**Counting Backwards Toward the Future of Immigrant Students
in Basic Writing: Conceptualizing Generation 1 Learners**

Emily Suh

Unlike child immigrants, individuals who immigrate to the U.S. as adults do not attend U.S. K-12 schools. Adult immigrants often first experience U.S. education and language support through adult English as a Second Language (ESL). These programs have linguistic and academic goals distinct from K-12. Although some adult immigrants persist to college, researchers have not examined their transition. Furthermore, the literature that explores the experience of adult immigrant learners transitioning to college lacks a clarifying, non-deficit term to identify the group. Scholars' failure to establish a unified term for adult immigrant students is indicative of the students' marginalization within fields of educational scholarship and learning institutions. This essay identifies limitations in the existing literature on Generation 1.5, international, and adult students. Drawing from andragogy and sociocultural theories of language acquisition, the author adds to the academic nomenclature referring to immigrant students by introducing the term "Generation 1 learner" and a theory of Generation 1 learning. Generation 1 learners immigrated as adults and first experienced the U.S. education system in adult ESL before transitioning to college. The author concludes with suggested ways to support Generation 1 learners in basic writing and beyond.

An Under-Recognized Student Body

Immigrants who come to the U.S as adults cannot attend U.S. K-12 schools for language instruction or other learning. Instead, they usually begin in adult English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, and many spend their entire U.S. education in community colleges that offer adult ESL through two-year degree programs. Not surprisingly, community colleges attract a growing number of students from immigrant backgrounds (Teranishi et al.) largely because of the colleges' open-access missions (Cohen et al.). However, because of the focus on foreign-born, U.S. K-12 educated Generation 1.5 students (Salas et al.), community college researchers and practitioners often fail to recognize the presence of adult immigrant students. Although they are multilingual like Generation 1.5 students, these students also have unique previous

educational experiences and characteristics as adult learners that distinguish them from Generation 1.5 and other students. In order to address a significant gap in our knowledge and provide an accurate term with which to describe these students, this article adds the term "Generation 1 learner" to the academic nomenclature referring to immigrant students to establish a term that can be used consistently across disciplines and avoid deficit labeling.

Several types of ESL programs exist to serve adult immigrants, and a wide body of research examines the adult immigrant experience in these programs. However, adult ESL programs can struggle to accommodate advanced learners' academic and linguistic needs as they prepare for college (Tucker). Generation 1 learners are frequently absent from the literature on immigrant or English language learner students in higher education (Crandall and Sheppard; de Kleine and Lawton; Kanno and Harklau). For the most part, existing literature on multilingual students or community college students focuses on international students, who come to the U.S. to study and plan to return to their home country (Hanassab and Tidwell; Levin; Townsend) or focuses on Generation 1.5 students. Generation 1.5 students are born in the U.S. or immigrate at a young age and receive all or most of their formal education in the U.S. (Salas et al.; Rumbaut and Ima). The existing literature thus fails to recognize the educational experiences of these adult immigrant students.

At the community college, adult ESL coursework is considered pre-college and classified within adult education of a non-academic nature (Boylan et al.). However, literature on adult education rarely addresses language acquisition or students' transition to college-level courses. Similarly, while the field of developmental education focuses on the transition to college (Highbee et al.) and supporting non-traditional students (Kenner and Weinerman), developmental education literature focuses almost exclusively on monolingual English students.

Furthermore, like TESOL, basic writing scholars' attention to multilingual college students is usually focused on Generation 1.5 (Matsuda; Matsuda et al).

The educational journeys of adult immigrant students transitioning to college are clearly absent from the research and literature. These learners bring with them a wealth of resources including experiences as adults immigrating to a new country, acculturating to American education through adult ESL, and investing in language learning and higher education. The learners access their unique experiences to motivate and inform their learning in ways that distinguish them from other English language learners. In this essay, I will be referring to this group of individuals as "Generation 1 learners." The lack of a common, and non-deficit, term to describe Generation 1 learners in the literature mirrors the learners' peripheral place in the community colleges at which they often begin in adult ESL. When researchers and instructors do not recognize Generation 1 as unique from their Generation 1.5 and international student peers, they fail to create and evaluate teaching practices that support these learners' unique needs while honoring their existing strengths.

Labels highlight specific attributes and connote positive or pejorative group representations. I have chosen the term "Generation 1 learners" to distinguish non-U.S. K-12 educated, adult immigrant English language learners as a subset of immigrant students distinct from U.S. K-12 educated Generation 1.5 students (Rumbaut and Ima). I also want to emphasize that Generation 1 learners are adult learners who are influenced by their multiple social roles (Knowles, *The Modern Practice*) and educational experiences outside of the U.S. K-12 system.

I employ the term Generation 1 learners (Suh, "Language Minority Students"; Suh, *Off from Lost*), whom I define as immigrants who (1) arrived in the U.S. at the age of 22 or older (Rumbaut) and are therefore ineligible for U.S. high school, (2) are adult learners (Knowles, *The*

Modern Practice) who first experience U.S. education in adult ESL (i.e., outside of U.S. K-12), and (3) transition to college with the plan to earn a degree. Below I summarize literature relevant to Generation 1 learners and distinguish them from other multilingual students. I ground the term "Generation 1 learner" in Knowles' ("Andragogy vs. Pedagogy"*)* theory of andragogy and sociocultural theories of language acquisition to establish a theory of Generation 1 learning and conclude with recommendations for supporting Generation 1 learners in basic writing and beyond.

Locating Generation 1 Learners within the Literature on Multilingual Students

Generation 1 Learners

Characteristics and goals. Because many adult ESL classes are free, volunteer-based programs with no federal or state oversight, it is difficult to determine the number of Generation 1 learners who enroll in adult ESL classes. The National Center for Education Statistics reported that there were 667,515 students served in state-administered English as a Second Language Programs in 2014 (US Department of Education). It is likely that many of these learners began in free programs before they transitioned to formal or tuition-based classes, like the classes in many state-administered programs. The students in these programs were adult immigrants, the majority of whom immigrated to the U.S. as adults and therefore did not receive a U.S. K-12 education. Further, they brought to their classrooms a wealth of experiences as adult learners with previous life, learning, and language learning experiences. Generation 1 learners often enter their education with specific social roles or career goals which they believe are achievable through a college degree or further education (Norton, *Identity* 2nd edition; Norton, "Non-participation"; Peirce; Suh, *"Off from Lost"*). The portion of the adult ESL student body which transitions into college classes is the group I refer to as Generation 1 learners.

Perhaps because researchers interested in adult immigrant students belong to a variety of related but distinct fields, there is no cohesive label for this group. While some refer to these students as (adult) ESL students, I question the appropriateness of this term, noting the label's inaccuracy once students leave ESL classes. Based upon tenets of disability scholarship that advocate for person-centered language (Snow), it is an inaccurate term in this case for students who were previously enrolled in ESL. Perhaps because of the unwieldiness of this phrase, it also has not become popular in the literature. Instead, many of the references to these learners are framed in deficit language (Gorski); this language highlights linguistic and/or academic under-preparedness. For example, in their position paper on success factors and promising practices, the Community College Consortium for Immigrant Education describes what they have identified as key characteristics of adult immigrant students:

> Many are older nontraditional students who attend college part-time while juggling jobs and families. They often come from low-income backgrounds, experience turbulence in their lives, and have a difficult time marshaling the financial resources to pay college fees and tuition. Immigrant students also face unique challenges and needs as they learn a new language, navigate unfamiliar community college systems and community services, and acclimate to a totally new culture—all at the same time. (Casner-Lotto 2)

This network of community colleges spearheading research and best practices for adult immigrant learners describes the learners with phrases ranging from "immigrant students" and "late-entry," to "less-skilled nontraditional [students]" (Casner-Lotto 224). In addition to the Consortium's description, Generation 1 learners have been referred to as "foreign high schooled immigrant students" (Conway), "Adult Basic Education English learners" (Csepelyi), "adult ESL students" (Csepelyi), and "mature English Language Learner (ELL) Student[s]" (Almon

"College Persistence"). This lack of common terminology further suggests the group's peripheral place within the literature and institutions of higher learning.

