understandings of the complexities and possibilities of classroom trinaries be leveraged to approach such situations in more performative, team-oriented, and rigorous ways?

While this dissertation demonstrates the trinary to be a powerful classroom configuration and theoretical construct, it also ultimately reveals the trinary to be a provisional lens. Participant accounts (as illustrated in Figure 1.1) indicated that the trinary enabled unique perspectives not only on the institutional actors that constitute the traditional classroom binary, but also on such entities as program directors, the institution, and the ‘āina or land. Thus, the most profound strength of the trinary might be
its capacity to reveal its own inadequacy as a signifier of the host of interrelations forged and deepened by this unique approach to teaching and learning.

Supporting Future Research on Trinary Collaborations

As noted in the Methodology Chapter, the logs, memos, and end-of-semester evaluations contained far more information and insight than I was able to address within this dissertation. Furthermore, as analyzed in Chapter Four, mentors often felt as though they were submitting conference logs and weekly memos into a kind of rhetorical void, without a clear sense of these documents’ audiences beyond WPAs or their purposes beyond generic program assessment. In light of performance studies theories of directorship, Chapter Four argued that one of the most significant areas of growth for the current UH Writing Mentors Program and its administration would be supporting mentors’ performances as composition researchers. While eleven mentors have been able to leverage their records to present at the Annual UH College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature peer-reviewed graduate student conference, they were able to work with data from only their own sections. As such, I believe that mentors’ performances as composition researchers would be greatly enhanced by offering mentors access to the larger UH Writing Mentors Program archives. What I envision is the creation of a digital database of trinary FYC collaborations that would include mentor conference logs, mentor weekly memos, mentor evaluations, student evaluations, and instructor evaluations. This database would be password protected and would be made available to UHM writing mentors, program administrators, and participating instructors—past, present, and future. While I first conceived of this database primarily with writing mentors in mind, I would propose that instructors who participate in the
program also be offered access to the database as a means of learning more about what mentors do, strengthening their own trinary collaborations, and potentially integrating trinary collaborations into their own scholarly agendas.²

This research vision parallels several other current digital writing archive projects within Composition Studies: the NCTE-sponsored *National Gallery of Writing*; Samantha Blackmon, Cristina Kirklighter, and Steve Park’s co-directed project, *Writing and Working for Change: A Digital Archive of Social Activism by Teachers of NCTE/CCCC*; and *The Stanford Study of Writing*, directed by Andrea Lunsford, which longitudinally tracks the writing practices and development of Stanford undergraduates over five years. The article, “Performing Writing, Performing Literacy,” which presented data from the Stanford Study of Writing in light of performance theory won the 2006 Richard Braddock award honoring the field’s most outstanding article of the year on writing or the teaching of writing (Fishman, Lunsford, McGregor, Otuteye). I envision a UH Writing Mentors Program Digital Archive of Trinary Collaboration being similar to the Stanford Study of Writing in its specificity to a single institution and in that it does not make the full range of raw data available to outside researchers. While I see the benefits of making the Writing Mentors Program archives available to a public, international audience as do many other digital archives, I believe that the complex politics of writing instruction in Hawai‘i as illustrated in Chapter Five demand that the data be interpreted first by individuals immersed in the same institutional and geographic space. I also believe that making these archives publicly available would not be appropriate, given the degree of familiarity and dependence many students performed with their students on stages they believed to be semi-private.
This major research undertaking would necessarily involve a new IRB agreement, a new Principal Investigator, an IT specialist, and a team of supporting researchers. The resulting program archive would serve as a rich locus for both informal and formal research. For example, a mentor facing a difficult situation with a student could perform keyword searches on all the logs and memos to learn how other mentors have handled similar challenges. Or a mentor wondering how to address a potential conference topic, such as working with students on critical reading, could sort the logs according to this conference topic and glean strategies from mentors’ narratives. More formalized research on programmatic archives could take the form of graduate seminar papers, MA theses, doctoral dissertations, and peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals, and perhaps one day a published anthology by program participants.

Of course, new permissions would need to be sought from all non-anonymous contributors to my dissertation project. The process of contacting prospective participants, double checking permissions, and expunging records of any identifying information would necessarily involve painstaking attention to detail and great care. The single most important criteria for any decisions related to the creation of this mentoring database should be the preservation of anonymity. Thus, while a database that interlinks mentor conferencing records, instructor and student evaluations, and institutional records would be quite powerful from a research perspective, I believe that such links increase the risk of revealing participants’ identities. I therefore recommend that each data source remain discrete. From a human studies perspective, I also believe it would be most appropriate to carefully limit demographic information. However, I foresee few if any risks associated with noting for each piece of archival material the demographic
descriptors of (a) institutional position (characterized broadly as first-year student, MA mentor, Ph.D. mentor, tenure-line faculty, Ph.D. student instructor, lecturer, and “other” instructor classifications); and (b) gender. Given that a total of 1,946 first-year students were enrolled in the 100 mentored sections in my study, I believe there would be relatively few risks in attaching to mentor logs the following generically-categorized student demographic traits: (c) SAT writing score percentile (i.e. top 25%, middle 50%, bottom 25%); (d) final grade in FYC (not to include + and - ); (e) UH ethnicity classification; (f) high school location (i.e. O‘ahu, neighbor island, cont. US, and intl.); (g) high school type (public, independent, other). And I foresee no perceptible human studies risks in making the database sortable by these additional features of conference logs: (h) assignment stage; (i) conference length; (j) conference location; (k) number of students attending; (l) conference topics; and (m) number of conference conducted with a given student (i.e. 1st, 2nd, 3rd . . . ).

A researcher could sort the database according to any desired combination of these demographic and conferencing features, arriving at a manageable set of logs, memos, and/or end-of-semester evaluations for qualitative coding or mixed methods research. Some of the research questions made possible through this database pertain to specific facets of the trinary arrangement, whereas other questions engage perspectives on student writers, composition instructors, writing conferences, and/or FYC enabled by the writing mentor’s presence as a new kind of composition researcher. For example, a broad range of interesting and useful research topics could be addressed by first sorting the archive according to demographic features. Questions a researcher might by ask by sorting the conference logs according to students’ SAT scores and final grades include
the following: How did mentors challenge students who came to FYC with standardized test scores in the top 25% and/or who earned the final grade of an A in the course? What mentoring strategies did mentors consider to be successful when working with advanced writers? What specific strengths and knowledges did mentors recognize in students who came to FYC with the lowest 10% of standardized writing scores? How did mentors build upon these strengths? Researchers might also build upon my work in Chapter Five by considering the ways in which students’ transitions to college are inflected by place of origin. In this case, a researcher might sort the conference logs according to high school location, high school type, and perhaps ethnicity, asking such question as: What challenges did mentors perceive students to be facing who were coming to UHM from neighbor islands? Or from high schools in the continental US? Or from international contexts? What can these archives teach the profession about students’ negotiations with new classroom and institutional cultures?

Much could also be learned by sorting the logs according to various conferencing features. For example, one might isolate those conference logs pertaining to a given topic from the checklist of twenty for further analysis (See Appendix E). Sample research questions include the following: Within conference logs in which mentors checked the topics box for understanding the assignment, what can be learned about the ways in which students misunderstood assignments? How can these findings help instructors to craft more learner-friendly assignments? What can mentors’ perspectives teach the profession about the ways in which students interpret and negotiate writing prompts? Or take the designated conference topic of building student confidence: What factors tended to impede and enhance student confidence (i.e. instructor behaviors, classroom dynamics,
student habits, additional student responsibilities, etc.)? How do mentors purport to build
students’ self-efficacy? Sorting the data first by this conference log feature and second by
demographic features, a researcher might also ask: In what ways can we understand
performances of self-efficacy as cultural, mediated by such factors as ethnicity and place
of origin? Or expanding the dataset to include end-of-semester evaluations, one might
ask: What markers of self-efficacy can be seen in students’, instructors’, and mentors’
end-of-semester evaluations? Similarly rich sets of research questions could be posed
about the remaining eighteen conference topics. I see this type of research as something
that could be completed within the context of a research methods seminar as an
introduction to qualitative coding and mixed-methods research. However, such a project
could also grow into a larger research project such as a MA thesis or a scholarly article.

Other facets of trinary collaborations that call for future research are the roles of
technology in trinaries, including a more systematic analysis of the many ways in which
mentors engaged Jon McKenzie’s category of technological performance. With the rapid
expansion of online and hybrid writing courses, it remains to be researched how a third
actor’s roles would shape and be shaped by these digital environments, including the
degree to which the multi-dimensions of mentoring (Nora and Crisp) could be enacted
online. Furthermore, in focusing primarily on mentors’ work, this dissertation leaves
much space for research into how trinary collaborations influenced instructors’
performances, both during the formal collaboration and beyond. It would also be
enlightening to investigate the influence of trinary experiences on mentors beyond their
tenure in the program. Jim Henry and I conducted an initial focus group interview with
former writing mentors who were in their first years of teaching, and it would be
interesting to discern what elements of the mentoring experience “stuck” with them beyond their first experiences in throes of instructorhood. Finally, I am aware that (among many things) gender played a far greater role in trinary collaborations than I was able to account for in this work, and I invite future research into this important facet of trinaries.

The range of research questions and topics I have enumerated indicates the richness of a digital program archive as a future locus of programmatic inquiry and illustrates my assertion that the research I have conducted these past four years can and should be mined by multiple mentors, WPAs, and FYC instructors for years to come. The UH Writing Mentors Program, its participants, and the place of Hawai‘i have enriched my life and shaped my perspective in ways that I can never reciprocate fully. However, I believe that presenting mentors with these rich data would offer me a means of giving back. Thus, I sincerely hope that the requisite combinations of interested individuals and institutional funding might turn this promising vision into a reality. While the UHM Writing Mentors Program is already one-of-a kind, this added dimension of programmatic research would truly make it stand alone.
Notes

1 I would characterize the student teaching experiences common to K-12 teacher preparation programs as a form of a classroom trinary.

2 Although the published archive would be fully anonymous, I believe that each mentor, administrator, and instructor who is granted access should first pass the research ethics education course offered through the UH Human Subjects Program (which can now be completed online and in a few hours) and sign an agreement to honor the program’s terms of participation, which would include not sharing the password or significant amounts of raw data with individuals outside the program.

3 I believe the project should begin with a pilot sampling of four-to-eight sections of FYC, prior to engaging the full set of programmatic data. Ideally, the team of researchers would be employed from the ranks of existing UHM writing mentors at a competitive hourly salary or in the form of ¼- time graduate assistantships that might serve to complement most mentors’ ½- time positions working with one trinary classroom per semester. The database creation project could also be associated with a graduate-level seminar or an independent study. I envision the team of researchers being invited to collaborate not only in the creation of the database but also in a peer-reviewed publication analyzing the challenges, opportunities, and dilemmas of creating such a site of research.

4 For example, the 52 writing mentors across the 100 sections in this study would each need to be contacted and given the options (a) not to participate or (b) to participate by granting consent for their mentoring records to be placed under password protection and made available to past, present, and future UH writing mentors, administrators, and participating instructors. Mentors who elect to contribute their records would also be given an opportunity to review their logs and memos, indicating any narratives that they do not want to be included in the digital database. Upon graduating from the program, current and future mentors would be extended an invitation to contribute their mentoring records anonymously to the growing digital program archives. Those 62 instructors across the 100 trinary sections of FYC in my project would also need to be contacted and invited to contribute their end-of-semester evaluations to the collection. Although the students described in mentors’ logs were not considered research participants by the IRB and thus were not approached for informed consent within my dissertation, I would recommend that from this time forward first-year students be informed of the project and offered the option for mentors’ attendance records associated with their name to be either anonymously included or not in the password-protected program archives. Students’ knowledge of their potential participation in this larger research project would invariably inflect mentor-student relationships, a change that would need to be considered carefully. As it currently stands 1,452 students across the 100 sections in my dissertation gave permission for their end-of-semester survey responses to be used in future reports and publications representing the UH Writing Mentors Program.

5 I recommend that each item in the archive be subjected to three different rounds of analysis to guarantee the removal of any details that might potentially reveal identities (i.e. names of people, names of high schools, names of hometowns, discussions of participants’ idiosyncrasies, detailed descriptions of instructors’ assignments, etc.)
APPENDIX A: Comparison of Three Trinary Classroom Models

Note: The table below portrays three models of trinary collaborations according to the categories of course assignments, classroom configurations and roles, conferencing cycles, conference topics, the third actor’s relationship to grading, and the third actor’s name. My portrayal of the Brown University Writing Fellows program is based upon their current program website as well as Tori Haring-Smith and Margot Soven’s early publications depicting the program. My portrayal of classroom-based tutoring is drawn from the introduction and conclusion chapters to Spigelman and Grobman’s anthology as well as from the editors’ descriptions of their own CBT experiences at Penn State Berks in their individually-authored articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Brown University Writing Fellows Program Model</th>
<th>University of Hawai'i Mānoa Writing Mentors Program</th>
<th>Classroom-Based Tutoring Model from Spigelman and Grobman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Assignment</td>
<td>• Fellows work in writing-intensive courses across the curriculum</td>
<td>• Mentors work in First-Year Composition courses only (at this time)</td>
<td>• Classroom-based peer tutors assigned to basic writing, FYC, and WAC courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program spans first-year writing seminars to upper-division courses</td>
<td>• Program includes regular and honors sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program includes regular and honors sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Roles and Configuration</td>
<td>• Writing fellows interface with students and instructor</td>
<td>• Writing mentors interface with students and instructor</td>
<td>• Classroom-based peer tutors interface with students and instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fellows generally attend some classes, but work primarily out of class</td>
<td>• Mentors expected to attend all classes and to conference with all students regularly outside of class</td>
<td>• Tutors work primarily within class, though they may also conference with students outside of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fellows often work with same students across full semester</td>
<td>• Mentors work with same students across full semester</td>
<td>• Tutors often work with same students across full semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing Cycles</td>
<td>• Conferences primarily occur outside of class</td>
<td>• Conferences primarily occur outside of class, supplemented with regular daily in-class interactions</td>
<td>• Conferences primarily occur in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conferences are almost exclusively one-to-one</td>
<td>• Conferences are primarily one-to-one, but paired and small group conferences also occur frequently</td>
<td>• Conferences occur primarily in small groups, but also include one-to-one interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standardized, pre-set conferencing cycle</td>
<td>• Both ad-hoc and pre-set conferences</td>
<td>• Some conferences occur during pre-set, in-class peer workshop sessions; other classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uniform conferencing protocols set by program, with some variation at the course level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Writing conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
generally address completed drafts and occur the week prior to an assignment’s deadline

• Conferencing protocols largely determined by instructors and mentors, while adhering to a few set programmatic policies
• Conferences occur across all stages of assignments with the highest percentage occurring during the initial stages of an assignment

interactions are ad hoc.
• Tutors often lead peer groups in draft workshops and may determine peer review protocols for entire class
• In-class conferences occur while students are drafting and during revision

| Conferencing Topics | • Conferences focus on the draft’s “argumentation, analysis, organization, clarity and style”
• Very little content negotiation, as the instructor and students are positioned as the “experts” on the course topic
• “Tutors suggest language, ideas, and strategies that student writers may incorporate directly into their drafts... encourage collaborative conversation among writers and responders; point out useful text sources from which writers may expand their arguments” (7)
• Content negotiation is included within tutors’ purview |
| • Conference topics include all those listed for Writing Fellows, as well as finding sources, developing critical reading skills, strategizing about time management, building confidence as a writer, discussing the student’s transition to college, and more.
• The most widespread conference topic was “generating ideas for the paper’s content,” with 79% of students claiming to have addressed this topic with their writing mentor. Additionally, 53% of students claimed to have sought mentors’ assistance with “understanding material that was covered in class.” |

| Relationship to Grading | • Fellows do not assign grades to student work
• Students submit papers to fellows for formative feedback
• Fellows leave comments on student drafts that instructor assesses along with final paper
• “Tutors suggest language, ideas, and strategies that student writers may incorporate directly into their drafts... encourage collaborative conversation among writers and responders; point out useful text sources from which writers may expand their arguments” (7)
• Content negotiation is included within tutors’ purview |
| • Mentors do not assign grades to student work
• Mentors generally do not encourage students to submit drafts for written commentary, reserving the majority of their time for f2f meetings
• Mentors work carefully so as not to be perceived by students as occupying any grading role, directly or indirectly |

| Terms, | • “Writing Fellows”
• “Writing Mentors”
• “Classroom-Based” |
| (Potential) Motives, and Implications in Naming of Third Classroom Actor | • Emphasizes third actor’s expertise and accomplishment as a student and writer  
• Connotes male gender  
• Enhances prestige of the program and authority of third actor in students’, instructors’, fellows’, and university administrators’ eyes  
• Signals academic focus of enterprise | • Emphasize third actor’s approachability as well as the intended reciprocity of the relationship  
• Does not directly connote specific gender  
• Reduces intimidation of approaching an institutional representative for FYC students  
• Signals both academic and interpersonal focus of enterprise | Writing Tutors” and “Peer Group Leaders”  
• Emphasizes the third actor’s role as a peer leader and the location of work as the classroom  
• Does not directly connote specific gender  
• Signals primarily academic focus of enterprise |
APPENDIX B: Writing Mentor Comments in Relation to Keeping in Touch with Former FYC Students

Note: Beginning in Spring 2008, I included the following question on the program’s anonymous end-of-semester surveys for mentors: “If you have mentored in the program before, did you keep in touch with any of your students from previous semesters?” Of the 42 returning mentors, 29 (or 69%) responded “yes.” A follow-up survey question asked mentors: “If you answered ‘yes’ to the previous question, please describe the nature and frequency of your interactions with your former mentees.” The following list categorizes mentors’ discursive responses to this question.

