12-2013

Discursive affordances : police, transfer, and the performance of identity.

Robert John Terry
University of Louisville

Recommended Citation

Terry, Robert John, "Discursive affordances : police, transfer, and the performance of identity." (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations.* Paper 1422.
https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1422

DISCURSIVE AFFORDANCES:
POLICE, TRANSFER, AND THE PERFORMANCE OF IDENTITY

By

Robert John Terry
B.A., University of Texas at Dallas, 2005
M.A., University of Louisville, 2008

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of English
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

December 2013

DISCURSIVE AFFORDANCES:
POLICE, TRANSFER, AND THE PERFORMANCE OF IDENTITY

By

Robert John Terry
B.A., University of Texas at Dallas, 2005
M.A., University of Louisville, 2008

A Dissertation Approved on

August 2, 2013

By the following Dissertation Committee

_____
Joanna Wolfe, Dissertation Director

_____
Beth Boehm

_____
Paul Griner

_____
Mary Rosner

_____
Thomas Hughes

ii

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife

Abbey Kuehne Terry

and my stepdaughter

Maia Kuehne-Seeber

and to all those people, countless,

who had faith in me when I did not.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I also wish make my feelings about the student participants of this study and the work they do as police officers clear. I feel this clarification is necessary because police, as a profession, inhabit a complex cultural space because of their relationship with dominant Discourses. In the constructions forwarded by certain Discourses, police are almost canonized as unflawed heroes, as individuals whose service to the public renders them free of any and all of the flaws and complexities of human existence. Certainly, I absolutely believe that the five participants in this study are all dedicated public servants, individuals who have committed their lives and considerable capabilities to trying to

contribute to some version of the greater good. Each of them has been heroes to others in life and death situations, literally saving lives and bringing some kind of resolution to heart-wrenching situations. Because of their commitment to their profession, each of them has gone willingly into dangers that most people would do anything to avoid.

However, these positive representations of police are not the complete picture. For many Discourses, police are enforcers of an unjust social order, agents of a corrupt government that serves the elite while suppressing the lower classes, that maintains large portions of racial and gender inequality. Multiple historical examples exist to support this understanding of police, so even those less critical of police must acknowledge this complex background. At times, such as when viewing the rhetoric of Christopher Dorner's (the former L.A.P.D. officer who went on a well-publicized revenge rampage, targeting his fellow officers, in early 2013) "manifesto," the paramilitary elements of policing can also seem alarming to a public that participates in very different Discourses. The military-ish elements are often also points of conflict with a public that mostly operates outside military Discourses, even if echoes of such dominant organizations always make their way into other Discourses.

From my experience with my student participants in the AOC, working police are neither the saints nor the villains that different Discourses present them to be. Like teachers, who are often placed under similar Discursive binaries, they are individuals placed in morally complicated situations who do the best they can with an extremely difficult job. Sometimes they get it right, sometimes they get it wrong, but most of the time they just do what they can with the best of intentions based on their axiological and epistemic understandings. Still, like all Discourses, significant points of contention occur

on those lines. Throughout my discussion of these participants and their experiences with their academic writing, I have done my best to fairly represent each of them, honoring their strengths and abilities while also attempting to fairly explain how elements of their performance of identity have complicated successful performances and recognitions of transfer. I thank them for their bravery in opening themselves up to the type of scrutiny this research required, and I hope that they, likewise, recognize that I worked from the best intentions.

I would also like to thank my instructor participants for spending as much time as they did discussing their courses, their pedagogies, their writing assignments, and their understandings of the AOC and its students. Each of them possesses a great amount of expertise in their fields, and all are accomplished and highly capable teachers. Tolerating a graduate student's constant probing of their understanding of their writing assignments and their expectations for those writing assignments can't be a pleasant experience, but each of these instructors never hinted at any annoyance, cheerfully answering yet another question about their assignments and their understanding of their students.