In spite of largely deficit driven language, a picture of Generation 1 learners begins to emerge based on this literature. Learners enroll in adult ESL due to being motivated by goals such as regaining social and economic status, finding a more skilled and/or higher paying job, and improving their communication with other English speakers. Through their experiences as employees, caregivers, and language learners/students in previous educational contexts, Generation 1 learners come to college with several skills which foster their academic success (Peirce; Suh, "*Off from Lost*"). For example, many Generation 1 learners transfer study strategies and learning experiences from their time in adult ESL to their college classes (Suh, "*Off from Lost*"), and even those who do not come with previous academic experience benefit from qualities typical of adult learnings, including their punctuality, strong work ethic, ability to multitask, and job-related skills.

Institutional support. Generation 1 learners often first encounter U.S. education in adult ESL. Although adult ESL is offered in a number of formats and by a variety of organizations, I focus here on community college adult ESL offerings because they are most prevalent and because learners can transition into degree programs at the same institution. While adult ESL can serve U.S. high school graduates, these students typically are placed in basic writing courses if they require additional language support before college composition. Thus, Generation 1 learners comprise the vast majority of students enrolled in adult ESL within community colleges.

Adult ESL courses are usually non-credit and therefore ineligible for financial aid, as are many basic writing courses and those viewed as remedial by the institutions (Dean Dad). ESL

classes are often offered off-site with adjunct faculty, creating a situation which can unintentionally limit access of adult ESL students to college resources such as advisors, computer labs, or library materials housed on the main campus (Baynham and Simpson). Furthermore, the majority of adult ESL classes serve beginning and intermediate students. Due to scarce resources and the limited numbers of qualifying students, fewer courses are available for academic English. Students therefore face the paradox of limited advanced course offerings and a lengthy course sequence as a punitive obstacle to their full participation in the college's academic community (Crandall and Sheppard; Cspelyi; Tucker).   Shawna Shapiro critiques the marginalizing effect of these lengthy course sequences, offsite locations, and adjunct faculty staffing policies, noting how the combination positions adult ESL students as "illegal aliens" who must pay unreasonably high costs in time and money for their membership in the college's community.

A limited body of research, begun in the 1980s, addresses the length of time required for immigrant students to learn English as an additional language (i.e., Cummins, "Age and Arrival"; Cummins, "BICS and CALP"; Mainstream English Language Teaching Project qtd. in Florez and Terrill). This now somewhat dated research suggests that adult immigrant students may require up to 1,000 hours of instruction to achieve basic proficiency if they are already literate in their first language (Mainstream English Language Teaching Project qtd. in Florez and Terrill; Robertson and Ford). Consequently, significantly more instruction is therefore necessary for those adult learners seeking to achieve collegiate level academic proficiency. The second language acquisition scholar Jim Cummins distinguishes between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) noting that immigrant children can acquire BICS in approximately two years while immigrant children

enrolled in the K-12 system make take five to seven years to acquire grade level norms in academic language (Cummins, "BICS and CALP").

Adult learners are not legally entitled to the language acquisition supports guaranteed to their children in public schools, and adult English language students often attend part-time in multi-class sequences, taught by instructors with varied levels of training and experience teaching multilingual students (Tucker). As a result, adult- arrival immigrant students may require several years more than their children to acquire the academic register necessary for college.

Students who persist to advanced ESL levels and want to earn a college degree are highly intrinsically motivated, and they can become frustrated with programs' perceived lack of academic rigor, lengthy course sequences, off-site locations, and limited access to college resources (Tucker). Like other community college students, Generation 1 learners in adult ESL struggle with persistence. Beginning with the earliest examination of students in college-offered ESL (Belcher), researchers have consistently found that students with lower placement levels have lower completion rates (Almon, "College Persistence"; Curry, "CLA;" Patthey-Chavez et al.). Indeed, some estimate that as few as 1.8% of adult education students, including adult ESL students, transition to credit-level courses (Duke and Ganzglass). Several factors affect student persistence in adult ESL, including academic and career goals (Baynham and Simpson,; Becker), competing role expectations (Almon, *English Language Learner,* "Retention;" Csepelyi; Norton), financial constraints (Almon, "Retention"), and knowledge of the school system (Almon, "College Persistence").

Despite these challenges, Generation 1 learners often find supportive faculty in adult ESL classes (Cspelyi). Additionally, a small but relevant body of literature on adult ESL explicates

the theory of adult second language acquisition and promising practices in adult second language teaching (see for example Krashen, Perdue). Unfortunately, a very limited literature base examines students' transitions from adult ESL to credit-level courses within the community college (Almon, *English Language Learner*; Becker; Cspelyi; Suh, *"Off from Lost";* Suh, "Language Minority"); at present, I know of no research on non-traditional multilingual students' pathway from adult ESL through college graduation. Additional research is also needed to test the strength of the hypothesized correlation between Generation 1 learners' job/life skills and academic success.

Generation 1.5 Students in K-12

To better understand Generation 1 learners, it is important to contrast them against Generation 1. 5 students. Unlike Generation 1 learners, Generation 1.5 students (Rumbaut and Ima) are the focus of most research and literature on immigrant students. Although they are foreign-born, these students complete the majority of their formal education in the United States. Researchers (Harklau; Olsen; Suarez-Orozco, Suarez-Orozco and Todorova) document several common experiences influencing Generation 1.5 students' transition to college. These experiences include socialization into U.S. academic discourse practices, interactions with emotionally and culturally supportive ESL teachers, entering mainstream classes, and discussions about college preparation with academic cultural insiders.   Because of the limited body of literature on Generation 1 learners in college, I turn to research on the Generation 1.5 experience to highlight similarities and distinctions between this group and Generation 1 learners.

Socialization. Schools are socializing institutions in which students learn the discourse practices and preferred ways of being a student. Reflecting upon the French university setting,

sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron outline the ways in which educational institutions inculcate cultural norms and reify students' unequal access to *symbolic capital* through ways of using language. Discourse patterns, part of what Bourdieu and Passeron refer to as *linguistic capital*, and the students' acceptance of the educational institution's legitimacy become *symbolic capital* which students learn to apply to interactions within the school and other social settings. In sociocultural theories of language learning, language is one of several resources that can be applied to identity or social role enactment.

Much of the literature on Generation 1.5 students details their socialization through participation in school environments. Linda Harklau, for example, demonstrates how high school classes act as instructional niches introducing student performance expectations. Different classes and tracks, such as ESL and mainstream classes, are unique linguistic and academic environments for learning language and subject content (Harklau). For example, in class, immigrant students learn the cultural obsession with individuality and how this obsession is manifested through classroom language practices, such as citing published literature and not copying a classmate's work, or material practices, such as individually owned supplies (Toohey). In addition to language practices, students learn participation rules, such as raising their hands and waiting to be called on or working collaboratively in groups. In this way, the social and cultural messages students receive in K-12 shape students' choices, ways of seeing the world, and identity (Grenfell and James).