Nature of post-FYC interaction, as characterized by mentor:

- Casual, friendly impromptu interactions on campus or “around town” in which mentor & student stop to talk and exchange updates on how one another are doing; mentor often asks about the student’s current coursework and progress in school (n=16)
- Emails to “keep in touch” regarding academic, personal, and/or work life (n=8)
- Student-initiated requests for assistance on assigned papers (n=7)
- Student-initiated requests for letters of recommendation (n=5)
- Student-initiated requests for advice on academic future, including questions about registration, declaring majors, and scholarship opportunities (n=5)
- Student-initiated requests for assistance with personal statements for scholarships and/or study abroad opportunities (n=3)
- Student-initiated requests for advice for managing workload and/or exams (n=2)
- Student-initiated requests to be added as a Facebook “friend” (n=1)
- Student questions about being an English grad student (n=1)
- Student invitation to lunch on campus to “catch up” with mentor (n=1)
- Emails thanking mentor for help received (n=1)
- Student-initiated request for advice on how to act as a mentor, given that the student is now serving in a mentoring position of his own (n=1)
- Mentor email to students with offers for continued mentoring and writing-related assistance (n=1)
- Student-mentor contact within a course they both happened to enroll in the next semester
- Student sees mentor holding a writing-related workshop for current FYC students and joins in (n=1)

Sample comments by returning writing mentors:

I ran into several of my former students on a few occasions on and off campus, and the students stopped to update me on their academic endeavors... I haven't run into these students very frequently, but when I have, they have been eager to talk about school, classes they are taking, etc. (ME 77)

Some students I saw almost everyday, with others I've never seen again. I've had a student who requested a recommendation, a student who asked me for advice on mentoring now that he was in that position in his program, a student emailing me with questions about scholarships for her major, and one asking questions about being an English grad student (ME 53)

I helped a handful of students with either essays from other classes or personal statements for scholarships and study abroad. (ME 38)
Several students from previous semesters looked me up on Facebook, so I "added" them as Facebook friends. These students occasionally send me invitations to community events that they are involved in, such as concerts or benefit events. (ME 37)

Many of my former students have come to me for advice about their academic future. Also, there were just pleasant correspondences often thanking me for the help they received. (ME 76)

Just a happy new years messages etc. so far. I do hope to hear how they've progressed and get feedback from them with more retrospect. (ME 23)

I bumped into a couple students on campus and around town, but I primarily kept in contact with one student through email. That student has been keeping me up to date with his/her work and academic life, and has asked me questions about things like registration and approaching people in a couple different UH departments about declaring majors. (ME 12)
APPENDIX C: Conference Log Instrument, Fall 2006 Pilots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutor/Mentor</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>How did this session come about? <em>(circle one)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Required (101L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Tutoring/Mentoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief Reflections on the Session:

Did the session seem successful to you? Why or why not?

Any ideas for following up with this student? Any ideas for help this student needs that is beyond your ability (or responsibility)?
APPENDIX D: Conference Log Instrument, Spring 2007 Pilots

Mentor

Student

Date

Genre of the Assignment, if applicable
(E.g., first person narrative, analysis, research …)

How did this session come about? (circle one)
Suggested by Instructor  Requested by Student  Suggested by You

When did this session come about, with respect to the writing assignment? (circle one)
At the Beginning  In the Middle  Near the End  After Completed

Topic(s) Addressed:

Brief Reflections on the Session:

Did the session seem successful to you? Why or why not?

Any ideas for following up with this student? Any ideas for help this student needs that is beyond your ability (or responsibility)?
**APPENDIX E: Conference Log Instrument, Fall 2007-Spring 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student's Name:</th>
<th>Mentor's Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location of Conference:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of conference (in minutes):</td>
<td>Conference # (eg 1st, 2nd, 3rd):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When* did this session come about, with respect to the writing assignment?
- [ ] At the Beginning
- [ ] In the Middle
- [ ] Near the End
- [ ] After initial grade

Was this an individual or group meeting?
- [ ] Individual
- [ ] Group: # of students?

Did you refer the student to any other campus resources:
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, please specify the resource(s):

Did the student follow up on your referral:
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not Sure

What elements of the student's performance did your session address:
- [ ] Getting to know each other; developing rapport
- [ ] Preparing for writing conferences (with you or the instructor)
- [ ] Understanding the assignment's requirements
- [ ] Choosing (or modifying) a topic
- [ ] Generating ideas for the paper's content
- [ ] Finding outside sources
- [ ] Incorporating outside sources into a piece of writing
- [ ] Clarifying the paper's purpose and/or audience
- [ ] Organizing the paper more effectively (including transitions)
- [ ] Honing grammar, usage, and style
- [ ] Collaborating with classmates (addressing any peer-to-peer issues)
- [ ] Approaching the instructor with concerns, questions, requests
- [ ] Applying the instructor's comments for revision
- [ ] Developing confidence as a writer and college student
- [ ] Upholding class and/or university policies and expectations
- [ ] Understanding material that was covered in class
- [ ] Developing critical reading skills
- [ ] Utilizing technology and university resources
- [ ] Acquiring skills in time management and personal organization
- [ ] Handling issues of college and personal life not directly related to the course
- [ ] Other(s): please specify__________________________

*How* did you go about addressing these elements of the student's performance: (please elaborate in a few sentences)
APPENDIX F: Sample Completed Conference Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student's Name: Alisa Smith</th>
<th>Mentor's Name: Michelle Tanabe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 11/9/XX (Week 12)</td>
<td>Location of Conference: Sinclair Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of conference (in minutes): 60 minutes</td>
<td>Conference # (eg 1st, 2nd, 3rd): 6th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**When** did this session come about, with respect to the writing assignment?
- [ ] At the Beginning
- [ ] In the Middle
- [X] Near the End
- [ ] After initial grade

Was this an individual or group meeting?  
- [ ] Individual
- [X] Group: # of students? 2

Did you refer the student to any other campus resources:  
- [ ] Yes
- [X] No

If yes, please specify the resource(s):  

Did the student follow up on your referral:  
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not Sure

What elements of the student's performance did your session address:  
- [ ] Getting to know each other; developing rapport
- [ ] Preparing for writing conferences (with you or the instructor)
- [ ] Understanding the assignment's requirements
- [ ] Choosing (or modifying) a topic
- [ ] Generating ideas for the paper's content
- [ ] Finding outside sources
- [ ] Incorporating outside sources into a piece of writing
- [ ] Clarifying the paper's purpose and/or audience
- [X] Organizing the paper more effectively (including transitions)
- [ ] Honing grammar, usage, and style
- [X] Collaborating with classmates (addressing any peer-to-peer issues)
- [ ] Approaching the instructor with concerns, questions, requests
- [ ] Applying the instructor's comments for revision
- [X] Developing confidence as a writer and college student
- [X] Upholding class and/or university policies and expectations
- [ ] Understanding material that was covered in class
- [ ] Developing critical reading skills
- [ ] Utilizing technology and university resources
- [ ] Acquiring skills in time management and personal organization
- [ ] Handling issues of college and personal life not directly related to the course
- [ ] Other(s): please specify______________________________

*How* did you go about addressing these elements of the student's performance: (please elaborate in a few sentences)

As mentioned in John's log, I mediated a conference between John and Alisa. After John had left, Alisa commented that it was just "torture" to read his essay as that John's essay was "just awful." I worked with Alisa on her professionalism in the class. While it does not appear that Alisa had communicated these specific comments to John, I discussed with her constructive ways of giving feedback and let her know that John also knew that he had not submitted a complete, polished draft for review. I asked if she had ever been in a situation where she did not submit her best work, and she replied yes. I asked Alisa to define what had made John's paper "awful," and through her answers we constructed ways that Alisa could give constructive feedback that did not resort to name-calling or to negative judgments that did not help the writer improve his or her writing.

Alisa came back with a newly revised draft of her polemic essay. I was simply blown away by the improvement she had made with the essay, and told her so. Although there were a few areas
that were a little too informative, the majority of her essay had become a polemic piece. Hence, she has more of a framework for her essay and it was just a matter of flushing out her ideas. We worked on making her thesis more specific as I wanted her voice to come through instead of the notes from the professor (she had copied the professor's thesis statement on the post-it word-forward). We then went through each paragraph and I asked her to summarize what she felt the paragraph was about. We discussed organization and structure after completing the summary so she could see how each point tied together. We also worked on her quotes within each paragraph as many of them were drop quotes or were not sufficiently explained. Because her writing began to fall apart in the conclusion, we also worked on different ways she could end her essay. Specifically, I asked her how she felt her argument related to a readership in contemporary society since the appropriation of Italian immigrants in America had occurred a while ago. She responded that because appropriation was still occurring in contemporary society, that this issue was still being recycled. We worked on how she could weave this idea into her conclusion.
APPENDIX G: Guidelines for Conference Logs

Purpose: To keep track of each student conference you have conducted for the purposes of reflecting on your own practices, generating ideas about how you might follow up with individual students, and charting students’ progress over the semester. To provide professional experience in participating in a composition research project. To provide a record for the mentoring program that can be used for program assessment and to justify future funding for mentors.

Log Submissions: Please use the Survey Monkey link for this semester (which is different from last semester) to submit each conference log: <Link provided>.

Time Frame: Logs are to be completed as soon as possible after a conference occurs, while the interaction is still fresh.

Record-Keeping Tips: Mentors have also found it helpful to keep a paper attendance sheet and to take notes on conferences in a comp book. Some mentors keep an electronic file for each student with notes, emails, assignments, etc. When transposing those notes into conference logs, mentors have found it helpful to compose in Excel or some other non-online venue, which prevents loss of work in the case of an Internet failure. Holly will email you at least once a month with a full record of the logs you have submitted via SurveyMonkey.

Length Guidelines:

Short Logs: The narrative section of most logs should be 2-3 sentences total. Briefly depict the assignment at hand, the student’s concerns or challenges, the topics you addressed in the conference, and how you addressed those topics.

Extended Logs: Each week, select one log for elaboration and compose a narrative of approximately 250 words. If you want to write more, this is fine, but not necessary. This log could represent a conference that you perceived to be successful, or one that was problematic, or one that exemplified a trend you are finding across your students, or one that occurred with a particular student whose progress you are closely following, or simply a conference that interested you.

How do I log an intake interview? The only exception to the conference length guidelines provided above is intake interviews. Because these narratives can be useful to you in remembering a student’s interests, attitude, writing background, etc, we ask that you write a paragraph for each intake interview. Capture as many details as you can remember about the student and your interaction, and consider ways you might individualize instruction for this student in the upcoming semester.

What counts as a conference? Any interaction with a student that involves mentoring. “Conferences” have lasted from 3 to 120 minutes. While the majority of conferences are scheduled and take place in Sinclair Library or mentors’ offices, they may also take place spontaneously in hallways, in the classroom, over email, etc.

How do I log an email conference? If you email a student in a mentoring capacity (i.e., the email represents more than a transaction of information), please log it. You may summarize the interaction or paste the body of your email into the narrative section, along with the student’s response. In this case, the conference “location” would be “email.”
APPENDIX H: Weekly Memo Instrument

1. Mentor (Last, First):

2. Week of Semester:

3. Total number of conferences conducted during the previous week (format: 6, 7, 8. . .):

4. Summative Reflection: How did your conferences go this week? Reflect on any perceived trends across your conferences, observations about individual conferences, and/or analyses of your own approaches to mentoring. Please provide approximately one paragraph of discourse.

5. Pedagogical implications: Identify a concrete step (or steps) you could take based upon your response to the previous question. Please provide approximately one paragraph of discourse.
APPENDIX I: Sample Completed Weekly Memo

1. Mentor: Werner, Karl

2. Week of Semester: Week 5 (Sept 20-24)

3. Total number of conferences conducted during the previous week (format: 6, 7, 8. . .): 4

4. Summative Reflection: How did your conferences go this week? Reflect on any perceived trends across your conferences, observations about individual conferences, and/or analyses of your own approaches to mentoring. Please provide approximately one paragraph of discourse.

For the last two weeks students in my ENG 100 class have been busy working on paper number one, a definition argument. Students were asked to choose an abstract term like “justice,” “patriotism,” “equality,” or “the American Dream” and then argue for the need to either redefine or extend its definition. Most of the students I worked with had a difficult time with the assignment—not so much with the actual writing, but rather with the necessary critical thinking and analysis required to address the writing prompt. I noticed that many students ended up describing different uses of their chosen term, rather than constructing an argument.

5. Pedagogical implications: Identify a concrete step (or steps) you could take based upon your response to the previous question. Please provide approximately one paragraph of discourse.

My first instinct was that students had problems “understanding the assignment,” which I am starting to see as an all-purpose explanation for more complex problems. Rather than misunderstanding the assignment, I realized the students lacked both context for a discussion of these terms and analytical tools to draw their own conclusions. I tried to address the lack of context by providing students with the tools to find background information (primarily showing them search techniques on Lexis Nexis), but upon seeing the results in subsequent conferences, I am beginning to wonder how much analytical and critical thinking play a role. Most who had chosen patriotism, for instance, did not know about the Patriot Acts and how post-911 events have transformed our understanding of patriotism. But even after we had done some research and found out about the Patriot Acts and the inevitable discussions about the abuse of patriotic sentiments in advancing political agendas, not all were able to use that information to formulate an argument.

While I hesitate to call my mentees basic writers, readings by Mina Shaughnessy and Andrea Lunsford helped me better understand both the problems these writers face and possible pedagogical approaches. I was struck by Shaughnessy’s description of a typical college professor’s response to student papers: “Why, he [the teacher] wonders, do they reach such instant closure on their ideas, seldom moving into even one subordinate level of qualification but either moving on to a new topic sentence or drifting off into reverie and anecdote until the point of the essay has been dissolved?” This sounds very much like the essays that I had been reading, but rather than fault the students, Shaughnessy’s point is that teachers need to adapt their pedagogy to the needs of the students. Andrea Lunsford has suggested in “Cognitive Development and the Basic Writer” that we need to “foster conceptualization and analytical thinking” and that “basic writing classes should never be teacher-centered; set lectures should always be avoided. Instead, the classes should comprise small workshop groups in which all members are active participants, apprentice-writers who are ‘exercising their competence’ as they
learn how to write well. Class time should be spent writing, reading what has been written aloud to the group/audience, and talking about that writing.” While small workshop sessions are not always feasible in our packed classrooms at UH, mentors get the opportunity to work with individual students and small groups. Considering Lunsford emphasis on teaching students “how” to write, I think it might a good idea to use mentoring conferences to have students do some actual writing. This could be followed by an analysis of what has been written, with a special emphasis on analytical thinking.
APPENDIX J: Guidelines for Weekly Memos

**Purpose**: To connect the dots between individual conferences and think more carefully about patterns and trends across the class. To reflect critically on and to more fully theorize your own mentoring practices. To consider new approaches and concrete pedagogical steps you might take in the upcoming week. To provide a record of mentors’ work and reflections for the Writing Mentors Program and to keep program administrators abreast of your work.

**Submissions**: Please use the Survey Monkey link for this semester (which is different from last semester) to submit each memo: <Link Provided>.

**Time Frame**: Memos are to be completed at the end of each week’s conferences. They are due each Sunday night by midnight.

**Record-Keeping Tip**: In order to prevent lost work in the case of an Internet failure, mentors have found it helpful to compose their memos in Word or some other non-online venue. Holly will email you at least once a month with a full record of the memos you have submitted via SurveyMonkey.

**Length Guidelines**: Aim to write at least one paragraph in response to each of the two questions. More is fine but is not required or expected.

**What if I don’t conduct any conferences during a particular week?** You should still submit a log for that week. For the first question, reflect on how the current assignment is going (i.e. what the most challenging parts are) and how your students are faring at this point in the semester. For the second question, strategize on ways you might generate future conferences, contribute to the current assignment, connect with a particular student, prepare a workshop for the class, etc.

**Sample Memos**: Several mentors have mentioned that it would be helpful to see how others are approaching their conference logs and weekly memos. Mahalo to [names of mentors] for being willing to share examples of their memos from Fall 2010. (The only change I've made is to omit any names of instructors or students, so as to preserve confidentiality.) This collection of memos displays a variety of approaches and strengths: asking thoughtful questions about the nature of subjectivity, writing, language, legacy, culture, etc; brainstorming specific, creative, and operationalized pedagogical implications; connecting critical theory or class readings with mentoring observations; re-thinking initial conclusions; revisiting observations or strategies from previous memos; wondering. . .This upcoming Spring, I hope to send out another installment featuring more authorial voices and styles.
APPENDIX K: End-of-Semester Evaluation Instrument for Students

Explanation: The purposes of this survey are two-fold: 1) to evaluate each individual classroom mentor specifically; and 2) to assess the English Department's mentoring program as a whole. Your honest, thoughtful feedback will provide meaningful information to your mentor and help us to improve the mentoring program for future students. All completed evaluations should be returned to one student in the class. The student will then turn in the forms to the English department's main office at Kuykendall 402. Your mentor and instructor will be allowed to read these evaluations only after final grades for the class have been submitted.

1) Please list your mentor's name: __________________________________________________________

2) What is your year in school? □ Fr. □ Soph. □ Jr. □ Sr. □ Other: please specify

3) Did either of your parents attend college? □ No □ Yes

4) Please identify your gender (i.e. female, male, transgender, etc.)___________________________

5) Approximately how many total times did you meet with your mentor outside of class? _______

6) In what stages of the writing process did your mentor work with you? Please check all boxes that apply.
   □ At the Beginning □ In the Middle □ Near the End □ After a paper's initial grade

7) What topics did you and your mentor discuss in conferences? Please check all that apply.
   □ Getting to know each other; building rapport
   □ Preparing for writing conferences (with the mentor or the instructor)
   □ Understanding the assignment's requirements
   □ Choosing (or modifying) a topic
   □ Generating ideas for the paper's content
   □ Finding outside sources
   □ Incorporating outside sources into a piece of writing
   □ Clarifying the paper's purpose and/or audience
   □ Organizing the paper more effectively (including transitions)
   □ Honing grammar, usage, and style
   □ Collaborating with classmates (addressing any peer-to-peer issues)
   □ Approaching the instructor with concerns, questions, requests
   □ Applying the instructor's comments for revision
   □ Developing confidence as a writer and college student
   □ Upholding class and/or university policies and expectations
   □ Developing critical reading skills
   □ Understanding material that was covered in class
   □ Utilizing technology and/or university resources (i.e: library, websites, student health...)
   □ Acquiring skills in time management and personal organization
   □ Handling issues of college and personal life not directly related to the course
   □ Other(s): please specify

__________________________________________________________
8) Did your mentor help you to connect with any campus resources? ☐ Yes ☐ No (ie: library, search engines, websites, departments, career counseling, first-year student advising, student health...)

*If yes, please list the resource(s): ________________________________

9) Overall, how would you rank your level of satisfaction with your mentor?
☐ very unsatisfied ☐ unsatisfied ☐ neutral ☐ satisfied ☐ very satisfied

10) In your own words, please identify the various roles that your mentor played this semester, both in the course as a whole and in your experience as an individual student. Please give as many specific, detailed examples of your interactions with your mentor as you can remember.

11) In what ways did you find the mentoring program to be helpful?

12) In what ways could the mentoring program be improved?