In the discussion of my experiences in their classrooms, it may sometimes seem as if my analysis of their performances and interactions in the classroom may seem like they are evaluations, but they are not. Although I will be highlighting elements that some readers may find problematic in their pedagogy, I believe that each of these instructors was, at all times, themselves weaving a fine line of identity possibilities. Anything that may seem problematic should be understood not as a reflection of the instructor or their pedagogy but as a response to a complex situation with a complex population. In clearer terms, readers should be careful not to infer any kind of negative evaluation of these

instructors based on the analysis of classroom interactions presented here. Rather, as I will explain in this chapter, attempting to soothe potential Discourse conflicts in order to promote more useful alignment between teachers and students is a complicated, sometimes ideologically dangerous process. While it always begins with the best of intentions, it sometimes can lead to complex, confusing situations with no easy resolution, and I believe that each of my teacher participants is fully aware of the complexities of what may seem like problematic statements or actions, intending only to use them as a way to build better bridges between the ideas of the course and the students' identities. All teachers work in the less-than-perfect constraints of reality where there is never such a thing as a perfect pedagogy, and we all work with the best of intentions.

ABSTRACT
DISCURSIVE AFFORDANCES: POLICE, TRANSFER, AND THE PERFORMANCE
OF IDENTITY

Robert John Terry

December 6, 2013

This dissertation is an analysis of how the performance of identity affects the

possibilities for the transfer of writing strategies. It begins with a literature review of the

existing research on transfer within the field of composition and posits that an

undertheorized understanding of identity may be leading to misunderstandings related to

the transfer of knowledge. It then provides a framework for understanding the

performance of identity developed through James Paul Gee's Discourse theory and

provides a framework for understanding and identifying Discourse conflicts related to the

performance of identity. After providing an overview of the research site, the

Administrative Officers' Course (AOC) held at the Southern Police Institute (SPI), and

the research participants, it provides an analysis of how identity performance at both the

student and instructor level affected the possibilities for productive or unproductive

transfer. In the conclusion, I propose an approach to performing an instructor identity that

may enable more productive transfer.

The dissertation is divided into five chapters, providing a theoretical introduction,

an overview of the research methodology, analysis of the performance of identity at both

the student and instructor level, and a summary of research findings with potential

pedagogical applications. The first chapter provides a literature overview of existing

research on transfer and a framework for understanding the performance of identity and conflicts related to it. The second chapter provides an overview of the research site, its history, its demographics, the courses offered as part of the AOC, the student participants of the study, and the methodology used as part of the research study. The third chapter focuses on the experiences of the student participants, detailing their experiences with the writing experiences and illustrating how the performance of identity affected how they transferred or failed to transfer writing strategies from other contexts. The fourth chapter focuses on the pedagogies of my teacher participants, including their understandings of potential transfer conflict, efforts to ease that conflict, and the types of identities they situated in the classroom. The fifth chapter summarizes these findings and provides a potential pedagogy to help minimize such negative conflicts of identity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE OVERVIEW

Introduction

In this chapter, I provide a brief overview of the current framing and

consideration of transfer as understood within general educational theory and how it has

been discussed within composition studies. With this framework in mind, I join with

Rebecca Nowacek (2011) and Dana Lynn Driscoll and Jennifer Wells (2012) in stressing

the need for considering the complexities of the performance of identity (used here as a

term to incorporate student dispositions in a social context) when considering and

researching transfer. By drawing on the work of Christine Casanave (2002), Roz Ivaniĉ

(1998), Anne Herrington and Marcia Curtis (2000), and James Paul Gee (2012, 2010,

2004, 2000, 1992), I provide a structure for considering identity, specifically the rejection

of certain textual approaches, which I then apply to Linda Bergmann and Janet

Zepernick's (2004) study of student rejection of transfer possibilities from first year

composition courses. To further expand on how identity can be understood, I discuss

Gee's 2000 taxonomy for analyzing the ways we talk about identity, complicate one

element of Gee's Discourse theory by synthesizing it with Raewyn Connell's concept of

hegemonic masculinity, and provide a framework for understanding two dimensions of

identity conflict that might affect the possibilities for productive transfer of knowledge.