This is not to say that socialization within U.S. high school ensures academic success or individual and cultural acceptance. Immigrant students frequently report feelings of isolation and frustration over their limited ability to express themselves and take up an identity other than "foreign student" (Harklau, "ESL Learning Environment;" Olsen; Suarez-Orozco et al.).

However, they gain experience and an understanding of American culture and begin the complex process of academic identity work while still in high school. In contrast, Generation 1 learners experience the dominant culture in different contexts (i.e., on the job, interacting with service providers, etc.) that do not provide instruction in academic language or behavior expectations. Thus, they are deprived of some of the acculturating experiences that would enhance their comfort within the academy.

In-school interactions. A large body of literature documents Generation 1.5 students benefiting from teacher and staff support (Harklau "ESL Learning Environment," "Good Kids;" Olsen; Suarez-Orozco et al.). Caring teachers and staff are important agents of socialization and support for Generation 1.5 students. High school ESL teachers help Generation 1.5 students develop "academic survival strategies" to advance in their coursework and present themselves as competent students often in order to transition out of ESL (Harklau, "ESL Learning Environment" 47). High school teachers can act as cultural brokers advising students' navigation of relationships and policies within and outside of the school system (Sarroub; Suarez-Orozco et al.). Coaches can play similarly supportive roles, assisting students academically and emotionally as students graduate from high school and begin college (Harklau and McClanahan).

Much of the literature on Generation 1.5 students is framed within theories of social interaction. Through this lens, students' K-12 experiences are seen as shaped by interactions within school, but students also enact their agency to navigate the school system and respond to others within it. Thus, through a series of negotiated process in which "outside and societal factors influence and are influenced by the daily interactions between students, teachers and counselors," Generation 1.5 students co-construct their individual identities and perceptions of

their abilities, including language mastery (Harklau "Tracking and Linguistic Minority Students"

219). This theoretical framing of Generation 1.5 students as agentive is relevant to discussions

about Generation 1 learners because of the theoretical similarities to andragogy, a theory of adult

learning (Knowles "Andragogy, not Pedagogy"), and Bonny Norton's theory of investment

(*Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation; Identity and Language Learning:*

Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change; "Language, Identity, and the Ownership of

English"; "Non-participation"; Norton and Toohey). Norton's theory informs much of the

research on Generation 1.5 students (Bigelow; McKay and Wong), but the theory originated

from her work with adult English language learners, some of whom were Generation 1 learners

planning to attend college.

Generation 1.5 students' K-12 schooling experiences involve the intersectionality of

language learning, academic expectations, and socialization into the U.S. school system. Laurie

Olsen identifies three components of U.S. high schools' Americanization of newcomer students:

academic marginalization/separation, requirement to become English-speaking (while dropping

the native language) for participation in the high school's academic and social life, and

conformity to the racial hierarchy of the United States. For example, existing racial categories

within high school complicate immigrant students' academic endeavors as students are

confronted with stereotypes about which racial groups are and are not the high achievers. These

intricate racial and ethnic negotiations are a critical piece of immigrant students' identity work

within the school (Sarroub; Suarez-Orozco et al.). As Olsen explains, the school is a microcosm

of American society at large, and in school Generation 1.5 students learn that becoming English-

speaking is not sufficient for gaining membership or acceptance. Thus, through their K-12

education, Generation 1.5 students undertake critical identity work and navigate larger societal

beliefs about multicultural and racial identities as they make personal decisions about what it means to be American. These lessons and decisions are directly applicable to their interactions in larger U.S. society. In contrast, Generation 1 learners must learn these lessons outside of the sheltered environment of the school, and they often struggle with a greater number of competing identities and social roles than their Generation 1.5 peers (Almon; Suh "Professionalization").

College preparation. Although Generation 1.5 students' academic preparation is influenced by several factors, high school classes offer Generation 1.5 students a distinct advantage over Generation 1 learners in terms of exposure to U.S. academic culture. Harklau characterizes the high school experience for Generation 1.5 students as "a series of instructional niches" through which students traverse daily ("Good Kids" 42). Sheltered English language support classes and mainstream content courses are each unique learning and language environments with distinct expectations and assumptions regarding student performance. Researchers document mixed findings regarding the effectiveness of high school in preparing Generation 1.5 students for college based on these niches. Olsen and others note how the limited academic expectations of some ESL classes can result in academic marginalization for ESL students. Prolonged experience in such environments makes it increasingly difficult for students to transition into courses that prepare students for college-level material. In contrast, others discuss positive learning gains made by students in sheltered English language learning classrooms (Hansen-Thomas; Harklau "ESL versus Mainstream"; Krashen; McIntyre et al.).

At the same time, mainstream content courses can also offer great potential to challenge Generation 1.5 students with college aspirations. With their frequently high levels of authentic communication, mainstream classes better prepare Generation 1.5 students for college content. Generation 1.5 students make the greatest gains when their teachers provide specific attention to

language acquisition as well as exposure to mainstream course content, delivery styles, and expectations (Short et al.).

Unfortunately, attendance in mainstream classes does not guarantee preparation for college success. Mainstream courses can prove challenging for English language learners when teachers do not make adjustments to their speed of talk or output (Harklau, "ESL Learning Environment"). Ability grouping or tracking practices can also adversely impact English language learners' preparation for college through differences in high school curriculum, expectations, participation structures (Callahan; Mehan et al.; Worthy et al.), and quality of spoken and written language interaction (Harklau, "ESL Learning Environment"). Overall, Generation 1.5 students who attend mainstream classes gain insight into a variety of U.S. educational expectations and experiences, but they may still struggle to transition to college. Generation 1 learners who did not attend a U.S. high school face similar linguistic, academic, and cultural challenges in transitioning to college from adult ESL programs (Almon, *English Language Learner;* Becker); however, their previous formal education and their adult ESL experiences make their transitional experiences unique. They lack the years of formal introduction to the American academic environment of their Generation 1.5 college peers.

Literature on Generation 1.5 students supplements a conceptualization of Generation 1 learners regarding the importance of ESL teacher support and explicit attention to language acquisition. However, Generation 1.5 students' U.S. high school acculturative experiences may better prepare them linguistically, academically, and culturally for participation in the U.S. higher education system. Generation 1 learners may not have had equivalent experiences with the racialization and socialization that occurs in U.S. high schools. Instead, Generation 1

learners' identities have been shaped primarily by their previous experiences and social roles as adults, both prior to their immigration to the United States, and thereafter.

International Students

Although they were the focus of early research on English language learners (Johnson; Light et al.), international students are less frequently represented than immigrant language learners in the literature on two-year institutions and within community colleges. In her study on differences between international and Generation 1.5 students, Kristen di Gennaro reports that international students were significantly less likely than Generation 1.5 students to demonstrate rhetorical control (i.e., inclusion of essay components, ordering of ideas, and support in their writing). The international students were more likely to demonstrate sociolinguistic control, defined as the ability to maintain a formal written register; however, this difference was not significant. di Gennaro made no comparisons to Generation 1 learners, but it can be inferred that, like international students, Generation 1 learners would not have received the same amount of instruction on the structure of an essay or supporting ideas within it as Generation 1.5 students, who would have received this instruction in American high schools.