13) Do we have your permission to quote anonymously from your free responses in reports and publications representing the mentoring program? ☐ Yes ☐ No
APPENDIX L: Discursive Prompts on End-of-Semester Evaluations for Students, F07-S11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive Prompts on Student Evaluations:</th>
<th>Semesters Asked:</th>
<th>Number of responses with permission to quote (across 100 sections in study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please identify the various roles that your mentor played this semester, both in the course as a whole and in your experience as an individual student. Please give as many specific, detailed examples of your interactions with your mentor as you can remember.</td>
<td>F07, S08, F08, S09</td>
<td>n=812 (not including 26 blank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways did you find the mentoring program to be helpful?</td>
<td>F07, S08, F08, S09</td>
<td>n=#811 (not including 27 blank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways could the mentoring program be improved?</td>
<td>F07, S08, F08, S09</td>
<td>n=#696 (not including 142 that were left blank)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Next year, the Chancellor’s office will decide whether to continue or cut the Writing Mentors Program. Do you think the mentoring program should be continued for English 100 future students? (Yes/No). Please add any comments about the UH Writing Mentors program that you'd like the Chancellor to hear: | F08, S09 | n1=423 (yes/no)  
n2=234 comments (not including 191 that were left blank) |
| Did your mentor help in your transition to college? Please elaborate. (In F09, follow-up prompt was revised in hopes of garnering greater specificity. “If your mentor helped you in your transition to college, can you give some examples of how?”) | F08, S09, F09, S10, F10, S11 | n1=1006  
n2=732                                                               |
| The traditional college classroom involves an instructor and students. What was it like to have a mentor added to this equation? (Please give as many specific, detailed examples as you can remember.) | F09, S10, F10, S11 | n=551 (not including 47 that were left blank)                               |
| Your mentor will likely be creating a teaching portfolio to apply for future jobs. Can you provide a few sentences of recommendation? (Feel free to discuss how your mentor helped you and what you see as the mentor's strengths and weaknesses.) | F09, S10, F10, S11 | n=514 (not including 84 that were left blank)                               |
| When you enrolled in English 100, did you realize that you were signing up for a mentored section? (Yes/No) If you answered "yes" to the previous question, why did you enroll in a mentored section? What were you hoping to gain by working with a mentor? If you answered "no," how did you feel when you learned that you had an assigned mentor? Did your feelings about having a mentor change over the course of the semester? | F10, S11 | n=278 (not including 45 that were left blank)                               |
APPENDIX M: End-of-Semester Evaluation Instrument for Mentors

Explanation: Please know that all survey results are anonymous. In fact, we have even blinded the survey to respondents' IP addresses in order to make the results non-traceable, hopefully allowing for more candid responses. We sincerely intend to use your feedback in order to help us improve the mentoring program.

Please also note that you will need to complete this survey in a single sitting, as it is not possible to save partially-completed surveys. Thank you for taking time to share your opinions, ideas, and experiences with us.

1. How would you rate your overall level of satisfaction with the mentoring program?
   □ Very Satisfied □ Satisfied □ Dissatisfied □ Very Dissatisfied

2. What have been the best and/or most fulfilling aspects of your job as a mentor? Please explain why.

3. What have been the most frustrating and/or problematic aspects of your job as a mentor? Please explain why.

4. How would you most accurately describe your role within your English 100 classroom?
   □ Worked almost exclusively outside of the classroom, rarely attending class, except perhaps for introductions;
   □ Attended class regularly, functioning mostly as an observer and speaking only occasionally;
   □ Attended class regularly and participated in classroom activities and discussions, asking questions and making comments regular basis;
   □ Attended class regularly and participated in classroom activities and discussions, asking questions and making comments regular basis; gave input into assignments and activities; took the lead in occasional workshops, activities, discussions, and sessions.

Feel free to elaborate on your response:

5. This past semester, what did your English 100 students teach you?

6. Please give Jim and Holly some feedback on our performances as program administrators. What have we been doing well that you'd like to see us continue? How can we better support your work as a mentor?

7. In what ways have the bi-weekly roundtables been useful? How could they be improved? What are some additional ways that can we enhance the value of the mentoring program in terms of your own professional development?

8. The job description calls for 10 hours per week of work for MA students and 9 hours per week for undergraduates. Over the course of the semester, how many hours of work did you average per week? (These responses are completely anonymous, so please give us as accurate a response as possible.)
   □ <5 hours □ 5-6 hours □ 7-8 hours □ 9-10 hours □ 11-12 hours □ 13-14 hours □ >15 hours
   □ Other: please specify

9. What can we as administrators do to make the actual number of hours spent on the job come closer to the job description?
10. Approximately what percentage of your overall time as a mentor did you allot to the following activities?

Directions: In each of the boxes below, please enter a number between 0 and 100 representing a percentage of your overall time. Do not include the percent symbol. Please note: The survey will only accept responses that add up to 100. If, when you press submit, your final survey does not go through, it is because the numbers in this particular response don't add up to 100.

- Attending your English 100 class
- Preparing for your English 100 class
- Conferencing face-to-face with students
- Completing conference logs
- Writing in your composition notebook
- Communicating with your instructor
- Attending mentor roundtables
- Other

11. Approximately how many emails did you send to your students per week?

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- over 20

12. Please describe the nature of your emails with students and explain the roles that email communications played in your overall work as mentor.

13. Is there anything else we should know? Please use this box to give us any additional feedback on this past semester or suggestions for the future.

14. We foresee that your responses to these questions could potentially serve as a way to represent the program. Would you be willing for your responses to be used in future reports and/or publications?  

- No
- Yes
APPENDIX N: Discursive Prompts on End-of-Semester Evaluations for Mentors, F07-S11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive Prompts on Mentor Evaluations:</th>
<th>Semesters Asked:</th>
<th>Number of responses with permission to quote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What have been the best and/or most fulfilling aspects of your job as a mentor? Please explain why.</td>
<td>All 8</td>
<td>( n=89 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have been the most frustrating and/or problematic aspects of your job as a mentor? Please explain why.</td>
<td>All 8</td>
<td>( n=89 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traditional college classroom involves two institutional roles: instructor and student. Based upon your experience, in what ways did/can your presence as a &quot;writing mentor&quot; change this equation? You might address such topics as classroom environment; student writing; lines of communication; your own pedagogy; roles available to students, mentor, and instructor.</td>
<td>F09, S10, F10, S11</td>
<td>( n=41 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This past semester, what did your English 100 students teach you?</td>
<td>F07, S08, F08, S09, F09</td>
<td>( n=62 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This past semester, what did you learn from working with your assigned instructor?</td>
<td>S08, F08, S09, F09</td>
<td>( n=48 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please give Jim and Holly some feedback on our performance as program administrators. What have we been doing well that you'd like to see us continue? How can we better support your work as a mentor?</td>
<td>All 8</td>
<td>( n=85 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways have the bi-weekly roundtables been useful? How could they be improved? What are some additional ways that can we enhance the value of the mentoring program in terms of your own professional development?</td>
<td>All 8</td>
<td>( n=83 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can we as administrators do to make the actual number of hours spent on the job come closer to the job description?</td>
<td>All 8</td>
<td>( n=72 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe the nature of your emails with students and explain the roles that email communications played in your overall work as mentor.</td>
<td>All 8</td>
<td>( n=83 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you mentored in previous semesters, did you keep in touch with any of your former students? If you answered &quot;yes&quot; to the previous question, please describe the nature and frequency of your interactions with your former mentees.</td>
<td>S08, F08, S09, F09, S10, F10, S11</td>
<td>( n=32 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else we should know? Please use this box to give us any additional feedback on this past semester or suggestions for the future.</td>
<td>All 8</td>
<td>( n=48 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O: End-of-Semester Program Evaluation Instrument for Instructors

Explanation: We intend to use your feedback to better understand the possibilities and problematics of this classroom configuration and to improve the overall program. All responses will be kept anonymous. Thank you for sharing your opinions, ideas, and experiences with us.

1. Please identify your institutional position:
   - Ph.D. Student (Graduate Teaching Assistant)
   - Lecturer
   - Assistant Professor
   - Associate Professor
   - Full Professor

2. How would you rate your overall level of satisfaction with the UH Writing Mentors Program?
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

3. Please list the ways that you integrated your mentor into your course. You might address syllabus representation, conference attendance policies, classroom roles for the mentor, and any other topics you deem relevant.

4. Taking into account that mentors are paid for 10 hours of work per week (which includes attending class, holding conferences, and documenting their work) how well do you believe the mentor in your section was utilized? I believe the mentor was:
   - under-utilized
   - utilized appropriately
   - over-utilized (i.e. consistently working beyond the 10 designated hours)
Feel free to further explain your response:

5. The traditional college classroom involves two institutional roles: instructor and student. Based upon your experience, in what ways did the presence of a "writing mentor" change this equation? You might address such topics as classroom environment; student writing; lines of communication; your relationship with students; your own pedagogy; roles available to students, mentor, and instructor.

6. If given the opportunity, would you want to work with an English 100 mentor in the future?
   - Yes, most definitely.
   - Probably.
   - I’m not sure.
   - Probably not.
   - Definitely not.
Feel free to comment on your response.

7. Are there any specific topics that you would like to see addressed in future workshops, either for mentors or instructors?

8. How would you feel about the possibility of adding a 1-hour lab component to mentored sections of English 100? Students would be required to reserve an hourly slot in their schedules to meet with the mentor, and the mentor would be responsible for conducting the 1-hour lab as a series of one-on-one conferences and small group workshops.
   - I would be in favor of this option.
   - I would be opposed to this option.
Please feel free to comment:

9. Is there anything else that you would like for us to know?

10. We foresee that your responses to these questions could potentially serve as a way to represent the program. Would you be willing for your responses to be used in future reports and/or publications?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Other (please specify):
APPENDIX P: End-of-Semester Mentor Evaluation Instrument for Instructors

Explanation: This evaluation provides valuable feedback to your mentor and to us as program administrators. In the past, many instructors' comments on this evaluation have been integrated, with their permission, into letters of recommendation for teaching positions. We will return these evaluations to mentors once all final grades have been submitted. Thank you for taking the time to provide this feedback.

1. Please list your name.

2. Please list your assigned mentor’s name.

3. How would you rate your overall level of satisfaction with your assigned mentor’s performance?
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

4. Please comment on your assigned mentor's overall contributions to your course this semester.

5. What do you see as this individual's biggest strengths as a writing mentor and future instructor?

6. What do you see as areas of improvement and/or opportunities for growth in this individual's performance as a writing mentor and future instructor?

7. We foresee that your responses to these questions could potentially serve as a way to represent your mentor and/or the program. Would you be willing for your responses to be used in future letters of recommendation, reports, and/or publications?
   - No
   - Yes, but keep my responses anonymous
   - Yes, and you may use my actual name when appropriate
   - Other (please specify):
APPENDIX Q: Discursive Prompts on End-of-Semester Evaluations for Instructors, F07-S11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive Prompts on Instructor Evaluation of Mentor and Program Combined</th>
<th>Semesters Asked</th>
<th>Number of responses with permission to quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please comment on your assigned mentor's overall performance this semester. (Added in F08: If possible, please identify both strengths and areas for improvement.)</td>
<td>F07, S08, F08, S09</td>
<td>n=49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please list the various roles your mentor played during class. (i.e., asked clarifying questions, passed out assignments, led discussions...)</td>
<td>F07, S08, F08, S09</td>
<td>n=49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do you believe the mentor's presence influenced the classroom environment? (Please feel free to share any specific examples or anecdotes that come to mind.)</td>
<td>F07, S08, F08, S09</td>
<td>n=48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do you believe the mentor's work influenced your students' writing? (Please feel free to share any specific examples or anecdotes that come to mind.)</td>
<td>F07, S08, F08, S09</td>
<td>n=47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways, if any, do you believe that having a mentor influenced your own pedagogy?</td>
<td>S08, F08, S09</td>
<td>n=36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What suggestions do you have for how we can improve the mentoring program?</td>
<td>F07</td>
<td>n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, if anything, did you learn from your assigned MA mentor?</td>
<td>F08, F08, S09</td>
<td>n=21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any specific topics that you would like to see addressed in our Fall mentoring workshops, either for mentors or instructors?</td>
<td>S08, F08, S09, F09, S10, F10, S11</td>
<td>n=44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else that you would like for us to know?</td>
<td>S08, F08, S09, F09, S10, F10, S11</td>
<td>n=27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive Prompts on Instructor Evaluations of Program Only</th>
<th>Semesters Asked</th>
<th>Number of responses (with permission to quote)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please list the ways that you integrated your mentor into your course. You might address syllabus representation, conference attendance policies, classroom roles for the mentor, and any other topics you deem relevant.</td>
<td>F09, S10, F10, S11</td>
<td>n=36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traditional college classroom involves two institutional roles: instructor and student. Based upon your experience, in what ways did the presence of a &quot;writing mentor&quot; change this equation? You might address such topics as classroom environment; student writing; lines of communication; your relationship with students; your own pedagogy; roles available</td>
<td>F09, S10, F10, S11</td>
<td>n=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Prompts on Instructor Evaluation of Mentor Only</td>
<td>Semesters Asked:</td>
<td>Number of responses with permission to quote:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please comment on your assigned mentor's overall contributions to your course this semester.</td>
<td>F09, S10, F10, S11</td>
<td>n=46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you see as this individual's biggest strengths as a writing mentor and future instructor?</td>
<td>F09, S10, F10, S11</td>
<td>n=46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you see as areas of improvement and/or opportunities for growth in this individual's performance as a writing mentor and future instructor?</td>
<td>F09, S10, F10, S11</td>
<td>n=43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any specific topics that you would like to see addressed in future workshops, either for mentors or instructors?  
S08, F08, S09, F09, S10, F10, S11  
n=44

Is there anything else that you would like for us to know?  
S08, F08, S09, F09, S10, F10, S11  
n=27
APPENDIX R: 2008 Writing Assessment: Essay Selection Guidelines for Instructors and Students

To: All English 100, 100A, 101, and ELI Composition Students
From: The UH Mānoa English Department
Date: Spring Semester 2008

Background: All students enrolled in foundations courses in writing are being required to provide a writing sample that demonstrates their successful accomplishment of the following student learning outcome: “Students who successfully complete a Foundations Writing (FW) course will be able to compose a text that seeks to achieve a specific purpose and responds adeptly to an identifiable audience.”

Purpose: Once the semester is over, a team of evaluators will score students’ writing samples. The evaluators’ findings will be used both to demonstrate the educational effectiveness of our composition program for accreditation purposes and to help us learn how we can improve our composition program for future students.

Assignment: We ask that you choose a writing sample from your work in this course that you feel best exemplifies your ability to achieve a specific purpose and to respond adeptly to an identifiable audience.

Formatting Checklist: On date that your instructor designates, you will need to bring to class a typed copy of your writing sample that meets the following formatting guidelines:

_____ 1) The piece is a typed, formal essay that you have written for this course.
_____ 2) The piece is freshly printed, without any handwritten comments, corrections, or grades.
_____ 3) The piece does not contain your name, your instructor’s name, or your section number.
_____ 4) The piece does contain your 8-digit UH student identification number typed on the upper right hand corner of each page of your chosen writing sample.
_____ 5) The pages of your writing sample are stapled together.

Additional In-Class Essay: On the day you submit your writing sample, you also will be expected to complete a student background questionnaire and write an additional in-class essay. For the in-class essay, you will be given a writing prompt that will ask you to reflect on how your piece accomplishes the designated student learning outcome. You will have 30 minutes of class time to respond to the writing prompt. The people who will be assessing the writing program will use both your end-of-the-semester writing sample and your in-class reflective essay to determine how well UH Mānoa is in meeting its student learning outcomes.

Questions: If you have any questions about choosing your writing sample or about the reflective response you will be writing at the end of the semester, please contact your instructor and/or assigned mentor. We wish you the best with your writing and with the rest of your semester.

Submission Date: Your instructor’s writing sample submission date is____________________
APPENDIX S: 2008 Writing Assessment: Scoring Rubric for Out-of-Class Essays

Developed by Dr. Monica Stitt-Berg, Dr. Marlene Lowe, Dr. Erica Clayton Reynolds, Holly Huff Bruland (in-class reflective piece scoring rubric), and Dr. Brandy Nālani McDougall (short story/narrative rubric)

Outcome 1: Compose a text to achieve a specific purpose and respond adeptly to an identifiable audience. Note: “Identifiable audience” has been interpreted as the expectations of a critical and informed reader when reading a text that he/she identifies as a “logos-based” essay or a short story or (personal) narrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>“Logos-Based” Essay</th>
<th>Short Story/ Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The content is complex and sophisticated, going beyond commonplace knowledge and showing an awareness of nuances. It suggests engagement with and deep understanding of the main point and overall topic. Claims and evidence are credible to an informed and critical reader. If the text refers to secondary sources, the text demonstrates a clear awareness of the relationship of these sources to the main point.</td>
<td>The narrative goes beyond the obvious or predictable. Ideas are fresh and creative. The text shows evidence of risk-taking, whether in content and/or storyline. The content of the storyline is credible to an informed and critical reader. It offers the reader a human connection. The narrative’s setting and characters are fully described and developed. Insight—an understanding of human behavior and a knack for picking out what is significant—is an indicator of high level performance, though not required for a “4” score in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some content may be complex and sophisticated. The text suggests an understanding of the main point and overall topic. The thesis/main point is supported by claims and credible evidence, though perhaps in a straightforward, mechanical way. If the text refers to secondary sources, the text demonstrates awareness that there should be some relationship between the argument of these sources and the text’s main point.</td>
<td>Some of the narrative may go beyond the obvious or predictable. It offers the reader a human connection. If the text shows evidence of risk-taking, (whether in content and/or storyline), it may not always be successful. The content of the storyline is credible to an informed and critical reader. The narrative’s setting and characters are described and developed, though perhaps in a straightforward and mechanical way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The content may be commonplace or a superficial discussion of the main point and overall topic. Claims and evidence may not be credible to an informed and critical reader. If the text refers to secondary sources, the relationship between these sources and the text is not always clear.</td>
<td>The narrative’s setting and characters are described and developed but in a simplistic manner OR not consistently described and developed. The narrative or elements within the narrative may seem cliché or superficial, vague or needlessly abstract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some evidence may not be credible to an informed and critical reader and/or there is insufficient evidence provided.</td>
<td>Details in the narrative may not seem credible to an informed and critical reader. The narrative’s setting and character(s) are poorly described and developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td><strong>“Logos-Based” Essay</strong></td>
<td><strong>Short Story/ Narrative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A thesis statement or main point is clear, well focused, and maintained throughout. The organization enhances the reader’s understanding. The text is logical and well-sequenced, with unified paragraphs and graceful transitions.</td>
<td>The text is well sequenced, easy to follow, and engages the reader’s interest. The arrangement of ideas enhances the reader’s understanding of the overall narrative. There are unified paragraphs and graceful transitions. The text may show evidence of successful risk-taking in the structure/form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A thesis statement or main point is clear, well focused, and maintained throughout. There is an effective introduction, body, and conclusion with focused and orderly paragraphs. Transitions are signaled. The text spends an appropriate amount of time on details.</td>
<td>The introduction, body, and conclusion/resolution are effectively organized and for the most part engage the reader’s interest. The sequence supports the central theme/message. There are orderly paragraphs and transitions signaled. The text spends an appropriate amount of time on details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A thesis statement or main point exists and is carried through the entire text but may be done so in a general, topic manner that does not advance a thesis/main point. The text has a recognizable introduction and conclusion. There is little effort at smooth transitions. The text may spend too much time on details that do not matter or move ahead too quickly. The reader may have to infer how ideas are connected.</td>
<td>The narrative has a recognizable introduction and conclusion. There is little effort at smooth transitions, so the narrative seems choppy or disjointed at times. The text may spend too much time on details that do not matter or move ahead too quickly. The reader may have to infer how ideas are connected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A thesis statement or main point may exist, but it is not carried through the text OR is carried through at a very general level. The organization attempts to meet the needs of a reader and may succeed at a basic level; however, a more effective structure is expected. A logical sequence may not be discernable. A section may seem out of place or not needed. There is little effort at transition statements. Connections between ideas are unclear.</td>
<td>The narrative structure attempts to meet the needs of the reader and may succeed at a basic level; however, the storyline is confusing or disjointed without a clear purpose for being so. A section may seem out of place or not needed. There is little effort at transitions. The reader may have to infer how ideas are connected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td><strong>“Logos-Based” Essay</strong></td>
<td><strong>Short Story/ Narrative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The text skillfully upholds a reader’s expectations for first-year college-level discourse in terms of vocabulary and tone. Words chosen enhance meaning and clarify the reader’s understanding. The tone enhances the purpose. Purposeful and varied sentence structure and length enhance the text’s meaning and purpose.</td>
<td>The narrative displays a skillful (college-level) use of language: imagery, description, poeticisms, figurative language, metaphor, etc. The words chosen enhance meaning and clarify the reader’s understanding. The tone enhances the purpose. The writing has cadence; the writing suggests that the writer has thought about the sound of the words as well as the meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The text meets a reader’s expectations for first-year college-level discourse in terms of vocabulary and tone. The tone is appropriate for the purpose. Words chosen are adequate and correct. Sentence structure and length are varied.</td>
<td>The narrative displays adequate (college-level) use of language: imagery, description, poeticisms, figurative language, metaphor, etc. The words chosen are correct and adequate. The tone suits the purpose. The writing suggests that the writer thought about the sound of the words as well as the meaning, but perhaps not consistently throughout the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The text may occasionally fall short of a reader’s expectations for first-year college-level discourse in terms of vocabulary and tone. Words chosen are functional and may be repeated. Tone may be inappropriate at times.</td>
<td>The narrative may occasionally fall short of the reader’s expectations for adequate (college-level) language use: imagery, description, poeticisms, figurative language, metaphor, etc. The words chosen are functional and may be repetitive. Tone may be inappropriate at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The text does not meet a reader’s expectations for first-year college-level discourse in terms of vocabulary and tone. Limited vocabulary or misused words detract and may impair meaning. Tone may be inappropriate.</td>
<td>The narrative falls short of the reader’s expectations for adequate (college-level) language use: imagery, description, poeticisms, figurative language, metaphor, etc. Limited vocabulary or misused words detract and may impair overall understanding of the story. The tone may be inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>“Logos-Based” Essay</td>
<td>Short Story/ Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The text meets a reader’s expectations for college-level writing in the areas of paragraphing, spelling, grammar, punctuation, and citation rules. Intentional departures from conventions are signaled in the text. One or two sentences may demonstrate mechanical or structural difficulties, but not in a manner that distracts from the meaning of the text.</td>
<td>The narrative meets a reader’s expectations for college-level writing in the areas of paragraphing, spelling, grammar, punctuation, and citation rules. Intentional departures from conventions are signaled in the text. One or two sentences may demonstrate mechanical or structural difficulties, but not in a manner that distracts from the meaning of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The text meets a reader’s expectations for entry-level college writing in the areas of paragraphing, spelling, grammar, punctuation, and citation rules. Intentional departures from conventions may not always be signaled in the text. Some sentences may demonstrate mechanical or structural difficulties, but usually not in a manner that distracts from the meaning of the text.</td>
<td>The narrative meets a reader’s expectations for entry-level college writing in the areas of paragraphing, spelling, grammar, punctuation, and citation rules. Intentional departures from conventions may not always be signaled in the text. Some sentences may demonstrate mechanical or structural difficulties, but usually not in a manner that distracts from the meaning of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The text falls short of reader’s expectations for entry-level college writing in the areas of paragraphing, spelling, grammar, punctuation, and citation rules. Departures from conventions are not signaled. Sentences with mechanical or structural difficulties are confusing.</td>
<td>The narrative falls short of reader’s expectations for entry-level college writing in the areas of paragraphing, spelling, grammar, punctuation, and citation rules. Departures from conventions are not signaled. Sentences with mechanical or structural difficulties are confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The text does not meet reader’s expectations for entry-level college writing. Some problems with mechanics leave the reader wondering. Errors are frequent. Departures from conventions are not signaled.</td>
<td>The narrative does not meet reader’s expectations for entry-level college writing. Some problems with mechanics leave the reader wondering or inferring what the writer means. Errors are frequent. Departures from conventions are not signaled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General guiding statements about the scores**

4=Outstanding, suggesting the student is prepared to excel in future writing and writing-intensive courses
3=Strong, suggesting the student would perform reasonably well in future writing and writing-intensive courses
2=Only partially upholds reader expectations for first-year college-level writing, suggesting the student might struggle somewhat in future writing and writing-intensive courses but has enough aptitude as a writer to succeed given diligent effort, practice, and outside support
1=Does not meet reader expectations for first-year college-level writing, suggesting the student lacks the writing skills to succeed in future writing and writing-intensive courses
APPENDIX T: 2008 Writing Assessment: Prompt for In-Class Reflective Essays

Directions to Students: Before you proceed, please get out your typed writing sample. Check to be sure that your 8-digit UH ID number is written on the upper right hand corner of every page of your writing sample. Keep your writing sample on your desk as you compose this reflective in-class essay, referring back to it for specific examples. Please write in pen. You will have 30 minutes to compose your reflective essay.

Essay Prompt: Write a reflective essay about why you selected your particular writing sample to submit for this FW assessment. Please be sure to analyze how your chosen writing sample fulfills the student learning outcome: “Students who successfully complete a Foundations Writing (FW) course will be able to compose a text that seeks to achieve a specific purpose and responds adeptly to an identifiable audience.”

Some Optional Questions To Get You Started: If you need help getting started, please consult the questions below. Use them as launching point for what to write about and not as an absolute outline of required topics.

Purpose: What specific purpose(s) were you hoping to achieve through this piece? Can you point out specific places in your writing that are intended to achieve your purpose(s)? What do you want your audience to understand, feel, and/or do?

Audience: Who is your intended audience or audiences? What assumptions have you made about your audience? (i.e. their prior knowledge, expectations, biases, preferred styles of writing... ) In what specific ways have you attempted to respond to your audience within your selected writing sample?

Genre and Voice: Construct your responses in essay form: no bullet points or lists, please. We encourage you to write in the first person (using “I”).

Where to Write: Please use the back side of this direction sheet for any pre-writing. Begin your essay on the next sheet of paper. Be sure to write your UH ID number on the upper right hand corner of each sheet of paper that you use.

At the end of the 30 minutes, please staple the following materials together in this order and hand them to your instructor:

1st) this sheet of paper with the essay prompt;
2nd) your reflective in-class essay;
3rd) your selected, typed writing sample.

Mahalo for participating in this assessment!
APPENDIX U: 2008 Writing Assessment: Scoring Rubric for In-Class Reflective Essays

Student Learning Outcome: “Students who successfully complete a Foundations Writing (FW) course will be able to compose a text that seeks to achieve a specific purpose and responds adeptly to an identifiable audience.”

Goal of reflective piece assessment: To assess students’ meta-cognition vis-à-vis the act of writing, particularly their ability to discuss and analyze the concepts of purpose and audience within a 30-minute in-class writing situation. For the purposes of this assessment, we will draw upon J.H. Fravell’s explanation of metacognition: “Metacognition refers to one’s knowledge concerning one’s own cognitive processes or anything related to them, e.g., the learning-relevant properties of information or data. For example, I am engaging in metacognition if I notice that I am having more trouble learning A than B; if it strikes me that I should double check C before accepting it as fact” (232).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Holistic Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4     | **The author depicts the piece’s purpose and/or audience with specificity/complexity.**  
• In detail, the author discusses an intended outcome(s) for the piece (i.e. what he/she wants that audience to understand, feel, or do) and/or assumptions he/she has made about the audience (such as its prior knowledge, expectations, biases, and/or preferred styles of writing). The author may also reflect on the relationship/fit between the audience and purpose.  
• Referring to specific moments in the piece as evidence, the author analyzes how the submitted sample furthers a specific purpose and/or addresses an identifiable audience. The author’s analysis of his/her own writing demonstrates rhetorical and meta-cognitive awareness. |
| 3     | **The author depicts the piece’s purpose and/or audience with some degree of specificity/complexity.**  
• In some detail, the author discusses an intended outcome(s) for the piece (i.e. what he/she wants that audience to understand, feel, or do) and/or assumptions he/she has made about the audience (such as its prior knowledge, expectations, biases, and/or preferred styles of writing).  
• Referring more generally to the piece as evidence, the author analyzes how the submitted sample furthers a specific purpose and/or addresses an identifiable audience. References to the selected piece may be somewhat awkward and mechanical, but they do demonstrate evidence of analysis. |
| 2     | **The author depicts the piece’s purpose and/or audience in a fairly superficial and under-developed manner.**  
• In generic manner, the author states an intended outcome(s) for the piece (i.e. what he/she wants that audience to understand, feel, do) and/or an assumption he/she has made about the audience (such as its prior knowledge, expectations, biases, preferred styles of writing).  
• The author attempts to make some connection(s) between the selected piece and the concept of purpose and/or audience. |
| 1     | **The author depicts the piece’s purpose and/or audience in a superficial and cursory manner or not at all:**  
• The author may discuss his/her writing process or on his/her reasons for selecting the piece, but he/she does not state intended outcomes for the piece (what he/she
wants that audience to understand, feel, do) or assumptions he/she has made about the audience (such as audience’s prior knowledge, expectations, biases, preferred styles of writing). -OR-
- The author fails to connect the concept of purpose and/or audience with the selected piece. -OR-
- The author’s response is off-topic, does not respond to the prompt.
APPENDIX V: Demographic Survey Instrument for Mentors

PART I: INFORMED CONSENT

Purpose: This survey will be used for Holly Bruland's dissertation and other program-related publications in two ways: (1) To create a composite portrait of the entire group of instructors who have worked with a mentor; (2) To begin to map the relationships that emerge in mentored classrooms. Over the past 3 years, there have been approximately 1,500 unique instructor-mentor-student triangles. We would like to be able to present breakdowns of these triangles in terms of institutional position, age, gender, ethnicity, family educational history, academic focus areas, and geographic origin. For example: we might find that in 50% of all cases, the instructor, mentor, and student each represent a different decade in terms of age. Or we might find that in 15% of all cases, the instructor, mentor, and student all claim the same place of geographic origin.

Participants: We are asking all mentors who gave consent for their logs to be used for research purposes and who checked the box granting permission for follow-up questions to complete this survey. We anticipate approximately 35-40 mentor participants.

Terms of Agreement: Agreeing to participate in this study will not require any additional time on your part beyond completing a brief survey designed to take 5 minutes. Furthermore, we believe that participation in this study involves very little to no risk on your part. If you decide to sign this consent form, you will simply be granting us permission to use your survey data in our overall program demographics and to quote from your comments in our results. The results of this research may be presented to other educators and administrators, included in Holly Bruland's dissertation, and/or published.

Compensation: Participating in this research does not involve additional compensation. Furthermore, participating in this research may be of no direct benefit to you. It is believed, however, that the broader results of this research will improve the UH Writing Mentors Program for years to come and contribute to more effective training of writing mentors and mentoring of student writers.

Anonymity: All mentors who decide to participate in the study will be given anonymity. Furthermore, any demographic descriptors which could lead someone to identify a particular mentor will not be published.

Voluntary Participation: Participation in this study is voluntary, and refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which instructors are otherwise entitled. Participants may decide to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled.

Oversight: Agencies with research oversight, such as the UH Committee on Human Studies, have the authority to review research data. All research records will be stored in locked files or in secure digital files in the primary investigators' offices for the duration of the research project.
Questions or Concerns: If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact Principal Investigators Holly Bruland (hbruland@hawaii.edu) or Jim Henry (jmhenry@hawaii.edu). If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or if you have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, University of Hawai‘i, 1960 East-West Road, B-104, Honolulu, HI 96822. Telephone: (808) 956-5007.

Please print a copy of this form for your records.

“By completing this survey, I certify that I have read and that I understand the foregoing, that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time without prejudice. I herewith give my consent to participate in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the Principal Investigators or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence.”

_____________________________  ____________________
Name  Date

Are you willing to be contacted with follow-up questions?  □ Yes    □ No

If yes, please provide an email address and/or phone number:

PART II: DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

1. Institutional Position:
   □ M.A. Student
   □ Ph.D. Student
   Optional comments:

2. Area(s) of concentration: (Please check all that apply)
   □ Composition and Rhetoric
   □ Creative Writing
   □ Cultural Studies in Asia/Pacific
   □ Literary Studies in English

3. Prior to serving as a writing mentor, had you worked as a tutor or consultant in a writing center?
   □ Yes
   □ No

If you answered “yes,” please specify where you tutored and for how long. If you answered “no,” but have had prior experiences in tutoring, teaching, mentoring, or counseling, please note the positions and durations:
4. Gender: (female, male, transgender, etc.)

5. Year of birth: (i.e. 1961)

6. Location of high school from which you graduated:

7. Type of high school from which you graduated:
   - [ ] Public
   - [ ] Private
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

8. Name and location of college from which you graduated:

7. Type of college from which you graduated:
   - [ ] Public
   - [ ] Private
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

10. Did either of your parents or guardians attend college?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - Optional comments:

11. Did either of your parents or guardians attend graduate school?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - Optional comments:

12. How many years have you lived in Hawai`i? (i.e. 10)

13. Which languages do you speak-- and how fluently? Please count Pidgin (HCE) as its own language.

14. How would you describe your ethnicity?

15. Are there any additional markers of identity that figure into your self-presentation or pedagogy as a writing mentor?

16. Do you intend to teach after completing your graduate degree?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - Please comment on any post-mentoring plans or experiences:
APPENDIX W: Demographic Survey Instrument for Instructors

PART I: INFORMED CONSENT

**Purpose**: This survey will be used for Holly Bruland's dissertation and other program-related publications in two ways: (1) To create a composite portrait of the entire group of instructors who have worked with a mentor; (2) To begin to map the relationships that emerge in mentored classrooms. Over the past 3 years, there have been approximately 1,500 unique instructor-mentor-student triangles. We would like to be able to present breakdowns of these triangles in terms of institutional position, age, gender, ethnicity, family educational history, academic focus areas, and geographic origin. For example: we might find that in 50% of all cases, the instructor, mentor, and student each represent a different decade in terms of age. Or we might find that in 15% of all cases, the instructor, mentor, and student all claim the same place of geographic origin.

**Participants**: We are asking instructors and mentors from all (approximately) 100 mentored sections over the past three years to complete this survey. As several instructors have taught more than one mentored section, the total population of instructors is approximately 60. To represent the program accurately, we hope for the fullest participation possible.

**Terms of Agreement**: Agreeing to participate in this study will not require any additional time on your part beyond completing a brief survey designed to take 3-5 minutes. Furthermore, we believe that participation in this study involves very little to no risk on your part. If you decide to sign this consent form, you will simply be granting us permission to use your survey data in our overall program demographics and to quote from your comments in our results. The results of this research may be presented to other educators and administrators, included in Holly Bruland's dissertation, and/or published.

**Compensation**: Participating in this research does not involve additional compensation. Furthermore, participating in this research may be of no direct benefit to you. It is believed, however, that the broader results of this research will improve the UH Writing Mentors Program for years to come and contribute to more effective training of writing mentors and mentoring of student writers.

**Anonymity**: All instructors who decide to participate in the study will be given anonymity. Furthermore, any demographic descriptors which could lead someone to identify a particular instructor will not be published.

**Voluntary Participation**: Participation in this study is voluntary, and refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which instructors are otherwise entitled. Participants may decide to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled.

**Oversight**: Agencies with research oversight, such as the UH Committee on Human Studies, have the authority to review research data. All research records will be stored in locked files or in secure digital files in the primary investigators' offices for the duration of the research project.
Questions or Concerns: If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact Principal Investigators Holly Bruland (hbruland@hawaii.edu) or Jim Henry (jmhenry@hawaii.edu). If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or if you have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, University of Hawai‘i, 1960 East-West Road, B-104, Honolulu, HI 96822. Telephone: (808) 956-5007.

Please print a copy of this form for your records.

“By completing this survey, I certify that I have read and that I understand the foregoing, that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time without prejudice. I herewith give my consent to participate in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the Principal Investigators or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence.”

_________________________________________  ______________________________________
Name                                                Date

Are you willing to be contacted with follow-up questions?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

If yes, please provide an email address and/or phone number:

PART II: DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

1. Institutional Position:
   [ ] Ph.D. Student (Graduate Teaching Assistant)
   [ ] Lecturer
   [ ] Assistant Professor
   [ ] Associate Professor
   [ ] Full Professor

2. Approximately how many years have you been teaching First-Year Composition? (i.e. 10)

3. Area(s) of concentration: (Please check all that apply)
   [ ] Composition and Rhetoric
   [ ] Creative Writing
   [ ] Cultural Studies in Asia/Pacific
   [ ] Literary Studies in English

4. Gender: (female, male, transgender, etc.)

5. Year of birth: (i.e. 1961)

6. Location of high school from which you graduated:
7. Type of high school from which you graduated:
   □ Public
   □ Private
   □ Other (please specify)

8. Name and location of college from which you graduated:

7. Type of college from which you graduated:
   □ Public
   □ Private
   □ Other (please specify)

10. Did either of your parents or guardians attend college?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   Optional comments:

11. Did either of your parents or guardians attend graduate school?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   Optional comments:

12. How many years have you lived in Hawai`i? (i.e. 10)

13. Which languages do you speak-- and how fluently? Please count Pidgin (HCE) as its own language.

14. How would you describe your ethnicity?

15. Are there any additional markers of identity that figure into your self-presentation or pedagogy in the First-Year Composition classroom?
APPENDIX X: Sample Participant Check Roundtable Cover Letter for Mentors

Note: This cover letter was sent to the mentors over email, with an attached partial draft of Chapter Four.

November 27, 2011

Dear Mentors,

[Faculty Director of Program] and [Graduate Director of Program] have graciously agreed to allow me to spend part of the upcoming roundtable presenting my dissertation findings on the Writing Mentors Program and getting your feedback. I hope you’ll find the experience interesting and useful, as it’s somewhat unique to have someone studying and reporting on one’s specific occupation (i.e., mentoring) in such detail.

I have attached a partial draft of one of my dissertation chapters. If you’d be willing to read it over before the roundtable and to come with some feedback— either in the form of notes or just impressions to share orally— I would really appreciate it. Since I don’t want to ask you to do any more preparatory work than is absolutely necessary, especially at this busy time of the semester, I’m planning to digitally record the discussion so that I might have something to go back to after the roundtable when I revise the chapter. I’ll have voluntary permission sheets on hand: if you decide to sign one, it would give me permission to quote from or paraphrase your feedback anonymously. If you’d rather not sign a form, that’s entirely fine too. I’ll keep the list of people who agreed to let me use their comments confidential.