Although Generation 1 learners and international language learners may share limited exposure to U.S. academic writing conventions, their strengths as multilinguals, and their diverse international perspectives, Generation 1 learners are distinct from international students in several regards. A primary way in which they differ are the circumstances in which they learn English. Unlike most Generation 1 learners who attend ESL classes while working in their new home country, international students are limited in the length of time they can stay in the U.S. and their ability to work while there. The majority of international students are traditional-aged students and are unable to work, and therefore international students hold fewer non-academic

responsibilities. International students have already been admitted to colleges or universities, and thus usually possess strong academic skills and high levels of college preparation in order to meet university entrance standards. They may require language support before they are ready for a U.S. college classroom, but they have already developed study habits and have experienced rigorous academic environments in their home countries. In general, Generation 1 learners who have left their countries of origin for non-academic reasons experience less foreign language learning experience and thus lower levels of language proficiency than international students. However, Generation 1 learners have often spent more time in the U.S. than international students and thus benefit from their exposure to American culture. In fact, Generation 1 learners' extensive experiences as adults, adult learners, and residents of a new country may distinguish them from international students more profoundly than differences in their formal language learning experiences.

Establishing A Theoretical Conceptualization of Generation 1 Learners

A theoretical framing of Generation 1 learners must centralize the previous experiences these learners bring to college. While sociocultural theories of language acquisition articulate the relationship between language learning and identity (Hawkins; Norton; Toohey), they do not fully acknowledge the importance of previous experience as a resource for Generation 1 learners. The following section combines Malcom Knowles' andragogy and Bonny Norton's theory of investment to articulate a theory of how and why Generation 1 learners approach language learning in college.

Andragogy: A Theory of Adult Learning

An extensive body of literature addresses adult learners and theories of how to teach them. Sharan Merriam and Ralph Brockett define adult learners as "those whose age, social

roles, or self-perception, define them as adults" (8). In the United States, andragogy (Knowles) is the most widely acknowledged theory of adult learning (Johansen and McLean). Although andragogy has been rightly criticized for its lack of attention to the historical, cultural, and social factors mediating learning, it is useful for distinguishing Generation 1 learners from Generation 1.5 students. Furthermore, the theory acknowledges some of the essential strengths Generation 1 learners bring to their learning experiences.

Andragogy as a concept suggests the importance of learners' social roles and experiences vis-à-vis their learning. Adult learners choose to learn to enact a future self or respond to an immediate concern associated with a social role. For example, adult learners may return to school for certification to receive a promotion or for the purpose improving literacy skills so that they can read with their children. Adult learners are assumed to come to learning experiences with a readiness to learn and focus on personal development rather than extrinsic motivation, such as teacher or parent expectations. Adult learners also draw upon essential experiences, including previous formal education, and make connections to identity-shaping activities and roles, such as employee or parent. According to andragogy, aspects of these existing roles, such as persistence in a difficult task or patience with a child, are transferable to new learning experiences. As Knowles explains, "[An adult's] expanding reservoir of experience [is] an increasingly rich resource for learning, and at the same time provides…a broadening base to which to relate new learning" (*Modern Practice* 45). As a result, both previous experiences and social roles motivate adult learners and serve as learning resources. Andragogy as a theory is particularly relevant to Generation 1 learners gaining first English language proficiency and then a college degree in that, like other adult learners, Generation 1 learners are motivated to meet needs associated with social roles in the U.S. For many learners, these social roles are ones for

which the learners may not have had previous training (performing a job which requires a certain level of English proficiency, for example) or may require additional training (such as being able to communicate with doctors or other service providers in English). In my study of Generation 1 learners at one Midwestern community college, I found that learners frequently drew upon their previous experiences as evidence of their ability to persist and their strong work ethic even when the experiences were non-academic (Suh, "Language Minority Students," "*Off from Lost*").

A central tenet of andragogy is that adult learners consciously choose to learn and orient their learning choices towards self-actualization (Knowles and Associates). This assumption about adult learners distinguishes them from children, for whom the curriculum is determined by their teachers' assessment of what children need to learn. Adults resume their education to deal with an immediate concern arising from their social roles; thus, they desire application of their new knowledge to solidify their learning through immediate use (Merriam and Bierema). Understanding connections between the current topic and long-term learning objective is thus a key adult motivational force (Knowles and Associates). Researchers (Becker; Cspelyi; Suh, *"Off from Lost"*; Tucker), document Generation 1 learners' frustration with adult ESL when learners feel that adult ESL classes are inadequate preparation for college. Self-actualization for these learners is thus linked to their perceptions of themselves as college students and the importance that they place on others viewing them in the same role.

Andragogy as conceived by Malcolm Knowles is not without criticism. Many scholars question Knowles' implicit assumptions about learner autonomy and lack of attention to cultural context. Daniel Pratt, for example, argues that andragogy incorrectly assumes the learner "has risen above the web of social structures" and thus "does not acknowledge the vast influence of these structures on the formation of the person's identity and ways of interpreting the world"

(18). Rather, it can be posited that the social roles, motivations for learning, and learning styles andragogy addresses emerge from an individual's culture and characteristics including race, class, gender, and culture, and society. However, andragogy fails to consider the effect of these variables on learning. As a result, Ming Yeh Lee concludes, "Knowles overgeneralized the characteristics of [a white, male, middle-class] population…and silenced those [with] less privilege, whose values and experiences were often ignored in educational settings" (15). Lee's critique is particularly salient for assessing the effectiveness of using andragogy to explain the experiences of Generation 1 learners who are highly motivated to fulfill their multiple roles in a new culture but whose previous experiences may not provide them with the *symbolic capital* others value in their new learning environments. For example, newly arrived Hmong immigrants' preindustrial and preliterate cultural contexts do not match the highly participatory expectations of their U.S. adult ESL teachers (Hvitfeldt).

Lee persuasively concludes that adult immigrant learning experiences are "significantly shaped by their countries of origin," but andragogy "does not account for powerful influence of dynamic contexts in which the learners interact. Especially when it comes to the experiences of immigrant adult learners" (13). Decontextualized understandings of learning ignore complexities of the learning environment's social structure and instructor authority as well as how these aspects affect motivation. Given the influence of andragogy on how adult and developmental education classes are taught (Johansen and McLean), researchers must examine how the narrow conceptualization of learners envisioned by Knowles' conception of andragogy may influence Generation 1 learner experiences. Community colleges and scholars require an articulated theory of adult learning which recognizes learners' diverse cultural, linguistic, and life experiences.

Investment: A Sociocultural Theory of Second Language Acquisition

Bonny Norton's investment theory examines how language learners' self- perceptions influence their language use and participation choices (Norton, *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation; Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change,* "Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English"; "Non-participation"; Norton and Toohey). Like other sociocultural theories of language learning, investment conceptualizes language as *symbolic capital*. For Norton, language is an essential resource for identity presentation and assertion of group membership. For example, by using or resisting the use of English, students in an adult ESL class can align themselves with dominant aspects of U.S. culture or reaffirm allegiance to another ethnic or national identity. Drawing from Norton, others (McKay and Wong; Toohey) explore how language learners use English to make participation choices in a variety of educational settings. However, the responses of teachers and fellow students to learners' applied *symbolic capital*—and the learners' chosen identities—vary. Instructors who accept learners' refugee experiences as legitimate evidence of learner persistence, for instance, may still devalue learners' previous educational experiences if these instructors feel those experiences do not align with participation expectations for a U.S. classroom (Suh, "*Off from Lost"*).