Here are a few questions I’d especially appreciate your feedback on:

--To what degree did the three paradoxes and sub-themes ring true (or not true) to your experience as a writing mentor? Are there any ways you’d suggest my revising them?

--Did anything in my interpretations of mentors’ comments seem inaccurate to you?

--Is there anything else I should be aware of in interpreting mentors’ comments about the best and worst parts of the position?

Thanks, and I look forward to seeing you this Wednesday,

Holly Bruland
APPENDIX Y: IRB Project Approval Letter
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APPENDIX Z: Voluntary Consent Form for Mentor Conference Logs and Weekly Memos

Purpose: We are seeking your permission to conduct additional research on your conference logs and weekly memos that would go above and beyond our regular program assessment. The purpose of this research is to learn more about the complexities of mentoring and to investigate mentors’ insights into students’ learning processes and one-on-one writing pedagogies.

Terms of Agreement: Agreeing to participate in this study will not require any additional time on your part. If you decide to sign this form, you will simply be granting us permission to use the written portions from your conference logs in our follow-up research and to quote from your work in our results. The results of this research may be presented to other educators and administrators at UH and/or published in an academic journal.

Anonymity: All mentors who decide to participate in the study will be given anonymity. In order to guarantee this anonymity, all mentors involved in the study will be assigned a pseudonym. Furthermore, any elements of a writing sample which could lead someone to identify a particular mentor or student will not be published.

Voluntary Participation: Participation in this study is voluntary, and refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which mentors are otherwise entitled. Participants may decide to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled.

Questions or Concerns: If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact Principal Investigators Holly Bruland (hbruland@hawaii.edu) or Jim Henry (jmhmary@hawaii.edu). If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or if you have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, University of Hawai‘i, 2540 Maile Way, Honolulu, HI 96822. Telephone: (808) 956-5007

Please sign both the blue and yellow sheets of paper. Keep the blue copy of this form for your personal records and return the yellow copy with your signature to your instructor.

"I certify that I have read and that I understand the foregoing, that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time without prejudice. I herewith give my consent to participate in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the Principal Investigators or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence."

Printed Name __________________________ Signature of Participant __________________________ Date __________

If you are willing to be contacted with follow-up questions, please provide your email and/or phone # below:

E-mail address __________________________ Phone contact __________________________

If you are willing to be contacted with follow-up questions, please provide your email and/or phone # below:
APPENDIX AA: Voluntary Consent Form for Focus Group Interview Participants

Purpose: We are seeking your permission to conduct additional focus group interviews that would go above and beyond our regular program assessment. The purpose of these focus group interviews is to learn more about the mentoring program qualitatively--from the perspectives of students, mentors, and instructors.

Terms of Agreement: Agreeing to participate in this study means that you will attend a 1-hour group discussion on the mentoring program. Groups will consist of approximately 6-8 participants each. The members of any given group will come from the same contingency: all students, all mentors, and all instructors. The session will be digitally recorded, and the transcript will be transcribed for further study. If you sign this form, you will simply be granting us permission to quote from the transcript of your focus group interview in our results. The results of this research may be presented to other educators and administrators at UH and/or published in an academic journal.

Anonymity: All students, mentors, and instructors who decide to participate in the study will be given anonymity. In order to guarantee this anonymity, all participants involved in the study will be assigned a pseudonym. No quotations that could enable any individuals to be identified will be published.

Voluntary Participation: Participation in this study is voluntary, and refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which individuals are otherwise entitled. Participants may decide to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled.

Questions or Concerns: If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact Principal Investigators Holly Bruland (hbruland@hawaii.edu) or Jim Henry (jmhenry@hawaii.edu). If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or if you have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, University of Hawai‘i, 2540 Maile Way, Honolulu, HI 96822. Telephone: (808) 956-5007

Please sign both sheets of paper. Keep one copy of this form for your personal records and return the other copy with your signature to Holly.

“I certify that I have read and that I understand the foregoing, that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time without prejudice. I herewith give my consent to participate in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the Principal Investigators or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence. “

_________________________          ___________________________         ___________________________
Printed Name                  Signature of Participant              Date

If you are willing to be contacted with follow-up questions, please provide your email and/or phone # below:

_________________________          ___________________________
E-mail address                Phone contact
APPENDIX AB: Presentations from the UHM Writing Mentors Program

UHM English Department Colloquium
Jim Henry and Holly Bruland, “Trans/Performing First-Year Composition: Teaming Mentors with Faculty in English 100.” (March 2008)
Erica Reynolds Clayton, Holly Bruland, Jim Henry, Kenton Harsch, Marlene Lowe, and Monica Stitt-Bergh “Assessing Ourselves: Results and Findings from Our Foundations in Writing Assessment Measure” (December 2008)

UHM Annual Graduate Student Conference of the College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature
Holly Bruland, "Gaining Entrance: The Classroom-Based Tutor's Role in Mentoring First-Year Composition Students," (April 2007)
---,“Casting the Role of the Mentor-Researcher,” (April 2008)
Chelsey Kojima, “Individualized Learning Outcomes in Higher Education” (April 2008)
Annette Priesmann, “Pertaining to a Pedagogy of Punctuation” (April 2008)
Tracey Williams, “Transitional Ally” (April 2008)
Alicia Maedo, “The Mentor as Mobile Writing Centers for Collaboration” (April 2008)
Tanya Torres, “Enabling Multiple Means of Expression and Engagement: The Role of the Mentor in Approaching Universal Design Pedagogy” (April 2008)
Jennifer Sano “Student Evaluations of Mentor and Program Performance” (April 2008)
Cornelius Rubsamen, "Casting Mentors as Self-Efficacy Builders in the FYC Classroom" (April 2011)
Steven Holmes, "Mentoring Argumentation: Pedagogies in Combining the Toulmin and Rogerian Models" (April 2011)
Melinda Smith, "The Role of Motivation in Performing as a Writer in Liminal Spaces" (April 2010)

Conference on College Composition and Communication:
Holly Bruland, "On Location: Adding Writing Mentors to the First-Year Composition Curriculum" (March 2009)
---, "Exploring On-Location Mentoring in First-Year Composition Classroom Cultures" (March 2010)
---, "A New Turn in Teacher-Research: Contesting the Student-Teacher Binary through Trinary Classroom Configurations." (April 2011)

International Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Conference:
Holly Bruland, “Researching the Trinary Writing Classroom.” (May 2010)

Association of American Colleges and Universities Annual Meeting:
Holly Bruland on Panel of K. Patricia Cross Award Recipients. “Faculty of the Future: Voices from the Next Generation.” (January 2009)
APPENDIX AC: Publications from the UHM Writing Mentors Program
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2011

APPENDIX AD: UHM Foundations in Written Communications Hallmarks

1. Introduce students to different forms of college-level writing, including, but not limited to, academic discourse, and guide them in writing for different purposes and audiences.
   - The primary goal of W Foundations classes is learning to write. Course reading should serve as a basis for writing rather than as a body of material to be mastered per se.
   - The primary reading focus should be on expository texts. The course should consider a variety of college-level readings (e.g. summary/abstract, narrative, analysis, argument).

2. Provide students with guided practice of writing processes—planning, drafting, critiquing, revising, and editing—making effective use of written and oral feedback from the faculty instructor and from peers.
   - There should be a coherent sequence of various types of writing studied and assigned in the course. Generally, such a sequence will move from presumably simpler to more complex rhetorical tasks (e.g. from summary to analysis/interpretation to argument, or from narrative/serialization to comparative analysis to research-based inquiry).
   - Types of interaction concerning student writing will vary and may include in-class collaborative group work (including online or hybrid instruction), instructor/student conferencing (in person and/or online), student/student peer review, and tutorial feedback as available.

3. Require at least 5000 words of finished prose—equivalent to approximately 20 typewritten/printed pages.
   - “Finished prose” is defined as writing which has received peer and/or instructor feedback, has usually undergone student revision, and has been formally evaluated by the instructor. Writing such as journal entries, e-mail letters, pre-writing exercises, unrevised in-class writing, or feedback to peers should not normally be considered “finished prose.”

4. Help students develop information literacy by teaching search strategies, critical evaluation of information and sources, and effective selection of information for specific purposes and audiences; teach appropriate ways to incorporate such information, acknowledge sources and provide citations.
   - “Information literacy” includes knowledge of and competence using Internet as well as print materials.

5. Help students read texts and make use of a variety of sources in expressing their own ideas, perspectives, and/or opinions in writing.

Source: University of Hawai‘i General Education Website
<http://www.hawaii.edu/gened/foundations.htm>
## APPENDIX AE: Table of Mentored and Non-Mentored Sections of FYC at UHM, Fall 2007-Spring 2011

### Mentored and Non-Mentored Sections of FYC offered at UHM Fall 2007 to Spring 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Mentored Sections</th>
<th>Un-Mentored Sections</th>
<th>Total Sections Offered (ENG 100, 100A, &amp; 190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The wide variation in FYC section offerings semester-to-semester—ranging from 32 to 58—can be attributed to a handful of shifts in the administration of FYC that took place during this period, most notably the enforcement of a rule that students must register for FYC before advancing beyond thirty credits. This rule enabled FYC to become truly a first-year course, but it also created a “backlog” of students (a problematic term used by university administrators) who had avoided FYC to date, requiring additional section offerings for a short-term period.
APPENDIX AF: UH Mānoa Writing Mentor Job Description

Authors: Jim Henry and Holly Bruland

TITLE: UH Mānoa Writing Mentor
DEPARTMENT: English
REPORTS TO: Dr. Jim Henry, UH Writing Mentors Coordinator
POSITION STATUS: 1/4 time Teaching Assistantship (10 hours per week)

POSITION SUMMARY: Mentors are assigned to sections of English 100 to assist faculty primarily by holding regular individual conferences with students, first to get to know them and then to seek ways to enhance their writing prowess. Other work entails regularly attending classes and helping the instructor in such tasks as facilitating peer review. Our program, unique in the U.S., seeks to provide English 100 students with valuable support in the form of your expertise as a writer and as a UH Mānoa student. We also seek to help you hone your skills and knowledge as a writing consultant in the tradition of composition and rhetoric. Your ten hours of weekly work include three hours per week attending class, six hours holding individual conferences and documenting this work (though these hours may vary per week), and an hour per week divided among the following: conferring with the course instructor, reading and/or preparing for bi-weekly roundtables of mentors, and making entries in your Composition log book.

Principal Responsibilities and Duties

1. Attend All Classes and Collaborate Closely with the Instructor. Your primary responsibilities are to the instructor of the course and to the students in your section. You should attend all class meetings of your section of English 100, and you should remain in close contact with the instructor. Your instructor may want you to play a strong role in the classroom, or s/he may prefer that you remain on the periphery. Meet with the instructor to determine this role at the earliest possibility, and consult with the instructor during the term to assure that you are on track. Under no circumstances should you undermine the authority of the instructor, and under no circumstances should you grade, or be asked to grade, student writing.

2. Meet Regularly with Students. Hold regular weekly conferences with the students in your section. Within the first two weeks of the semester, you should hold an introductory interview with each student in your section. After that, you should try to meet with each student at least once every two to three weeks, timing your meetings with each student so that s/he gets advice at different stages of writing: prewriting or brainstorming, drafting, revising, re-revising, editing, etc. You will find that your role as a mentor often goes beyond conveying purely cognitive skills and requires you to address other hindrances that may be impeding student success. It also entails recognizing your professional limitations, e.g., making referrals when a problem extends beyond your expertise and training. Although the job requires that you develop rapport with students, it is important to maintain certain professional boundaries as you tread a fine line between representing the institution and advocating for students. Advise students that your role in representing
the institution requires you to report to your supervising instructor any disclosed transgressions of university policy or intentions to harm oneself or others.

3. **Document Your Work.** As our initiative is funded through the Chancellor's office, we must document our work. Complete a Mentor's Log for each individual session that you hold with students and submit these logs regularly to the Mentoring Coordinator, [Name, email]. At the end of each semester, you will be asked to complete a summative report and to participate in an exit interview.

4. **Attend Mentoring Roundtables and Workshops.** We will schedule regular roundtables and workshops. These meetings will sometimes revolve around assigned readings chosen to help you perform in conferences or in the classroom, and sometimes they will require a brief report on your work to the group. Treat these meetings professionally, as you would treat any other course in English.

5. **Communicate Extenuating Circumstances.** If any situation arises that may require emergency intervention or counseling beyond your purview, communicate immediately with [Name, email].

6. **Wonder.** You can't be required to wonder, of course, but we hope this experience will prompt you to wonder regularly about the complexities of representation and self-representation in discourse. Such wonder lies at the heart of composition studies, and we hope you will leave this foray into composition with ways to wonder that will serve you in the future professionally and intellectually.
APPENDIX AG: Intake Interview Guidelines and Ideas

Note: The content of this handout was generated by the Fall 07 mentors. The ideas here are meant to serve as a springboard rather than a script; use only those questions that suit your own ethos and objectives.

Purposes: Develop rapport with students; demonstrate that you're accessible and that you care; learn about students' backgrounds, interests, and goals (may help in finding future paper topics); Show students where conferences will occur; help students understand your role as a mentor and how to prepare for future conferences; address any student concerns; give you some ideas for how you might individualize instruction for each student.

Possible Questions:
1. How was your first week of classes?
2. How is your class load this semester? What other classes are you taking than English 100?
3. What year are you in school?
4. Do you live in the dorms or off-campus? How long is your commute?
5. Do you have a job? If so, where? How many hours a week?
6. Where did you grow up?
7. What were your high school English classes like?
8. How did your high school English teacher work with your class?
9. Did you write much in high school? What kinds of writing assignments did you do? Did you write any research papers in high school? What kinds of writing do you like? Dislike? What are your favorite and least favorite things about writing?
10. Were you involved in any sports or clubs at your high school? Which ones?
11. Where did you go to high school? (As Kekoa pointed out, this may be a loaded question)
12. How many languages do you speak? Which ones?
13. What do you like to read? What kinds of music do you like?
14. What do you do in your free time? What are your interests?
15. Why did you choose to go to college at UH?
16. Do you have any relatives or high school friends at UH?
17. Do you know what you want to major in?
18. What do you hope to do after you graduate?
19. Is there anything else you want me to know about yourself?
20. Do you have any specific concerns about English 100? About college in general?
21. Do you have any questions for me?
22. What do you hope to get out of English 100?
23. What do you hope to get out of our mentoring sessions?
24. How can I best support you in achieving your goals?
25. Do my office hours work with your schedule? If not, what are some alternate times we could meet?

Documenting Intake Interviews: Use the regular conference log to document your intake interviews. However, for the narrative portion, please elaborate on some specific ideas you have for working with this particular student throughout the semester. How might you help this student to engage meaningfully in English 100 and "The Mānoa Experience?" (See p. 7 of the following link: http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/proposal/Full_Proposal.pdf)
APPENDIX AH: Sample UH Writing Mentors Program Fall Orientation Agenda

Note: I have removed all hyperlinks from the schedule, but the original document may be found at http://www.english.hawaii.edu/mentors/workshops/August%2011.html.

Day 1 Morning: Mentors Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:30-8:50 | Coffee, Tea, and Pastries (Meet in KUY 410)  
Informal Introductions/ Picking up Materials |
| 8:50-10:10  | Introductions, Job Descriptions, Support websites, and Conference roles  
Web Site Overviews: UH Writing Mentors website, Laulima website |
| 10:15-10:25 | Break                                                                 |
| 10:30-12:00 | Hamilton Library Workshops, Hamilton 156, with [Name]  
Preview their new suite of workshops for students here. |

Day 1 Afternoon: Mentors Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12:15-12:50 | Lunch (KUY 410)  
Discussion topic: balancing the demands of mentoring with your own academic load |
| 1:00-2:30 | Orientation with the KOKUA Program, the UH Mānoa office for students with disabilities (Queen Liliuokalani Center, Room 012) |
| 2:45-4:00 | Philosophy/Goals for Overall Mentoring Program: Mentoring as Teaching-Researching-Theorizing, in the Composition tradition  
Sample Conference Log  
Sample Weekly Memo  
Fall 2009 University Assessment Poster Session Data  
Ongoing Data Collection  
Students’ Mid-term freewrites, end-of-semester evaluations  
End-of-Semester evaluations by instructors via SurveyMonkey  
Planning Your First Task: Intake Interviews |
| 4:15-4:30 | Orientation to Sinclair (Walk from KUY 410 to Sinclair)  
Visiting the mentors’ designated area with the dedicated computer for mentoring, with a brief introduction to the Writing Center by Interim Writing Center Director [Name]. |

Day 2 Morning: Mentors and Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:30-8:50 | Coffee, Tea, and Pastries (Meet in KUY 410)  
Informal Introductions/ Picking up Materials |
| 9:00-11:00 | Mentors and Instructors work separately |
**Mentors Meet with Graduate Student WPA** at Counseling Services for orientation with [Names]. Queen Liliuokalani Center, Room 306

**Instructors meet in KUY 410 with Program Director:**
English 100 Hallmarks, UH Writing Mentors Program Support Sites
- GenEd Hallmarks
- UH Writing Mentors website
- Laulima site for instructors, mentors, tutors

UH Writing Mentors Job Description

Philosophy/Goals for Overall Mentoring Program: Mentoring as Teaching-Researching-Theorizing, in the Composition tradition
- Sample Conference Log
- Excerpt from S08 Colloquium: Slides of F07 participants, stages of writing conferences, and five most common topics in conferences
- Tips for teaching purpose and audience based upon F08 Colloquium

Ongoing Data Collection
- End-of-semester evaluations by instructors via SurveyMonkey
- End-of-semester evaluations by mentors via SurveyMonkey
- End-of-semester focus groups: instructors, mentors, students

Added resource: Our English 100 online journal, *Na Mana'o*

Adding your mentor to your MyUH classlist
Adding your mentor to your Laulima site
Adding language about KOKUA

Planning Successful Collaborations with Mentors
- Positioning mentors as Hamilton Library and online research coaches
  - Preview the new suite of library workshops for English 100 instructors here
- Using mentor-and-instructor-generated ideas for integrating mentors into the course
  - Fifty Ways to Add Your Mentor
  - Key Mentor-Supportive Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:15-12:15</td>
<td>Mentors and Instructors meet and collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please develop 4 or 5 specific steps you anticipate taking to integrate the mentor into the course, based upon “Fifty Ways to Add Your Mentor” and “Key Mentor-Supportive Practices”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX AI: Fifty Ways to Add Your Mentor (with apologies to Paul Simon)

Derived from end-of-term evaluations and roundtable discussions
Authors: Jim Henry and Holly Bruland

1. **Represent the mentor on the syllabus.** Include specific information about your mentor on the syllabus, including her or his stipulated roles, what the mentor is or is not expected to do (no grading, ever), contact information. Make it clear what the attendance policy is for conferences.

2. **Integrate mentor conferences into the syllabus.** Integrate a required mentor conference into each major assignment or think of some other way to keep the students working regularly with the mentor in order to avoid a deluge/drought conferencing pattern.

3. **Collaborate.** Ask your mentor to review your representation of roles and expectations and revise as necessary. Seek input, as mentors are developing their own ideas about teaching, too.

4. **Schedule meta-talks.** Set aside time during the semester for meta-talk about the class, i.e., not just about specific students or assignments but also to touch base about the evolving role.

5. **Support the intake interview.** Make it clear to students that the intake interview is important, valued, and required.

6. **Suggest self-identified goals for the course.** Ask students to identify a handful of concrete goals for the course, in collaboration with the mentor. Mentors can use these goals periodically in conferences with students.

7. **Make the long view a part of your first class meetings.** For many students, this class may be their first in college. For some, the first in college for anyone in their family. Help them see how this vital work in English 100 really is laying a foundation for their future as a writer. Stress that the mentors share this orientation and want help students glimpse their futures as writers.

8. **Refer to the mentor as part of specific activities.** Integrate references to the mentor at specific and propitious points in the syllabus.

9. **Refer to the mentor in class as a writer.** Students appreciate mentors' abilities to speak to them both as fellow students and as a more experienced writer. An occasional comment from you acknowledging this expertise bolsters the mentor's authority.

10. **Make the mentor a library guide.** Stipulate one of your mentor's roles as a liaison and guide to the libraries. In addition to the workshop (if you organize one through this revived service), direct students to work one-on-one with the mentor in increasing information literacy (one of our FW Hallmarks). Mentors should help students develop this literacy both virtually, using Voyager, and literally, by voyaging on foot with a student or students to Hamilton.

11. **Make the mentor a UH Mānoa guide.** Consider writing activities that would position the mentor as a guide to college life, both generally and specifically to our campus.
12. **Brainstorm writing transfer.** Discuss with the mentor those aspects of assignments that you imagine could easily transfer to writing in other courses or in later workplace writing.

13. **Let the mentor guide portfolios.** Consider positioning the mentor as a guide to helping students begin a writing portfolio—3D or electronic—that they will add to in future semesters. (Consider attending the workshop on using portfolios in teaching writing to be offered by Nedra Reynolds through the Center for Teaching Excellence in the fall.)

14. **Let the mentor orient students to WI courses.** Consider positioning the mentor as a guide to the Writing Intensive courses they will later take, so that part of the mentor’s scope of activities might include previewing such courses with students and brainstorming about preparing for them.

15. **Plan the mentor's in-class persona.** Mentors can role model in class by taking notes and participating. Plan in advance what you each see as optimal participation.

16. **Let the mentor lead small groups.** Mentors can be valuable member of small-group discussions, judging when to add a comment and when the group dynamics are ok.

17. **Let the mentor model peer review.** Helping students learn how to give productive and supportive review takes practice, and mentors can help you model such review.

18. **Call on the mentor each day for announcements.** Set aside a minute or two at the beginning and/or end of class for the mentor to “advertise” for conference signups, apprise students of scheduling changes, or other events/resources that might be of interest to students.

19. **If you’re standing in front of your class, wondering whether the students understand what you’ve been explaining, call on the mentor to paraphrase your main points or to ask clarifying question.** Sometimes hearing an explanation from a different voice, in different words, can be all it takes for an explanation to become clear to students. The mentor is also able to ask clarifying questions that students’ may have not yet articulated or may be reticent to ask.

20. **Ask the mentor to strategize aloud in class.** After presenting students with a complex assignment, ask the mentor how he/she might begin to approach it. Just hearing how the mentor breaks down a complex task into steps might help students feel less intimidated and get started sooner.

21. **Convey the mentor's value as assignment barometer.** The most often noted topic in mentoring conferences for F07 was reviewing and explaining the assignment. The mentors' job is not to critique the assignment, but if s/he sees a pattern of misunderstanding, to convey it to you. If you revisit the assignment in class, acknowledge the mentor's help.

22. **Let the mentor run an in-class workshop.** If you and the mentor choose, provide some points in the schedule of activities where mentors are running the class. The activity should include NO grading, but if properly planned, it can signal in yet another way the mentor's value.
23. **Let the mentor run an out-of-class workshop.** If you already know of recurrent problems for specific assignments in the past, schedule out-of-class workshops that the mentor will run so as to teach to several students at once.

24. **Require cover memos for assignments.** Require students to include commentary on their composing processes, including work with the mentor, for finished assignments. Stress that the memo is to help you and the mentor understand students' composing processes. Share the memos and your observations on them with the mentor.

25. **Plan mentor activities at all stages of writing.** To disabuse students' perceptions that mentors' roles are primarily to "edit," integrate the mentor's work into editing and drafting stages, too.

26. **Require students to compose their personalized editing checklists.** Teach them to compile it with the help of the mentor and to use it systematically to catch their own errors.

27. **Give the mentor copies of graded student work.** The mentor can then review your comments and build off of your suggestions in one-on-one conferences. Mentors who are familiar with the instructor’s grading practices and expectations can better steer students toward success.

28. **Allow students to revise essays after receiving an initial grade and/or comments.** Mentors can help students interpret and apply your comments to their revisions. One way to set up this policy is to give students a limited “revise and resubmit” window, allowing resubmission only if certain criteria have been met: for example, meeting with the mentor, changing at least 25% of the essay's content, writing a cover memo that documents revisions. Some instructors have found that averaging the resubmitted paper’s grade with the paper’s initial grade motivates students to submit their best work at each stage of the process.

29. **Add the mentor to your MyUH Page.** Enable your mentor to receive class announcements and send emails to students. For directions, see item #7 at http://www.english.hawaii.edu/henry/workshops/Spring%2008.html

50. **Assign a diagnostic essay.** In the first weeks of class, assign students a diagnostic essay. Set up an appointment to discuss perceived strengths and weaknesses in student writers with your mentor. Strategize for how the mentors can individualize instruction and/or offer workshops in problem area in response these diagnostics.
APPENDIX AJ: Key Mentor-Supportive Practices
Based upon Three Years of Research on the UH Writing Mentors Program
Authors: Holly Bruland and Jim Henry

1. Require an intake interview with the mentor for all students:
   a. Intakes should ideally take place in the first 1-2 (or 3) weeks of the semester.
   b. Mentors learn about students’ writing backgrounds and interests and create a foundation for future conferences. They build rapport, explain their role, and answer any student questions.

2. Require/Reward Consequent Writing Conferences with the Mentor Throughout the Semester:
   a. Build writing conferences into your syllabus as an important part of the course.
   b. Include a written policy / consequences for missed conferences.
   c. A recommended number of required writing conferences per student is 3-4.

3. Think Hard About Conferencing Cycles so that Mentors Experience a Steady Stream of Students Rather than a Boom/Bust Scenario:
   a. Consider building a mentor conference into major writing assignments.
   b. Find a way to get students meeting with mentors about their writing early in the semester.
   c. Help students to experience mentoring at various stages of assignments: in the brainstorming/ topic selection phase, during research, during drafting, and during revisions.
   d. Previous mentors have observed that portfolio systems tend to facilitate regular, meaningful conferences and continued revision.

4. Make Your Grading Practices and Expectations for Assignments as Transparent and Explicit as Possible:
   a. Consider employing some combination of the following: using a rubric, listing specific “criteria for success” on assignment sheets, and/or availing students of multiple examples of successful student papers.
   b. When mentors know what the instructor values in an assignment, they can coach the students much more effectively.

5. Build in Regular Meta-Discourse with the Mentor:
   a. Schedule a regular time to discuss with the mentor conferencing trends, concerns, observations, expectations, etc. (Weekly conferences work well for some instructor-mentor pairings, while other pairs have preferred to touch base for a few minutes before or after class.)

6. Consider Giving your Mentor A Teaching Role, However Limited:
   a. Consider reserving a day or two for your mentor to teach the class. (Under normal circumstances, MA mentors should teach no more than 1 full week of class.)
   b. Consider building up to a full class period of teaching with some smaller, scaffolded teaching opportunities: i.e. involving the mentor in daily announcements, having the mentor lead a 10-minute mini-lesson on a specific issue, splitting the class in half for an activity and asking the mentor to take half of the class, etc. . .
   c. If the mentor does teach a lesson, provide specific feedback: offer your observations on the lesson’s strengths and areas for improvement; help the mentor thing through such issues as pacing, student involvement, and performance.
   d. Call on your mentor as a substitute teacher if the need arises. (Not to be abused.)
APPENDIX AK: eHarmentoring Survey for FYC Instructors

Explanation: We are in the process of pairing English 100 instructors with mentors, and this survey is designed to assist us in matching you with the mentor who is best aligned with your pedagogical approaches and goals. (If you do not want to be assigned a mentor, please let us know, as this semester we have more sections of English 100 than available mentors.) As you may know, mentors have a distinctly different role than TAs: they are in the classroom not to assist instructors with grading but to assist first-year students in becoming successful writers and college students. This past semester, mentors' activities ranged from conferencing individually with students outside of class, to holding out-of-class group workshops on a variety of topics ranging from grammar to theory, to facilitating in-class draft workshops, to setting up e-portfolios. A particular emphasis this semester was out-of-class conferences: instructors who have composed their syllabi in ways that make these conferences an integral part of the course (and have linked conference attendance to student evaluation) have witnessed remarkable results.

1) Name of instructor:

2) In a few sentences, please explain your approach to English 100 and how you could see a mentor fitting into/ enhancing it:

3) To what degree would you want your mentor involved in the day-to-day activities of your classroom? Please click on the description that most closely fits your vision:

☐ Working solely outside of the classroom; not attending class at all, except perhaps for introductions;
☐ Attending class but functioning mostly as an observer and speaking only occasionally;
☐ Attending class and participating in classroom activities and discussions; asking questions and making comments regular basis;
☐ Attending class and participating in classroom activities and discussions; asking questions and making comments regular basis; giving input into assignments and activities; taking the lead in occasional workshops, activities, discussions, and sessions;
☐ Other: please describe

4) What kinds of support for the mentor would you be willing to build into your syllabus and grading practices? Please check all that apply:

☐ Require students to attend an initial intake interview in which the mentor and student get to know one another, discuss the student's course and career goals, and analyze the student's strengths and weaknesses;
☐ Administer an un-graded writing diagnostic at the beginning of the semester in order to identify students' strengths and weaknesses and to create individualized conferencing strategies for mentors;
☐ Administer a writing diagnostic at the end of the semester in order to assess students' progress
☐ Factor conference attendance in your overall course attendance policy;
☐ Require a set number of out-of-class conferences with the mentor over the course of the semester (i.e. requiring 3-4 total conferences or one conference per major paper assignment; building conferences into a portfolio system; requiring students to attend one of the various specialty topic workshops put on by the mentor outside of class);
☐ Offer incentives for attending additional conferences (i.e. adding a half-grade bonus to the student's overall course grade for attending 5 or more conferences, granting students a 1-day
paper extension for attending a conference, adding bonus points to a paper that has gone through a mentor conference, counting the student's writing process as part of the paper grade); □ Other: Please describe

5) Would you be willing to attend a workshop on [date] during our usual departmental colloquia time slot in order meet your mentor and share ideas? □ Yes □ No

6) If you already have a mentor in mind that you would like to work with, please let us know who it is and why you think the two of you would make a good pairing in the space below. We'll do our best (barring scheduling conflicts or other unforeseen factors) to honor individual requests:

7) We foresee that your responses to these questions could potentially serve as a valuable introduction to your mentor. Would you be willing and comfortable with our sharing your completed survey with your assigned mentor? □ Yes □ No

8) We also foresee that your responses to these questions could potentially serve as a way to represent the program. Would you be willing for your responses to be used in future reports and/or publications? □ No
□ Yes, but keep my responses anonymous □ Yes, and use my actual name when possible
APPENDIX AL: eHarmentoring Survey for Writing Mentors

Explanation: We are in the process of pairing mentors with English 100 instructors, and this survey is designed to assist us in matching you with the instructor who is best aligned with your approaches and goals. (If you do not want participate in the program next semester, please let us know asap so that we can identify and train a new mentor.) We have sent a similar survey to all English 100 instructors.

1) Name of mentor:

2) In a few sentences, please articulate your approach to student conferences and the reasons behind such an approach:

3) In a few sentences, please describe the various ways you would like to contribute to your assigned section of English 100. What are some creative approaches you'd like to experiment with in accomplishing this vision?

4) In a few sentences, please enumerate the ways you would like to see your instructor support, validate, and enable your work as a mentor:

5) To what degree would you want to be involved in the day-to-day activities of your classroom? Please click on the description that most closely fits your vision:
   - Working solely outside of the classroom; not attending class at all, except perhaps for introductions;
   - Attending class but functioning mostly as an observer and speaking only occasionally;
   - Attending class and participating in classroom activities and discussions; asking questions and making comments regular basis;
   - Attending class, participating in classroom activities and discussions; asking questions and making comments regular basis; giving input into assignments and activities; taking the lead in occasional workshops, activities, discussions, and sessions
   - Other: please describe

6) If you already have an instructor in mind that you would like to work with, please let us know who it is and why you think the two of you would make a good pairing in the space below. We'll do our best (barring scheduling conflicts or other unforeseen factors) to honor individual requests:

7) Would you be willing to attend a workshop on Thursday, December 6th during our usual departmental colloquia time slot in order meet your mentor and share ideas?  □ Yes  □ No

8) We foresee that your responses to these questions could potentially serve as a valuable introduction to your instructor: Would you be willing and/or comfortable with our sharing your completed survey with your assigned instructor?  Yes  □ No

9) We also foresee that your responses to these questions could potentially serve as a way to represent the program. Would you be willing and/or comfortable with using your responses in future reports and/or publications?
   - No
   - Yes, but keep my responses anonymous
   - Yes, and use my actual name when possible
APPENDIX AM: Percentage of Overall Conferences that Addressed Various Topics from the Checklist of Twenty Items on Mentors’ Conference Logs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Topic (from Checklist of 20)</th>
<th>Total Number of Conferences Logs with Topic Checked</th>
<th>Percentage* of Overall Conferences Addressing Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know each other; developing rapport</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the assignment's requirements</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating ideas for the paper's content</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing the paper more effectively (including transitions)</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying the paper's purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing (or modifying) a topic</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing confidence as a writer and college student</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honing grammar, usage, and style</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for writing conferences (with the mentor or instructor)</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating outside sources into a piece of writing</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding material that was covered in class</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding outside sources</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling issues of college and personal life not directly related to the course</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying the instructor's comments for revision</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholding class and/or university policies and expectations</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing technology and/or university resources (i.e. library, websites, student health . . .)</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring skills in time management and personal organization</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing critical reading skills</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching the instructor with concerns, questions, requests</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating with classmates (addressing any peer-to-peer issues)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mentor Conference Logs.

*Note: Percentages have been weighted. Eighteen of the twenty topics were listed across all four semesters. However, the topic of “Developing critical reading skills” was added to the list in Spring 2009, so the total in the penultimate column (n=186) was divided by the total number of conference logs from Spring 2009 through Spring 2011 (n=3,748). “Getting to know each other; developing rapport” was added in Spring 2010, so the total in the penultimate column (n=688) was divided by the total number of conference logs from Spring 2010 through Spring 2011 (n=1,535).
APPENDIX AN: Demographic Breakdown of 100 Trinary FYC Sections by Institutional Rank and Teaching Experience of Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor rank</th>
<th>Total sections</th>
<th>Average years teaching FYC</th>
<th>Average # of courses previously taught with Writing Mentor</th>
<th>Sections in which instructor had previously been a “Writing Mentor”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Student</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX AO: Demographic Breakdown of 100 Trinary FYC Sections by Participant Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Position</th>
<th>Average Year of Birth</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1940 to 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1960 to 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1973 to 1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX AP: Summary of Non-Codeable Instructor and Student End-of-Semester Evaluation Responses to Question Regarding Mentor Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Codeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor comments (n=12)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blank (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not enough examples to constitute a category (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Negative evaluative comments and/or mention of potential mentoring roles that were not fulfilled (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student comments (n=198)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blank (n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive evaluative comments (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Negative evaluative comments and/or rejection of mentor’s roles (n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listed positive mentoring qualities, but not behaviors or roles (n=71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vague comments or not enough examples to constitute a category (n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comments generically affirming that the mentor was “helpful” (n=37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX AQ: Relative Distribution of Student Commentary Across Mentoring Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Role</th>
<th>Number of different mentor behaviors pertaining to role</th>
<th>Percentage of clauses across student commentary pertaining to role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal writing coach to students</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource for individualized support</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpreter of classroom space, assignments, actors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classroom supporter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Co-instructor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fellow student</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Research coach for students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lead, advanced, or role model student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Third party perspective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Participant-observer researcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX AR: Relative Distribution of Instructor Commentary Across Mentoring Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Role</th>
<th>Number of different mentor behaviors pertaining to role</th>
<th>Percentage of clauses across instructor commentary pertaining to role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Co-instructor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fellow student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Classroom supporter</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interpreter of classroom space, assignments, actors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal writing coach to students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lead, advanced, or role model student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Third party perspective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Resource for individualized support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participant-observer researcher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Research coach for students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding, these percentages do not add up to 100%.*
APPENDIX AS: Summary of Student Responses to the End-of-Semester Survey Question, “In What Ways Could the Mentoring Program be Improved?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Improvement</th>
<th>Total Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No changes recommended; program works well “as is” (Includes responses of &quot;n/a&quot; n=54, &quot;none&quot; n=48, and “don’t know” n=42)</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more availability on the part of the mentor</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the personality and/or approach of the individual mentor</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve mentor more in the classroom</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require (more) meetings</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign more than one mentor per section of FYC</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve communication between mentor and instructor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not make meetings with mentor mandatory</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand mentoring to other courses</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve facilities for mentor-student conferences</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer students &quot;more meetings&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinue mentoring program entirely</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer students longer meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open a mentoring center for FYC</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find ways to motivate students to utilize mentors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more group mentoring sessions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish guidelines for working with the mentor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give the mentor grading powers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer food</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise program more widely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize FYC sections by subject areas, with more focus on individual mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give better benefits to mentors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer online scheduling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a set time for all mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct more mentoring over email</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not codeable (includes blank comments, n=141)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX AT: Catalogue of Mentors’ Frustrations and Fulfillments by Frequency, as Identified by Descriptively Coding Mentors’ Anonymous End-of-Semester Evaluations