A Theory of Generation 1 Learning

Scholars do not study what they do not know exists; educational researchers do not identify promising practices to serve unacknowledged student groups. A theory of Generation 1 learners is required to differentiate them from other language learners and facilitate their visibility. In articulating a theory of Generation 1 learning, I combine investment theory and andragogy. The tenets shared by these theories include that learning is motivated by desired

social roles, learners are intrinsically motivated, and previous experiences are rich resources for learning. Investment theory adds an awareness of how individuals learn within institutional contexts mediated by their access to varying levels and forms of symbolic capital. Unlike the implicit assumption in andragogy that all learners' previous experiences are equally valued, investment theory acknowledges learners' unique application of capital, how that capital is received, and their varied success in presenting themselves within different social contexts.

Combining andragogy and investment theory emphasizes essential distinctions between youth and traditional college-aged Generation 1.5 students and adult Generation 1 learners. Like other adult learners, Generation 1 learners bring a wealth of experiences, including formal and informal education, employment, caretaking responsibilities, and understandings of self vis-à-vis culture and language. While drawing from these experiences, Generation 1 learners also are highly self-motivated to meet learning goals related to their desired social roles. While Generation 1.5 students experience academic, acculturative, and racializing processes as K-12 students before college (Olsen; Toohey), Generation 1 learners may first encounter these processes in the basic writing classroom.

Through an integrated theory of Generation 1 learners' transition, researchers and practitioners acknowledge the complex intersectionality of Generation 1 learners' language learning, previous educational and life experiences, and their identity work as these factors play out in the dialogic environment of the basic writing classroom. A theory of Generation 1 learners is a heuristic for examining educators' and researchers' understanding of multilingual students and ways to support their learning. The theory further encourages collaboration between the previously disconnected fields of adult and developmental education and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. As Lisa Hoffman and Alan Zollman note, teaching practices

which engage diverse learners strengthen the learning of all students; recommendations for practice stemming from a theory of Generation 1 learners will broaden basic writing scholars' understanding of the students they serve, thereby improving their ability to serve all students.

Supporting Generation 1 Learners in Basic Writing

Generation 1 learners bring unique strengths and challenges to every learning environment. A theory of Generation 1 learners can inform the practice of all educators; however, I focus here on Generation 1 learners entering basic writing.

Linking Theory to Practice

The theory of Generation 1 learners transitioning from adult ESL to basic writing and other college courses examines the motivations, strengths, and needs of adult immigrant English language learners who transition from adult ESL to college courses. The theorizing of Generation 1 learners highlights several ways in which basic writing practices can or do align with these learners' distinct characteristics. In the following section, I explore how the theory of Generation 1 learners connects to current basic writing pedagogy and practices. The table below provides a brief summary of the interconnections that will be explained further in the following sections.

Table 1 Linking Theory, Student Characteristics and Practice

Theoretical Component	Student Characteristics	Basic Writing Practice
Possess strengths as adult learners	Resilient, Strong connection between social roles and academic goals,	Reading and discursive writing practices connecting self-to-world

	Drawing from previous non-academic learning experiences	
Work to acquire academic language	Need opportunities to develop language	Instruction in higher and lower orders of concern, practice using language in academic genres
Are new to the U.S. educational system	Need opportunities to develop academic capital, transform and apply existing symbolic capital	Introducing collegiate expectations for writing and ways of being a student
Invest in their identities as college student, English language expert, future/current professional and social roles	Need support for identity work	Explicit awareness and discussion of identity formation in class activities and discussion

Figure 1. This chart shows how theoretical components and student characteristics are linked to basic writing teaching practices.

Supporting Adult Learners

Adult learners bring unique strengths to the classroom based on their previous life experiences and the connections they make between their education and desired social roles/professional goals (Knowles). Generation 1 learners benefit from writing assignments and

activities which explicitly link the course content to their learning goals and previous experiences (Suh, "*Off from Lost"*). These assignments also increase students' meaning-making abilities (Bartholomae and Petrosky; Bird). At the same time, instructors must teach learners to move beyond their own experiences by engaging critically with texts presenting diverse perspectives.

Supporting Academic Language Acquisition

All English language learners can benefit from instructors drawing explicit connections between students' previously acquired social language styles and the academic language forms now being acquired. Jim Cummins uses the terms *Basic Interpersonal Skills* and *Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency* (CALP) to distinguish between social and academic language ("Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency"). Researchers estimate that a learner with first language literacy will need at least four to seven years to become academically proficient at elementary/middle school level (Hakuta et al.). Academic proficiency for adults is presumed to take much longer with estimates ranging from seven to ten years (Collier; Cummins, "Age on Arrival"; Mitchell et al.). Students need general academic vocabulary and disciplinary vocabularies. To facilitate academic language acquisition, Jana Eschevarria, Mary Ellen Vogt, and Deborah Short created the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), a framework for comprehensive academic interventions to increase academic language proficiency. This research-based approach to instructional design and content delivery includes explicit introduction of content and language objectives for each lesson, building background, using comprehensible input, strategies/interactions to maximize student comprehension, reviewing learning and meaningful assessment. Having clear learning objectives, making connections to background knowledge, and reviewing learning benefit not just language learners but all basic

writing students. Supporting academic language development extends beyond teaching academic vocabulary to including using language for academic purposes. As Stephanie Kratz notes, language conventions and non-cognitive issues alike can sabotage student learning if these tacit expectations are not made explicit.

Instructors must explicate the "intuitive" or "presupposed" knowledge about ways of being in college. Barbara Bird explains, "Our students need to learn more than the strategies of conversation 'moves': they need the conceptual knowledge of the concepts that intuitively drive insiders' participation in verbal culture" (n.p.). Bird's argument therefore expands Cummins' notion of CALP to include the conceptual knowledge necessary to construct knowledge. For Bird, such knowledge construction is meaning-making occurring through interpretive interaction with texts. In other words, Generation 1 learners learn through purposefully engaging with texts as readers and writers, and they must be explicitly taught these skills in their basic writing classes.

Supporting A Sense of Academic Belongingness

Anis Barwashi explains, "We cannot understand genres as sites of action without understanding them as sites of subject formation, sites, that is, which produce subjects who desire to act in certain ideological and discursive ways" (78). This positioning can be even more challenging for subjects whose language use is viewed by others as "broken" or "accented" in ways which mark the subject as an unwelcome foreigner. Like other basic writers, Generation 1 learners need opportunities to examine how they engage in the academic community. As Jamey Gallagher (2016) explains, when explicitly prompted to think about their writerly identities, students in basic writing reflect upon their growth and increased sense of belongingness. Generation 1 learners, in particular, need instructors who will model the discourse patterns and

genres of various academic spaces; with this support, these learners can engage in meaningful practice within the discourse community to develop a sense of belonging.

Supporting Generation 1 Learners' Entry into the U.S. Education System

Although Generation 1 learners are adult learners and sophisticated in many ways, they may also require additional assistance to understand the expectations of the U. S. education system, which is new to them, with its own conventions. Unlike Generation 1.5 students, who draw upon their experiences in the U.S. K-12 system (Harklau), Generation 1 learners' previous educational experiences occur primarily overseas or in adult ESL. These learners can struggle to adapt to student participation expectations, such as how to show their attentiveness during lectures or how to ask questions in ways which produce the necessary instructor or classmate assistance in socially accepted ways (Suh, "*Off from Lost"*). As in the interventions that can ease their entry into the academic discourse, Generation 1 learners benefit from explicit discussions about the expectations for participating in college. At the same time, however, instructors and staff need to recognize Generation 1 learners' autonomy as adult learners, understanding that they must choose whether and how they would like to acculturate within college. In my own research, for example, I observed how Generation 1 learners struggled to adapt to their basic writing classroom after their experiences in adult ESL and a transitions study lab in which they were encouraged to ask questions without raising their hands and even walk to the board as the teacher was talking in order to ask questions. Other learners, who better understood participation norms, also struggled at times to maintain their identity as college students when instructors continually referred to them as "ESL students" who were "not ready" for college because of perceived language deficiencies or their seeming unwillingness to engage in class discussions to the degree expected by the instructors.