**Most Frustrating and/or Problematic Aspects of the Position of “Writing Mentor”:**
- Working with students the mentor perceives to be unmotivated (n=31)
- Balancing the demands of the position with the mentor’s other responsibilities (n=19)
- Getting students to attend conferences when the instructor did not mandate or incentivize regular student-mentor conferences (n=13)
- Failing to reach a particular student despite the mentor’s best efforts (n=12)
- Fulfilling the documentation requirements of the position (n=11)
- Comments claiming mentor experienced no significant problems of frustrations with the position (n=11)
- Functioning within an instructor’s pedagogical vision, course structure, or teaching style that differed from that of the mentor (n=8)
- Dealing with conference cancellations and no shows (n=6)
- Discerning the instructor’s expectations of the mentor (n=5)
- Coping with instructor behavior judged by mentor to be unprofessional (n=4)
- Realizing that the instructor’s communication is not reaching the students and feeling responsible for making up for this perceived impasse (n=4)
- Feeling as though the mentor’s feedback is not valued and/or implemented by students (n=3)
- Finding that students are confused about how to interact with the mentor or vice versa (n=3)
- Finding mentor training and professional development to be lacking (n=3)
- Functioning in situations of ensuing confusion about what it means to have a “mentor” in the classroom (n=2)
- Identifying lack of fit between Ph.D. students’ needs and mentor program policies (n=2)
- Dealing with uncertainty about the program’s continuation (n=2)
- Dealing with students who “work around the system” (n=1 + PCR)

**Most Fulfilling and/or Best Aspects of the Position of “Writing Mentor”:**
- Getting to know students on both a personal and academic level (n=42)
- Being able to track individual students’ development over a semester (n=34)
- Receiving confirmation that the mentor has been helpful to the student (n=32)
- Helping students negotiate the transition to the university (n=17)
- Learning from one’s students (n=13)
- Observing first-hand an exemplary teaching model (n=12)
- Occupying a field researcher role as a participant-observer (n=12)
- Having dual access to both the instructor and students (n=9)
- Witnessing first-hand student “breakthroughs” (n=8)
- Observing students both inside and outside of class (n=8)
- Confirming teaching as an informed career choice (n=7)
- Connecting theory-driven graduate coursework with classroom praxis (n=6)
- Working across a full class of students (n=6)
- Dialoguing/debriefing with the instructor about the course (n=5)
- Working with students in coordination with the instructor (n=5)
- Interacting with other mentors and program administrators (n=4)
• Picking up specific assignments, teaching techniques, etc. from the instructor for the mentor’s future use as a FYC instructor (n=4)
• Being mentored by the instructor (n=3)
• Having a scaffolded, supported initial classroom teaching experience (n=3)
• Co-performing the course with the instructor as a coordinated effort (n=3)
• Occupying a role that is “in between” students and instructor (n=3)
• Gaining professional experience needed to secure future employment (n=2)
## APPENDIX AU: Catalogue of Mentors’ Frustrations and Fulfillments by Trinary Actor, As Identified by Descriptively Coding Mentors’ Anonymous End-of-Semester Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor in relation to (number of comments)</th>
<th>Source of Frustration</th>
<th>Source of Fulfillment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor (n=51)</td>
<td>• Functioning within an instructor’s pedagogical vision, course structure, or teaching style that differed from that of the mentor (n=8)</td>
<td>• Observing first-hand an exemplary teaching model (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discerning the instructor’s expectations of the mentor (n=5)</td>
<td>• Dialoguing/ Debriefing with the instructor about the course (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coping with instructor behavior judged by mentor to be unprofessional (n=4)</td>
<td>• Picking up specific assignments, teaching techniques, etc. from the instructor for the mentor’s future use as a FYC instructor (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Realizing that the instructor’s communication is not reaching the students and feeling responsible for making up for this perceived impasse (n=4)</td>
<td>• Being “mentored” by the instructor (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observing first-hand an exemplary teaching model (n=12)</td>
<td>• Having a scaffolded, supported initial classroom teaching experience (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dialoguing/ Debriefing with the instructor about the course (n=5)</td>
<td>• Co-performing the course with the instructor as a coordinated effort (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Picking up specific assignments, teaching techniques, etc. from the instructor for the mentor’s future use as a FYC instructor (n=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being “mentored” by the instructor (n=3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having a scaffolded, supported initial classroom teaching experience (n=3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-performing the course with the instructor as a coordinated effort (n=3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (n=215)</td>
<td>• Working with students the mentor perceives to be unmotivated (n=31)</td>
<td>• Getting to know students on both a personal and academic level (n=42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Failing to reach a particular student despite the mentor’s best efforts (n=12)</td>
<td>• Being able to track individual students’ development over a semester (n=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dealing with conference cancellations and no shows (n=6)</td>
<td>• Receiving confirmation that the mentor has been helpful to the student (n=32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feeling as though the mentor’s feedback is not valued and/or implemented by students (n=3)</td>
<td>• Helping students negotiate the transition to the university (n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finding that students are confused about how to interact with the mentor or vice versa (n=3)</td>
<td>• Learning from one’s students (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Getting to know students on both a personal and academic level (n=42)</td>
<td>• Witnessing first-hand student “breakthroughs” (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Admin. (n=42)</td>
<td>• Fulfilling the documentation requirements of the position (n=11)</td>
<td>• Observing students both inside and outside of class (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finding mentor training and professional development to be lacking (n=3)</td>
<td>• Working across a full class of students (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifying lack of fit between Ph.D. students’ needs and mentor program policies (n=2)</td>
<td>• Occupying field a researcher role as a participant-observer (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dealing with uncertainty about the program’s continuation (n=2)</td>
<td>• Connecting theory-driven graduate coursework with classroom praxis (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Occupying field a researcher role as a participant-observer (n=12)</td>
<td>• Interacting with other mentors and program administrators (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fulfilling the documentation requirements of the position (n=11)</td>
<td>• Gaining professional experience needed to secure future employment (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions across instructor, students, and/or program admin. (n=44)</td>
<td>• Balancing the demands of the position with the mentor’s other responsibilities (n=19)</td>
<td>• Having dual access to both the instructor and students (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comments claiming mentor experienced no significant problems of frustrations with the position (n=11)</td>
<td>• Confirming teaching as an informed career choice (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Getting students to attend conferences</td>
<td>• Working with students in coordination with the instructor (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having dual access to both the instructor and students (n=9)</td>
<td>• Occupying a role that is “in between”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Functioning in situations of ensuing confusion about what it means to have a "mentor" in the classroom (n=2)
- Dealing with students who "work around the system" (n=1 + PCR)
APPENDIX AV: Paradoxes Inhabited by Writing Mentors
As Identified by Pattern Coding the Catalogue of Mentors’ Frustrations and Fulfillments

1. In-Between-ness of Mentors’ Roles
   
   **Explanation:** This paradox addresses the degree to which mentors occupy a role that is both “instructor” and “student,” but that is also neither fully “instructor” nor “student” and the ways in which they must attempting to represent the interests of both positions. Sub-themes include the following: (a) occupying a position of relative disempowerment in relation to both the instructor and students; (b) relating to students without the burden of assessment, but with insider knowledge of the instructor’s pedagogical outcomes for the assignment and course; (c) relating to the instructor as a collaborator and instructor-in-training without having to bear the primary burden of responsibility for the course.

   **Applicable themes from descriptive coding of mentor comments:**
   - Balancing the demands of the position with the mentors’ other responsibilities
   - Getting students to attend conferences when the instructor did not mandate or incentivize regular student-mentor conferences
   - Having dual access to instructor and students
   - Functioning within an instructor’s pedagogical vision, course structure, or teaching style that differed from that of the mentor
   - Dealing with conference cancellations and no shows
   - Discerning the instructor’s expectations of the mentor
   - Coping with instructor behavior judged by mentor to be unprofessional
   - Worrying about how to communicate delicate issues to the instructor
   - Picking up specific assignments, teaching techniques, etc. from the instructor for the mentor’s future use as a FYC instructor
   - Confirming teaching as an informed career choice
   - Occupying role that is “in between” students and instructor
   - Being “mentored” by instructor
   - Having a scaffolded, supported initial classroom teaching experience
   - Feeling as though the mentor’s feedback is not valued and/or implemented by students
   - Finding that students are confused about how to interact with the mentor or vice versa
   - Functioning in situations of ensuing confusion [b/w instructors and program administrators] about what it means to have a “mentor” in the classroom
   - Working with students in coordination with the instructor
   - Co-performing the course with the instructor as a coordinated effort
   - Gaining professional experience needed to secure future employment
   - Learning from one’s students

2. Discrepancies between mentoring visions and institutional realities
   
   **Explanation:** This paradox addresses the ways in which notions of mentoring as altruistic and voluntary must be reconciled with the institutional realities of mentoring being a quarter-time job serving students who do not always want to be mentored. Sub-paradoxes include the following: (a) managing the impression of being “available” to students without surrendering one’s own academic priorities; (b) serving in a program that espouses helping all students excel in English 100, yet finding that all students so not want to excel in the ways envisioned by the mentor and/or program administrators; and (c) approaching students individually and their college educations holistically in an institutional system that treats students in aggregate and the college degree largely as a compartmentalized checklist of coursework to be completed.

   **Applicable themes from descriptive coding of mentor comments:**
   - Getting to know students on a “personal academic” level
   - Being able to track individual students’ development over a semester
   - Receiving confirmation that the mentor has been helpful to the student
• Working with students the mentor perceives to be unmotivated
• Balancing the demands of the position with the mentors’ other responsibilities
• Helping students negotiate the transition to the university
• Getting students to attend conferences when the instructor did not support conferencing through course policies that mandated or incentivized regular student-mentor conferences
• Failing to reach a particular student despite the mentor’s best efforts
• Dialoguing/Debriefing with instructor about the course and student challenges
• Dealing with students who “work around the system”

3. Writing Mentors as Participant-Observer Composition Researchers

Explanation: This category addresses the ways in which mentors simultaneously embrace and reject the role of “composition researcher” as part of their job description. Sub-themes include the following: (a) finding value and/or enjoyment in some elements of researcher role but not in others; (b) comments positioning mentors as future teachers and current researchers, but perhaps not so much as current teachers and future researchers with regards to the well-established category of “teacher-researcher;” and (c) more student conferences leading to more documentation and fewer conferences leading to less documentation, resulting in over-extended mentors becoming even more over-extended and under-employed mentors becoming even more under-employed.

Applicable themes from descriptive coding of mentor comments:
• Being able to track individual students’ development over a semester’s duration
• Occupying field researcher role as participant-observer
• Observing first-hand an exemplary teaching model
• Fulfilling the research requirements of the position
• Witnessing first-hand student “breakthroughs”
• Connecting graduate theory-driven coursework with classroom praxis
• Dialoguing/Debriefing with instructor about the course and student challenges
• Interacting with other mentors and program administrators
• Finding mentor training and professional development to be lacking
• Identifying lack of fit between Ph.D. students’ needs and mentor program policies
• Dealing with uncertainty about the program’s continuation
• Working across a full class of students
• Observing students both inside and outside of class
APPENDIX AW: Excerpted Transcript of Participant Check Roundtable #2

Notes: Discussion came in response to a draft of Chapter Four. Time of excerpted discussion is just under 5 minutes. This roundtable was conducted in response to a draft of Chapter Four, and mentors inductively brought up issues of place and geo-demographics.

FIRST MENTOR: Another issue for me was who is falling through the cracks, like who is not coming to class, it being a student of color or a Pacific Islander. Noticing if the student was a student of color, or if the student was a Pacific Islander, it was more distressing than if they weren’t. If they seemed to be falling through the cracks, not coming to class. Not being the professor, I saw my role in supporting students coming to class differently than her role. Unless we have that opportunity to meet with the students and build rapport, it can be difficult to impact their retention. So that was something that I felt strongly about during the semester. I felt that it was upsetting that a Samoan student wasn’t necessarily always coming to class, for example.

INTERVIEWER (Holly Bruland): Did you feel that that sense of, um, extra responsibility for that particular student was coming from yourself? Was coming from the program? Or, like, some kind of a combination?

FIRST MENTOR: Yeah, it’s coming from myself and from my awareness of how the institutions-- secondary schools, primary schools, etcetera-- educational institutions tend to fail our students. And being aware that ordinarily retention of indigenous student and students of color is really poor, especially in their first semesters at school, of college.

INTERVIEWER: There was one other mentor comment that talked about the mentor position heightening that person’s awareness of educational inequities and how the system is failing particularly indigenous students. It only happened once and it was such a great comment, but I was unable to do the repeat. So in some cases in these conversations, if somebody says something, it might turn something into a category for me. That’s a troubling phrase, “turn something into a category,” isn’t it?

CHORUS: Laughter, nods, indistinguishable comments around room

MENTOR TWO: That is bad. [Laughter around room.]

INTERVIEWER: “Make something more visible for my”—

MENTOR THREE: There you go. [Laughter around room.]

INTERVIEWER: More communicable?” Oh gosh, that just didn’t sound right. [Laughter]

MENTOR FOUR: It’s funny because I think that different mentors relate to different students in different ways. I mean, that’s really obvious at first. But, maybe it’s just because of who I am and being from the mainland, but I would always have the sense that sometimes it seemed like mainland students would not necessarily be dealing with inequity but would be having a harder time in their first semester just because they don’t have the support network on island, and a lot of the time the comments I would be getting from students from the mainland would be more expressions of alienation than I would be getting from the local students. And that’s something I really felt, I remember my first semester in particular.
INTERVIEWER: That may be something I haven’t accounted for enough, so far, is how different mentors relate to different students. And the way I’ve written this chapter, it doesn’t distinguish Hawai‘i all that much. Part of it, I think is the anonymous nature of the comments, but yeah, this is useful.

MENTOR FIVE: I did like the way you distinguished the individuals from the aggregate. That was really helpful for me, and it made me reflect on what I was doing. And I think I’ve been consciously, or even subconsciously, trying to kick the aggregate notion out the window when I meet with these students.
APPENDIX AX: Excerpted Transcript of Participant Check Roundtable #1

Notes: Discussion came in response to a draft of Chapter Four. Time of excerpted discussion is just under 5 minutes. This roundtable was conducted in response to a draft of Chapter Four, and mentors inductively brought up issues of place and geo-demographics.

MENTOR ONE: I’ve had challenges with my Hawaiian students in my class. Cause we have a Hawaiian focus in the classroom: everything that they’re writing has to be place-based in Hawai‘i. . . The Hawaiian students, I think they really enjoy the writing, but they don’t meet with me at all. And I don’t know if it’s the combination of the fact that it is place based, so they feel comfortable, so they don’t need to meet with me, or if it’s something to do with a cultural barrier where they don’t feel that they can connect to me or talk to me. Or there’s a difference in the ways that mentors are perceived in the Hawaiian culture. But I definitely have had a disconnect with the Hawaiian students in the class.

INTERVIEWER (Holly Bruland): Are they connecting with the instructor in a mentor kind of way?

MENTOR ONE: No, not at all. But she hasn’t really put herself in that position either. I don’t think any one in the class has gone to her for help the entire semester.

INTERVIEWER: Cause sometimes when the mentors have said they’re not getting that connection with students, whether it’s all of the students or certain contingencies, they say that sometimes the instructor has been a past mentor and then teaches the class with such a kind of mentor ethos, that the instructor sort of becomes the instructor and the mentor, and the mentor is like, “I don’t know what to do.” But it doesn’t sound like that’s what you’re talking about.

MENTOR ONE: No, that’s not the case here.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

MENTOR TWO: Um, I just want to counter that, just to say that I don’t think I’ve really noticed that myself with the Hawaiian students that I’ve had. I feel like I connect with them just as well as everyone else. Just for some counter data.

INTERVIEWER: That’s helpful. Thank you.

MENTOR THREE: But, like, as far as connecting with students goes, for me personally, I connect way better with the local students—like way better— than mainland students. And that’s mainly because I just have so much more in common, culturally, I guess. Even, like, students from the outer islands, you know, where they’re from and stuff like that. There’s a lot of things I can talk to ‘em about, even if they’re totally different people than me, versus when I meet a mainland student it’s a lot different. Like, I actually have to work to find common ground, you know what I mean? And then, it’s not that my relationships, the mentoring relationships, are any different--- well, no, it is kind of different. It’s just a lot harder for me to connect with the mainland students for me personally, like, culturally, I guess. I’m a lot more comfortable with the local students. But then, like, if they’re. Well it also depends on the local student, you know what I mean. If they’re like super Hawaiian from, like you know, Hawaiian homestead and all sovereign and stuff, it would be a little difficult for me to reach out to that, too, you know. But yeah. But, I mean, it’s not like those obstacles cannot be overcome. It’s just the initial interaction
with the different types of students from different backgrounds is a lot different. I have to position myself in different ways to like try and bridge the gap. . .

[After prompting from INTERVIEWER, MENTOR THREE continues with examples.]

MENTOR FOUR: Just to add to that whole sort of, Native Hawaiian sort of thing, the majority of class are my students are COP students. At least half. And what I’ve found—and I’ve done a lot of work with Native Hawaiian programs and things like that. What I’ve found is they’re very easily, I guess the word would be, “intimidated.” . . . They can get very easily intimidated, and as a result their reaction is either standoffish or it becomes aggressive. That’s a very common trend that I’ve noticed, not only in class, but in life in general. And I haven’t, my experiences are very similar to yours. [Speaker nods toward MENTOR TWO]. I’ve connected with them very well. And that’s because I approach them from a very—I almost like the role of just being a student in the class. My role is that. I just sit there, and I say something once in a while, but other than that I’m sitting with them, and talking with them, and things like that. And she’s teaching. But at the same time, it puts us on level ground. It develops trust. That’s just the way it is, I’ve noticed with, with Native students. But mostly, too, the difficulty with that is that you’re a student, but you’re also somewhat of an authority because you’re a mentor. For me, it’s that. My instructor told them right off the bat that I was a Master’s student, and once they heard that, it was kind of funny, because the whole dynamic kind of changed. They’re like, “Oh, you’re a Master’s student. Right on.” [Laughter around room.] They’re common with me, but they also respect me. It’s an unusual sort of situation, but yeah, it’s just the way it goes. I’ve noticed that about Native Hawaiian students. There’s just this, this—But anyway, I’m getting carried away.

INTERVIEWER: No, that’s useful. Keep going if you wanted to say more.

MENTOR FOUR: Oh no. Unfortunately, and I know this is going to sound bad, but it has a lot to do with culture, and social class, and race. That’s just the way it is. It’s easy to get offended by it. But, it’s just, those are the tones in the class that you have to, sort of, interpret and work with.
APPENDIX AY: Breakdown of Mentored First-Year Composition Courses by Degree of Engagement with Place

Note: Working primarily with course descriptions posted on the UHM Department of English website, I classified the 100 first-year composition courses in my dissertation study according to their degree of engagement with the politics of place. I based my classifications on the instructor’s use of place-related pedagogies in (a) the paragraph-length online course description; (b) the list of assigned texts; and (c) any details about the writing assignments. I assigned each course a category along a spectrum, ranging from Group One signifying courses with no apparent indication of engagement with the politics of place; to Group Two signifying courses with brief and/or tangential engagement with the politics of place; to Group Three including courses with sustained and explicit engagement with the politics of place which often involved courses which were thematically “centered” on Hawai‘i and the politics of place. The table below indicates the varying degrees of placed-based-ness across sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Description Categories</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Total sections (out of 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grouping 1: No indication of engagement with politics of place</td>
<td>These course descriptions made no mention of Hawai‘i or of issues potentially evoking writing or discussion about the politics of place. The required texts generally included composition textbooks, anthologies, and style guides with Continental U.S. publishers.</td>
<td>29 sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping 2: Tangential and/or brief engagement with politics of place</td>
<td>These course descriptions often made mention of issues relevant to the politics of place (such as class, ethnicity, language, community, sustainability) without situating these issues explicitly in Hawai‘i. Required texts often included traditional textbooks which were sometimes supplemented by “Course Readers” with excerpts of Hawai‘i-based authors.</td>
<td>41 sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping 3: Sustained and explicit engagement with politics of place</td>
<td>These course descriptions indicated that place-based writing or the politics of place constituted at least major unit of the course. Many (n=17) descriptions explicitly announced “place” and “Hawai‘i” to be organizing themes of the entire course, often indicating an investigation of such issues as tourism, militarization, and sovereignty. Others named “sustainability” as the organizing theme for the course, while noting an emphasis on both Hawai‘i-based and global issues. A significant portion of the assigned texts were composed by Hawai‘i-based authors.</td>
<td>29 sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classifiable</td>
<td>Course description and syllabus not available</td>
<td>1 section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To triangulate these initial codings, I consulted syllabi from 61 of the 100 sections that were on file in the Departmental office. (Of the 100 sections, 33 syllabi were available for the semester and section of the course in my study. Syllabi by the same instructor for a different semester within two years of the section were available in 28 cases, bringing the total number of syllabi available for triangulating purposes to 61.) In the process of triangulating, I often found more details on the reading and writing assignments, and particularly on the contents of “Course Readers,” which were quite common (n=33 sections) and indicated a resistance to textbooks, which are not only expensive but generally not place-specific. These additional details about
course readings often shifted my classification of a course by one grouping: for example, in several situations in which the course description indicated no engagement with Hawai‘i, I found on the syllabus one or two days designated to discuss an excerpted reading by a Hawai‘i-based author, changing the course from Group One to Two in my classification scheme.

Within the Group Three sections, assigned texts by Hawai‘i and Pacific-based authors included Craig Howes and Jonathan Osorio’s 2010 edited collection, *The Value of Hawai‘i* (4 sections); excerpts from Haunani-Kay Trask’s *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i* (3 sections); volumes of ‘Ōiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal (3 sections); Anne Keala Kelly’s documentary *Noho Hewa: The Wrongful Occupation of Hawai‘i* (3 sections), Lisa Linn Kanae’s *Sista Tongue*; Lee Tonouchi’s *Buss Laugh: Stand-up Poetry from Hawai‘i* (2 sections); Maori author Witi Ihimaera’s novel *The Whale Rider* (2 sections); Alani Apio’s plays *Kamau and Kamau a’e* (2 sections); excerpts from Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura’s edited collection *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i* (1 section); Matthew Kaopio’s novel *Written in the Sky* (1 section); Lee Cataluna’s short story collection *Folks you Meet at Longs* (1 section); Susan Soon He Santon’s play *Whatever Happened to John Boy Kihano* (1 section); Emelihiter Kihleng, Ryan Oishi, and Aiko Yamashiro’s edited anthology, *Routes* (1 section); and Dennis Kawaharada’s “Mango Trees on Kea‘ahala Road” (1 section).
APPENDIX AZ: Breakdown of Mentor-Student Logged Conferences by Location

Note: As many mentor logs indicated more than one conferencing location, the total conferences and percentages add up to more than 6,602 or 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Location</th>
<th>Total Logged Conferences (% of 6,602)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-Year Composition Classroom</strong></td>
<td>278 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Periphery Spaces</td>
<td>200 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuykendall building entrance and lobby areas</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallways and spaces directly outside of classroom</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff lounge in classroom wing of Kuykendall</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breezeway between Kuykendall classrooms and staircase</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs and elevator leading to classroom</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous classroom periphery spaces</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designated Mentor-Student Conferencing Spaces</strong></td>
<td>5,117 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Library Student Success Center (Years 2-4)</td>
<td>3,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuykendall 726 mentoring office (Year 1 only)</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. and ½-time M.A. mentor offices in English Department</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Resource Spaces</strong></td>
<td>374 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Library</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Center in Sinclair Library</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Composition Center in Kuykendall (Years 3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing labs and Information Technology Services (ITS)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic departments (UG Directors, Main Offices, etc.)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Lili’uokalani Student Center</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMBUDS building</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous campus resource spaces</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Social and Dining Spaces</strong></td>
<td>222 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Courtyard (adjacent to English Department)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches and tables outside of libraries and other buildings</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeterias, catering trucks, restaurants, &amp; coffee shops</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Center and other lounges (not including Kuykendall)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dining and social spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virtual Spaces</strong></td>
<td>337 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laulima (university-sponsored course website with chat room)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Messenger (IM)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text message</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous: Instructor’s office (3-way meetings)</td>
<td>5 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Code-able</strong></td>
<td>90 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No location indicated</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location too generic to determine classification (i.e. Kuykendall)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX BA: Mentor Referrals of FYC Students to Campus Resources, As Reported by Mentors

Note: This table was generated by coding the 6,602 conference logs according to mentors’ responses to the question: “Did you refer the student to any other campus resources?” Asterisks indicate that at least one student also named this same source (or a closely related source) in response to an anonymous end-of-semester program evaluation question that asked: “Did your mentor help you connect with any campus resources or representatives?” For a full listing of student responses to this question, please see Appendix BB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Named Campus Resource and/or Representative</th>
<th>Number of Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Employees, Representatives, Personnel</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Reference Librarian</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A specific professor (other than FYC instructor)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*FYC Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant (TA) for large lecture course</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor’s cell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another writing mentor with expertise in Hawaiian language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL tutor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates’ essay postings on Laulima</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates as resource</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus study group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concierge desk attendant in Sinclair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ask a Librarian” online service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Hawai‘i Library Resources</strong></td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Library services, resources, or tools (generic)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hamilton Library (generic)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sinclair Library (generic)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Collections and Holdings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hawai‘i and Pacific Collection, 5th floor Hamilton Library</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Collection, 4th floor Hamilton Library</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wong Audiovisual Center, 3rd floor Sinclair Library</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Government documents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Microfilm collection</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Microfiche collection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Academic journals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines: <em>Newsweek, Time, National Geographic</em></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Specific book in library holdings</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ebooks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*eBrary reader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course readings on reserve</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library-Based Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy card services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Lost and Found</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hamilton computer lab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sinclair computer lab</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Learning Assistance Center (LAC) in Sinclair Library</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sinclair Student Success Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Writing Center in Sinclair Library</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Study Area in Sinclair Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Wifi connections</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Online Library Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*UHM Library website</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ENG 100 resources link on Hamilton website</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hawai’i Voyager (online holdings catalogue)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*E-resources and databases (generic)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Project Muse</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Google Scholar</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*LexisNexis</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*JSTOR</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai’i Newspapers Index</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Academic Search Premier</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EBSCO Host</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CQ Researcher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*OED Online</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Advertiser Archive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-UH Library Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawai’i Public Library System</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bishop Museum Archives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor’s personal library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Academic Directions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Arts and Sciences Advising</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Majors and Degree Programs: websites, undergrad chairs, &amp; advisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Academy for Creative Media (ACM)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*English</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Cultural Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese (includes major &amp; certificate)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology and Rehabilitation Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific New Media Outreach College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-med (advising)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-law (advising)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Writing Certificate (through English Dept.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resources for Future Undergraduate Coursework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mānoa Writing Program Website (oversees requirement for Writing Intensive courses beyond FYC)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal recommendations of courses to take</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal recommendations of professors to take courses from</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Programs and Opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Opportunity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad Programs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Student Exchange Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Community College System</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Leeward Community College website</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Campus Student Services</strong></th>
<th>166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Student Career and Employment Center (SCEC)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Counseling and Student Development Center</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*KOKUA center for students with disabilities</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Student Health Services</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokua a Puni Native Hawaiian Student Services</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services (ITS)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*English Department Office (for registration assistance)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Computer Labs (generic)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR Scholarship database</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Scholarships (generic)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship opportunities specific to student’s intended major</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Student Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIC Labs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Center Computing Lab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Hall &amp; Tutoring for Student-Athletes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Testing Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYC Center with Tutors (in English Department)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Lili‘uokalani Center for Student Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Lili‘uokalani Center for Student Services Help/Info desk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Campus Resources</strong></th>
<th>45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHM Writing Mentors Program website</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Laulima</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*UHM website</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myUH portal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Campus Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH webmail service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Switchboard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Bookstore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CRDG for Course Reader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Campus map</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Theatre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Records</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Extracurricular Opportunities</strong></th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Activities Center (“for surfboard rental” n=1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural sports</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running and hiking groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsity teams/ tryouts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Campus Clubs and Registered Independent Organizations (RIO’s)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Activities, Programs, and Services (CAPS), with student activities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Campus Ministries Newman Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTUH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Fitness Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing-Related Resources</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorm RA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Parking</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal parking pointers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Shuttle Bus website</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Carpool website</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking services website</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UH Publications and Student Publishing Venues</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*List of student writing competitions and journals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na Mana'o (online FYC student journal)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka Leo student newspaper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinfish Press (sponsored by UHM English Department)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo Ridge Press</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai’i Review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-UH Websites for Writing-Related Support</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRice.com vocabulary builder</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son of Citation website</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“MLA formatting website”</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ulukau.org, “The Hawaiian Electronic Library”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Internet (generic)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Alternate Internet search engines</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoodleBib.com</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianahacker.com (support website to course text)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Resources</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship opportunity related to student’s major</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job interviewing techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Interview sources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutions Books</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL number of resources</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL number of referrals made</strong></td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX BB: Mentor Referrals of FYC Students to Campus Resources, As Reported by Students

Note: Students were responding to a question in the anonymous end-of-semester evaluation that asked, “Did your mentor help you connect with any campus resources or representatives? (i.e. library, search engines, counseling, advising, student health. . .).” A total of 565 students (or 39%) responded “yes.” A follow-up survey question asked students, “If you answered "yes," can you give some examples of which resources and how your mentor helped you to connect with them?” In 500 cases, students listed at least one resource. The table below offers a tabulation of this student-generated list of resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Named Campus Resource and/or Representative</th>
<th>Number of Times Listed in Student Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Employees, Representatives, Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus personnel (generic)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Librarian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A specific professor (other than FYC instructor)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYC Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Hawai‘i Library Resources</strong></td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>General</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services, resources, or tools (generic)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible and/or scholarly sources</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library research</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search tools (including “keywords”)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Library (generic)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Library (generic)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Collections and Holdings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i and Pacific Collection, 5th floor Hamilton Library</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong Audiovisual Center, 3rd floor Sinclair Library</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Center Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm collection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiche collection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic journals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific book in library holdings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books (generic)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ebooks</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBrary reader</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper archive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library-Based Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library workshops and library search tools</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair computer lab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library computing lab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Assistance Center (LAC) in Sinclair Library</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Student Success Center</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Center in Sinclair Library</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Library Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHM Library website</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 100 resources link on Hamilton website</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai’i Voyager (online holdings catalogue)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-resources, databases, and search engines (generic)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Muse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LexisNexis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Search Premier</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBSCO Host</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ Researcher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED Online</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online journals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online encyclopedias</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-UH Library Resources**

| Bishop Museum | 1 |
| State Archive | 1 |

**Future Academic Directions**

| 42 |

**Arts and Sciences Advising**

| 26 |

**Majors and Degree Programs: websites, undergrad chairs, & advisors**

| Departments (generic) | 4 |
| Majors (generic) | 5 |
| Academy for Creative Media (ACM) | 1 |
| Education | 1 |
| English | 4 |

**Resources for Future Undergraduate Coursework**

| 1 |

| Native Hawaiian scholarships |

**Campus Student Services**

| 26 |

| Student Career and Employment Center (SCEC) | 3 |
| Counseling and Student Development Center | 15 |
| KOKUA center for students with disabilities | 3 |
| Student Health Services | 3 |
| English Department Office (for registration assistance) | 1 |
| Computer Labs (generic) | 1 |

**Campus Resources**

| 4 |

| Campus Center | 1 |
| CRDG for Course Reader | 1 |
| Campus maps (Layout of Sinclair Library) | 1 |
| Campus Clubs and Registered Independent Organizations (RIO’s) | 1 |

**Non-UH Websites for Writing-Related Support**

| 48 |

| Websites (generic) | 29 |
| Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL) | 9 |
| “MLA formatting website” | 4 |
| Ulukau.org, “The Hawaiian Electronic Library” | 2 |
| Internet (generic) | 1 |
| dictionary.com | 1 |
| Grammar Girl website | 1 |
| Citation websites | 1 |

**Miscellaneous Resources**

| 6 |

<p>| Interview sources | 2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication venues for student writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not codeable</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL number of different resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL number of connections to resources noted by students</strong></td>
<td><strong>750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX BC: Summary of Twenty-Four FYC Sections Coded by Mentors’ Descriptions of their Work in Relation to Hawai‘i**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping of Sections</th>
<th>Total conference logs with mentoring actions related to Hawai‘i</th>
<th>Total memos with mentoring actions related to Hawai‘i</th>
<th>Ethnicity of mentors (self-described)</th>
<th>Degree of instructor place focus across sections (3= highest; 1=lowest)</th>
<th>Total number of categories identified for mentoring in relation to Hawai‘i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanaka Maoli mentors from Hawai‘i high schools</td>
<td>134 (28% of logs across grouping)</td>
<td>20 (49% of memos across grouping)</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian (x8 sections)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>40 of 40 (baseline group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Kanaka Maoli mentors from Hawai‘i high schools</td>
<td>131 (21% of logs across grouping)</td>
<td>10 (32% of memos across grouping)</td>
<td>Asian/Caucasian (x2 sections) Caucasian (x2) Chinese-Japanese (x1) Filipino (x2), Japanese (x1)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>31 of 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Kanaka Maoli mentors from North American high schools</td>
<td>117 (18% of logs across grouping)</td>
<td>20 (18% of memos across grouping)</td>
<td>Caucasian (x6 sections) Chinese/Caucasian (x1) Mixed race (x1)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>24 of 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX BD: Forty Mentoring Actions Related to Hawai‘i from Conference Logs and Weekly Memos Across Twenty-Four Sections of FYC with Mentors who Claimed Scholarly Interests Based in Hawai‘i and/or the Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Action related to Hawai‘i</th>
<th>TOTALS from Kanaka Maoli mentors (8 sections)</th>
<th>TOTALS from non-Kanaka Maoli mentors who graduated from high schools in Hawai‘i (8 sections)</th>
<th>TOTALS from non-Kanaka Maoli mentors who graduated from high schools in N. America (8 sections)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directing students to cultural and scholarly sources by Native Hawaiians and/or UHM's Hawaiian and Pacific Collections to</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing students to English language newspaper sources based in Hawai‘i</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing students to additional reliable (though generally unspecified) sources for Hawai‘i-related topics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing criteria for what makes a reliable source when writing about Hawai‘i</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating connections between research from Hawai‘i-based sources and students’ own experiences and values (and vice versa)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working to stoke student interest and engagement in Hawai‘i-based research and writing assignments</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching a class or giving a classroom presentation on a Hawai‘i-based topic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering and/or addressing how context shapes language use and interpretation, particularly the context of Hawai‘i</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Hawaiian knowledge and ways of knowing with students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working to assist, encourage, and build confidence in students facing educational and/or economic disadvantage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning hegemonic (geo)political perspectives about Hawai‘i</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting students at framing their work in larger (geo)political concepts and critical analyses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering background, suggesting ideas, and proposing possible directions for students’ writing assignments grounded in the mentor’s knowledge of Hawai‘i and the student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching about the Hawaiian language (diacritical markings, meaning of words, etc.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing complexity and encouraging space for respectful disagreement (with instructor, mentor, assigned texts) about Hawai‘i-related issues</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Talking story” with students to build rapport and to learn more about their backgrounds, interests, and perspectives</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refraining from outright critique of perceived ethnocentric comments that may alienate the student in favor of less direct approaches intended to foster rapport-building and possibilities for long-term teaching about Hawai‘i</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiring into students’ reasons for students choosing to attend UHM, while reflecting on how problematic motives and initial impressions might be addressed through mentoring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing (and sharing insights on) the cultural dynamics of Hawai‘i’s classrooms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting upon how Hawaiian values and perspectives inform the mentor’s own practices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping students understand the relevance of course materials that are not specifically Hawai‘i-based</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noting students’ enthusiasm for and interest in Hawai‘i-centered topics and texts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting forth Native Hawaiian and/or Pacific Islander authors as models for writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting factually inaccurate statements or other misinterpretations about Hawaiian history and present-day Hawai‘i</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing difficulties faced by students from the Continental U.S. in finding the means of authority to write about Hawai‘i-based research topics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggesting Hawai‘i-centered topics to stoke students’ interest in reading, writing, and research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Native Hawaiian students on how to take advantage of opportunities fund their education through scholarships for Native Hawaiian students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Continental US students to research and write about their hometowns as storied places with indigenous histories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching out to students who expressed feelings of missing home or indicated that they are having difficulty transitioning to living in Honolulu (students could be coming from neighbor islands, other Pacific Islands, the continental US, or additional countries)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing a student’s learning about Hawai‘i in other UHM courses (most frequently Hawaiian Studies and Ethnic Studies)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialoguing with students about differences between their home cultures and the cultures of UHM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversing in, talking about, or encouraging students’ written and oral uses of Hawai‘i Creole English (HCE) or Pidgin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>Count 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping students to revise work for submission to <em>Na Mana’o; A Journal Devoted to First-Year Composition at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Continental US students who confide that they feel personally attacked and/or alienated by assigned readings or class discussions addressing the politics of place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging students to learn one another’s names and to see each other as resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about Hawai‘i and Pacific island cultures, languages, places, values, etc. from one's students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing student resistance toward engaging with Hawai‘i in FYC (in the form of complaints, body language, displays of emotion ranging from boredom to anger)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working to support students who intend to transfer off-island to pursue their professed educational goals or life interests, while also underscoring the value of the current FYC course and/or the Mānoa experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching students on how to balance their schoolwork with their responsibilities to family, from a place of understanding and supporting the value of prioritizing family in Hawaiian and other &quot;local&quot; cultures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging students who told the mentor that they were planning to drop out of college altogether to continue their educations in one of UH's community colleges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being singled out as representative of all Hawaiians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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