Additionally, researchers (for example, Linda Harklau; Laurie Olsen; Shawna Shapiro) note that the U.S. educational system acts as a microcosm of larger society in that students are confronted with issues of race, ethnicity, and citizenship. Generation 1 learners, particularly those who recently immigrated, may first encounter racializing and alien-citizen identification (Shapiro) processes in basic writing. Instructors should challenge their students to examine how they belong to the academic discourse community and to explore the extent to which that community is ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse. In other words, supporting Generation 1 learners' entry into U.S. higher education also requires college classes to engage with diversity and global competency. Scholars (Caruana; Jones and Killick; Leask) theorize the importance of this kind of deep engagement with the world, and Shawna Shapiro and Megan Siczek suggest that one way to do so is through integrating readings/films with diverse perspectives and assigning writing to synthesize, reflect, and critique the pieces as well as their students' positionality in relation to issues of global significance.

Supporting Identity Investment

Joining the academic discourse community is an act in identity investment for all students. Even more than other basic writing students, Generation 1 learners invest in their identities as college students who are English experts (Suh, "*Off from Lost*"). Basic writing instructors must bring an awareness of how this identity work unfolds through reading and writing assignments and class discussions within their classes. Instructors must continue to create spaces for all students to acknowledge and unpack how they present themselves as students or other identities through their writing and in its different forms (Curry; Suh, "*Off from Lost*"). Assignments serve to support Generation 1 learners' identity work when instructors

acknowledge the expertise students bring to the basic writing classroom and then challenge the students to consider their own positionality in relation to a range of diverse perspectives.

Seeing and Supporting Learners Beyond the Basic Writing Classroom

This presentation within this article of the term Generation 1 learner and theory of Generation 1 learning provides the first steps in bridging the literature divide by drawing from theories of adult learning and sociocultural theories of language learning. Current literature documents the ways Generation 1 learners present themselves as college students and English language experts by accessing different forms of symbolic capital in the community college (Cspelyi; Suh, "Professionalization"). Understanding Generation 1 learners requires additional cross-disciplinary research on learners' persistence and completion, as well as how faculty without training in language acquisition or cultural competency can best support the learners' linguistic and academic development. Because many Generation 1 learners are referred to as "ESL students" by their instructors when they enter college-level courses (Suh, "Professionalization"), researchers should examine how Generation 1 learners use language and previous educational experiences to present themselves as "college students" and how others within the college respond to these identity presentations. This identity work is essential to viewing Generation 1 learners from a non-deficit, non-othering perspective.

Works Cited

Almon, Cate. "College Persistence and Engagement in Light of a Mature English Language

Learner (ELL) Student's Voice." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*,

vol. 39, no. 5, 2015, pp. 461-472.

---. *English Language Learner Engagement and Retention in a Community College Setting.*

2010. Dissertation, Temple University.

--- . "Retention of English learner students at a community college." *Linguistic Minority Students*

Go to College: Preparation, Access and Persistence, edited by Yasuko Kanno and Linda

Harklau, Routledge, pp.184-200.

Arendale, David R. *Access at the Crossroads: Learning Assistance in Higher Education*. ASHE

Higher Education Report, vol. 35, no. 6, 2010.

Bartholomae, David, and Anthony Petrosky. *Facts, Artifacts and Counterfacts: Theory and*

Method for a Reading and Writing Course. Heinemann, 1986.

Bawarshi, Anis S. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention*

in Composition. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2003.

Baynham, Mike, and James Simpson. "Onwards and Upwards: Space, Placement, and Liminality

in Adult ESOL Classes." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 3, 2010, pp. 420-440.

Becker, Liza. *Noncredit to Credit Transitions: The Role of Cultural Capital and Habitus for*

Adult Immigrant Learners in the Community College. 2010. Dissertation, California State

University, Long Beach.

---. "Noncredit to credit transitioning matters for adult ESL learners in a California community

college." *New Directions for Community Colleges*, vol. 2011, no, 155, 2011, pp. 15-26.

Belcher, Marcia. *Success of Students who Begin College by Enrolling in English as a Second Language*, Research report No. 88-90. Miami-Dade Community College Office of Institutional Research, April 1988. ERIC database ED296763. 1988.

Bigelow, Martha. *Mogadishu on the Mississippi: Language, racialized identity, and education in a new land.* Wiley and Sons, 2010.

Bird, Barbara. "Meaning-making Concepts: Basic Writer's Access to Verbal Culture." *Basic Writing e-journal*, vol. 8/9, 2009, np.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *In Other Words*. Translated by Matthew Adamson, Stanford University Press, 1990.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Translated by Richard Nice, Sage Publications, 1990.

Boylan, Hunter. "Targeted Intervention for Developmental Education Students: T.I.D.E.S." *The Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 32, no. 3, 2009, pp. 14-23.

Boylan, Hunter, et al. *Forging New Partnerships: Adult and Developmental Education in Community Colleges.* CAAL Community College Series Working Paper no. 8. Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy, 2004. http://www.caalusa.org/boylanpaper.pdf. Accessed 24 July 2019.

Callahan, Rebecca. "Tracking and High School English Learners: Limiting Opportunity to Learn. *American Educational Research Journal*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2005, pp. 305-328.

Caruana, Viv. "The Relevance of the Internationalised Curriculum to Graduate capability: The Role of New Lecturers' Attitudes in Shaping Student Voice." *Internationalisation and*

the Student Voice: Higher Education Perspectives, edited by Elspeth Jones, Routledge, 2009, pp. 30-43.

Casner-Lotto, Jill. *Increasing Opportunities for Immigrant Students: Community College Strategies for Success.* Community College Consortium for Immigrant Education, Nov. 2011.

Cohen, Arthur, et al. *The American Community College.* 6th ed., San Francisco, 2014.

Collier, Virginia. "Acquiring a Second Language for School." *Directions in Language and Education*, vol. 1, no. 4. The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1995. www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/directions/04.htm. Accessed 17 Nov. 2017. (ERIC Document no. ED394301).

Conway, Katherine. "Educational Aspirations in an Urban Community College: Differences Between Immigrants and Native Student Groups." *Community College Review*, vol. 37, no. 3, 2010, pp. 209-242.

Crandall, JoAnn, and Ken Sheppard. *Adult ESL and the community college.* CAAL Community College Series Working Paper no. 7, 2004, Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy.

Csepelyi, Tünde. *Transition to Community College: The Journey of Adult Basic Education English Language Learners from Non-credit to Credit Programs.* Dissertation, University of Nevada - Reno, 2012.

Cummins, Jim. "Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency, Linguistic Interdependence, the Optimum Age Question and Some Other Matters." *Working Papers on Bilingualism,* no. 19, 1979, pp. 121-129. (ERIC Document no. ED184334).

---. "Age on Arrival and Immigrant Second Language Learning in Canada: A Reassessment." *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 11, 1981, pp. 132-149.

---. "BICS and CALP: Empirical and Theoretical Status of the Distinction." In Brian Street and

Nancy H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2nd Edition,

Volume 2: Literacy. 2008. (pp. 71-83). New York: Springer Science + Business Media

LLC.

Curry, Mary Jane. "UCLA community college review: Academic Literacy for Adult English

Language Learners. *Community College Review*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2004, 51-68.

---. "Adult ESL Students in the Contact Zone: Exploring the Effects of Multiple Educational

Attainment Levels on the Community College Writing Classroom." Paper presented at

the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

2001. (ERIC No. ED454706).

Dean Dad. "Confessions of a Community College Dean: ABE, ESL, and Financial Aid." *Inside

Higher Ed.* June 28, 2011. www.insidehighered.com/blogs/confessions-community-

college-dean/abe-esl-and-financial-aid. Accessed 10 November 2015.

de Kleine, Christa and Rachele Lawton. *Meeting the Needs of Linguistically Diverse Students at

the College Level.* (Executive summary and paper). College Reading and Learning

Association, 2015.

di Gennaro, Kristen. "Investigating Differences in the Writing Performance of International and

Generation 1.5 Students." *Language Testing*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2009, pp. 533-559.

Duke, Amy-Ellen, and Evelyn Ganzglass. "Strengthening State Adult Education Policies for

Low-skilled Workers." *The Working Poor Families Project: Policy Brief.* 2007.

Echevarria, Jana, et al. *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model*.

Pearson, 2016.

Florez, MaryAnn Cunningham, and Lynda Terrill. "Working with Literacy-Level Adult English

    Language Learners." *Center for Adult English Language Acquisition*, July 2003.

    http://markuttecht.com/sites/default/files/portfolio/LiteracyDevelopment/website/resourc

    es/4.pdf. Accessed 24 July 2019.

Gallagher, Jamey. "Genre and Writerly Identities in an ALP Classroom." *Basic Writing e-

    Journal*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2016, np.

Gorski, Paul. "Unlearning Deficit Ideology and the Scornful Gaze: Thoughts on Authenticating

    the Class Discourse in Education." *Counterpoints*, vol. 402, 2011, pp. 152-173.

Grenfell, Michael, and David James. *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of Practical Theory.*

    Routledge, 2003.

Hakuta, Kenji, et al. *How Long Does It Take English Learners To Attain Proficiency?*. Spencer

    Foundation Report. Spencer Foundation, 2000. (ERIC document no. ED443275).

Hanassab, Shideh, and Romeria Tidwell. "International Students in Higher Education:

    Identification of Needs and Implications for Policy and Practice. *Journal of Studies in

    International Education*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2002, pp. 305-322.

Hansen-Thomas, Holly. "Sheltered Instruction: Best Practices for ELLs in the Mainstream."

    Kappa Delta Pi Record, vol. 44, no. 4, 2008, pp. 165-169.

Harklau, Linda. "ESL Learning Environment in Secondary Schools." *So Much to Say:

    Adolescents, Bilingualism, and ESL in the Secondary School,* edited by Christian Faltis

    and Paula Wolfe, Teachers College Press, 1999, pp. 42-60.

---. "ESL versus Mainstream Classes: Contrasting L2 Learning Environments." *TESOL*

    Quarterly, vol. 28, no. 2, 1994, pp. 241-272.

---. "Tracking and Linguistic Minority Students: Consequences of Ability Grouping for Second

    Language Learners." *Linguistics and Education*, 1994, pp. 217-244.

---. "From the 'Good Kids' to the 'Worst': Representations of English Language Learners across

    Educational Settings." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2000, pp. 35-67.

Harklau, Linda, and Shelley McClanahan. "How Paola Made it to College." *Linguistic Minority*

    Students Go to College: Preparation, Access and Persistence, edited by Yasuko Kanno

    and Linda Harklau, Routledge, 2012, pp. 74-89.

Hawkins, Margaret. "Becoming a Student: Identity Work and Academic Literacies in Early

    Schooling." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2005, pp. 59-82.

Highbee, Jeanne, et al. *The General College Vision: Integrating Intellectual Growth,*

    Multicultural Perspectives, and Student Development. General College and Center for

    Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, University of Minnesota,

    2005.

Hoffman, Lisa, and Alan Zollman. "What STEM Teachers Need to Know and Do for English

    Language Learners (ELLs): Using Literacy to Learn." *Journal of STEM Teacher*

    Education, vol. 51, no. 1, 2016, pp. 83-94.

Hvitfeldt, Christina. "Traditional Culture, Perceptual Style and Learning: The Classroom

    Behavior of Hmong Adults." *Adult Education Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 2, 1986, 65-77.

Johansen, Barry-Craig, and Gary McLean. "Worldviews of Adult Learning in the Workplace: A

    Core Concept in Human Resource Development." *Advances in Developing Human*

    Resources, vol. 8, no. 3, 2006, pp. 321-328.

Johnson, Patricia. "English Language Proficiency and Academic Performance of Undergraduate International Students." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1988, pp. 164-168.

Jones, Elspeth and David Killick. "Internationalisation of the Curriculum," *Internationalising Higher Education*, edited by Elspeth Jones and Sally Brown, Routledge, 2007, pp. 109-119.

Kanno, Yasuko, and Linda Harklau, eds. *Linguistic Minority Students Go to College: Preparation, Access, and Persistence.* Routledge, 2012.

Kenner, Cari, and Jason Weinerman. "Adult Learning Theory: Applications to Non-traditional College Students." *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2011, pp. 87-96.

Knowles, Malcom. "Andragogy, Not Pedagogy." *Adult Leadership*, vol. 16, no. 10, 1968, pp. 350-352, 386.

---. *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy Versus Pedagogy.* Oxford, 1970.

Knowles, Malcom, and Associates. *Andragogy in Action: Applying Modern Principles of Adult Learning.* Jossey Bass, 1984.

Krashen, Stephen. "Bilingual Education: A Focus on Current Research." *Focus: Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education*, no. 3, 1991.

---. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon, 1982.

Kratz, Stephanie. "Learning Journals in One ALP: Making Visible Students' Voices about Writing Ability and the Non-cognitive Context of Learning." *Basic Writing e-Journal*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2016, np.

Leask, Betty. "Bridging the Gap: Internationalising University Curricula." *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 2001, pp. 100-115.

Lee, Ming Yeh. "A Critical Analysis of Andragogy: The Perspective of Foreign-born Learners."

    Adult Learning Theory: A Primer, Edited by Lisa M. Baumgartner, Ming Yeh Lee, Susan

    Birden, and Doris Flowers. Information Series No. 392. Columbus, OH: Center on

    Education and Training for Employment. 2003, pp. 11-16. ERIC Document No.

    ED482337.

Levin, John. "The Business Culture of the Community College." *New Directions for Higher*

    Education, vol. 2005, no. 129, 2005, pp.11-26.

Light, Richard, et al. "English Proficiency and Academic Performance of International

    Students." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 21, no. 2, 1987, pp. 251-261.

Mainstream English Language Training Project. *Competency-based Mainstream English*

    Language Training Resource Package. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and

    Human Services, Office of Refugee Resettlement, 1985.

Matsuda, Paul. "Basic Writing and Second Language Writers: Toward an Inclusive Definition."

    Journal of Basic Writing, vol. 22, no. 2, 2003, pp. 67-89.

Matsuda, Paul, et al. "Changing Currents in Second Language Writing Research: A

    Colloquium." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2003, 151-179.

McIntyre, Ellen, et al. "Teacher Learning and ELL Reading Achievement in Sheltered

    Instruction Classrooms: Linking Professional Development to Student Development."

    Literacy Research and Instruction, vol. 49, no. 4, 2010, pp. 334-351.

McKay, Sandra Lee, and Sau-Ling Cynthia Wong. "Multiple Discourses, Multiple Identities:

    Investment and Agency in Second-language Learning Among Chinese Adolescent

    Immigrant Students. *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 66, no. 3, 1996, 577-608.

Mehan, Hugh, et al. "Forming Academic Identities: Accommodation Without Assimilation

    Among Involuntary Minorities." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 2,

    2005, pp. 91-117.

Merisotis, Jamie, and Ronald Phipps. Remedial Education in Colleges and Universities: What's

    Really Going On. *Review of Higher Education,* vol. 24, no. 1, 2000, pp. 67-85.

Merriam, Sharan, and Laura Bierema. *Adult Learning: Linking Theory and Practice.* Jossey

    Bass, 2009.

Merriam, Sharan, and Ralph Brockett. *The Profession and Practice of Adult Education.* Jossey-

    Bass, 2007.

Mitchell, Douglas, et al. "Evaluation of English Language Development Programs in the Santa

    Ana Unified School District: A Report on Data System Reliability and Statistical

    Modelling of Program Impacts." California Educational Research Cooperative, 1997.

Norton, Bonny. *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation.* 2nd ed.,

    Multilingual Matters, 2013.

---. *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change.* Longman,

    2000.

---. "Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English." *TESOL Quarterly,* vol. 31, no. 3, 1997,

    pp. 409-429.

--. "Non-participation, Imagined Communities and the Language Classroom." *Learner*

    Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research, edited by Michael

    Breen, Routledge, 2001, pp. 159-171.

Norton, Bonny, and Kelleen Toohey. "Identity, Language Learning, and Social Change."

    Language Teaching, vol. 44, no. 4, 2011, pp. 412-446.

Olsen, Laurie. *Made in America: Immigrant Students in Our Public Schools.* The New Press, 1997.

Patthey-Chavez, G. Genevieve, et al. "Educational Pathways of Generation 1.5 Students in Community College Writing Courses." *Generation 1.5 in College Composition,* edited by Mark Roberge, Meryl Siegal, and Linda Harklau, Routledge, 2009, pp.135-149.

Peirce, Bonny Norton. "Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1995, pp. 9-31.

Perdue, Clive. *Second Language Acquisition by Adult Immigrants: A Field Manual.* Newbury House Publishers, 1984.

Pratt, Daniel. "Andragogy After Twenty-five Years." *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, vol. 1993, no. 57, 1993, pp.15-23.

Robertson, Kristina, and Karen Ford. *Language Acquisition: An Overview.* colorincolorado.org/article26751/?utm_source=Twitter&utm_medium=Hootsuite&utm_campaign=CCSocialMedia. Accessed on 27 January 2018. 2008.

Rumbaut, Ruben. "Ages, Life Stages, and Generational Cohorts: Decomposing the Immigrant First and Second Generations in the United States." *International Migration Review*, vol. 38, no. 3, 2004, pp. 1160-1205.

Rumbaut, Ruben, and Kenji Ima. "The Adaptation of Southeast Asian Refugee Youth: A Comparative Study: Final Report to the Office of Resettlement." San Diego State University Press, 1988. ERIC Document no. ED299372.

Salas, Spencer, et al. "Generacion 1.5: A Cultural Historical Agenda for Research at the 2-year College." *Community College Review*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2011, pp.121-135.

Sarroub, Loukia. *All American Yemeni Girls: Being Muslim in a Public School.* University of

Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

---. "Seeking Refuge in Literacy from a Scorpion Bite." *Ethnography and Education*, vol. 2, no.

3, 2007, pp. 365-380.

Saxon, D. Patrick. et al. "Developmental education facts, figures, and resources." *Research in

Developmental Education,* vol, 19, no. 4, 2005, pp. 1-4.

Shapiro, Shawna. "Citizens vs. Aliens: How Institutional Policies Construct Linguistic Minority

Students." *Linguistic Minority Students Go to College: Preparation, Access and

Persistence*, edited by Yasuko Kanno and Linda Harklau, Routledge, 2012, pp. 220-253.

Shapiro, Shawna, and Megan Siczek. "Strategic Content: How Globally Oriented Writing

Courses can Bridge Pedagogical and Political Spaces." *Collaborations & Innovations:

Supporting Multilingual Writers Across Campus Units*, edited by Nancy DeJoy and

Beatrice Quarshie Smith, University of Michigan Press, 2017, pp. 167-186.

Short, Deborah, et al. "Research on Academic Literacy Development in Sheltered Instruction

Classrooms." *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2011, pp. 363-380.

Snow, Kathie. "People First Language." *Disability is Natural.* Retrieved from www.

disabilityisnatural.com/peoplefirstlanguage.htm. Accessed 16 November 2017. 2007.

Suarez-Orozco, Carola, et al. *Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society.*

Harvard University Press, 2008.

Suh, Emily. "Language Minority Student Transitions." *Journal of Developmental Education*,

vol. 40, no. 1, 2016, pp. 26-28.

---. *"Off From Lost": Generation 1 Learners' Transition From Adult ESL to Developmental Education.* Dissertation, University of Nebraska, 2016.

---. "Professionalization Through Politicization: Reaching Beyond Content Silos to Serve Two-year College Students." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* vol. 45, no. 1, 2017, pp. 35-37.

Teranishi, Robert, et al. "Immigrants in Community Colleges." *The Future of Children,* vol. 21, no.1, 2011, pp. 153-169.

Tinto, Vincent, and Stacy Riemer. "Learning communities and the reconstruction of remedial education in higher education." *Conference on Replacing Remediation in Higher Education*, vol. 26, 1998, Stanford University.

Toohey, Kelleen. "'Breaking Them Up, Taking Them Away': ESL Students in Grade 1." *TESOL Quarterly,* vol. 32, no. 1, 1998, pp. 61-84.

Townsend, Barbara. "Community College Transfer Students: A Case Study of Survival." *The Review of Higher Education,* vol. 18, no. 2, 1995, pp.175-193.

Tucker, James. *The ESL Logjam: Waiting Times for Adult ESL Classes and the Impact on English Learners.* National Association for Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Educational Fund, 2006. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED527905.pdf. Accessed 19 July 2019.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. *Participants in State-administered Adult Basic Education, Secondary Education, and English as a Second Language Programs, by Type of Program and State or Jurisdiction: Selected Fiscal Years, 2000 through 2014*. National Center for Education Statistics,

nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_507.20.asp?current=yes. Accessed 22

January 2018.

Welch, Nancy, and Tony Scott, editors. *Composition in the Age of Austerity.* U of Colorado P,

2016.

Worthy, Jo, et al. "Tracking and Ability Grouping." *Handbook of Adolescent Literacy Research*,

edited by Leila Christenbury, Randy Bomer, and Peter Smagorinsky, Guilford Press, pp.

220-235, 2009.

Emily Suh

Emily Suh is an Assistant Professor of Developmental Education at Texas State University where she teaches courses on developmental literacy research and theory. Her work in ESL/SLA, adult and developmental education focuses on the intersection of language acquisition and identity for multilingual and multicultural students. She also serves as the Cultural Diversity Co-chair for the National Organization for Student Success. She can be reached at emily.suh@txstate.edu