Understanding Transfer

Transfer of learning, a concept which David Perkins describes in "bare-bones forms" as "[p]eople learn something in one context, and this informs how well they learn and perform in another context," has become one of the most central concerns of educators everywhere, including those in composition studies (2010, p. 110). Fundamental to composition's interest in this topic is the nearly ubiquitous requirement of first-year composition (FYC) courses across most universities, a requirement that seems to be based on, as Elizabeth Wardle notes, "the assumption that FYC should and will provide students with knowledge and skills that can transfer to writing tasks in other courses and contexts" (2007, p. 65). The introduction, development, and spread of FYC has a complex, problematic, and politically fraught history (Berlin, 1987; Connors ,1997; Crowley, 1998; Hawk, 2007;among others), and many scholars have challenged its placement and continuation, especially those who draw on versions of Vygotsky's psychological framework (Russell, 1995; Petraglia, 1995; Smit, 2007; among others who draw heavily from activity theory). Despite this, the belief that adaptive writing ability is of crucial importance to present and emerging economies (Gee, 2004; Jenkins, 2008; among others) has, among other reasons, led to the continuation of the FYC series.

Accordingly, many composition scholars find themselves in agreement with Wardle when she argues that it is "irresponsible [for us to] not engage the issue of transfer" (2007, p. 66), especially as it relates to the continuation of FYC. Transfer has thus become one of the larger topics of composition research, with new studies appearing regularly. These studies all have a variety of strengths and weaknesses, largely the result of the theoretical frameworks and methodologies employed to discover and understand

why transfer is or is not occurring; however, because of the central concern, the dominant focus has been on studies from FYC to other academic courses and, extending this line of thinking, how all academic writing training transfers for use in students' careers. Transfer researchers' central concern is how students think about, apply, modify, translate, ignore, or avoid the training in writing they receive as they advance through their academic and professional career.

Possibly as a result of such a focus, most of these studies have also selected participants that fit the traditional perception of a college student. The participants have typically been between the ages of eighteen and twenty four and are taking this coursework before they experience some type of professional career. As a result, composition's studies of transfer have, despite being performed at a variety of campuses with different academic missions, have drawn on a relatively small range of participants.

This consistent image is problematic for a variety of reasons, but for the purposes of my proposed project, two are the most importance. First, as the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) noted, "**the 'traditional' undergraduate**—characterized here as one who earns a high school diploma, enrolls full time immediately after finishing high school, depends on parents for financial support, and either does not work during the school year or works part time—**is the exception rather than the rule**" (2009, emphasis added). Even in 2002, only 27% of students in post-secondary education met these criteria, and it seems likely that the percentage has decreased since then. Although there are a large number of reasons why different students might not fit these criteria (for instance, working full time while attending courses), age is certainly one of the major factors. In 2009, 30% of full time undergraduate students at public four-year universities

were twenty five or older (NCES), and given the large number of veterans entering school after their service in Iraq and Afghanistan, this percentage is likely to grow over the next decade. With this significant a population on college campuses, the focus on 'traditional' student populations seems likely to leave large questions about student experiences with transfer unanswered, especially when one takes into consideration how recent theories of learning (situated learning or social cognition) have talked about the ways in which experience, especially the ways in which experience relates to what we call identity, influences how learners perceive problems and potential solutions to those problems.

Without using a rich framework capable of examining the ways in which experience and identity play into enabling or disabling transfer, transfer research may not be seeing important elements because they are masked by the seeming ubiquity of this population. As the work social cognition psychologists has shown (especially the work of Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger, 1991), school-based experience is likely not even the most significant contributor to the problem-solving approaches people take in their lives and learning. In one of their well-cited studies, Lave and Wenger tracked the ways in which shoppers attempted to identify the "best buy" at a grocery store. The population of their study, participants in the Adult Math Project, almost always depended on unit price (cost per ounce, etc.) to determine the best bargain; however, rather than using school-based mathematical approaches, they used a series of intuitive approximations to make correct decisions. If school-based strategies for discovering unit price (i.e., formal division) were applied, they were applied without the participants giving voice to those ways of thinking (1991, p. 102-122). Rather than the explicit training of school, the

repeated experience of shopping had itself produced a mostly unconscious way of determining the proper answer based on a series of guesstimates. Transfer wasn't occurring between the experience of school and the experience of shopping; transfer was seemingly only occurring between different shopping experiences.

Of course, those like David Russell who hold to the strong version of activity theory would look at Lave and Wenger's findings and indicate that of course experience was the sole frame of reference for transfer. Seen from activity theory, the activity of shopping provides the framework for learning and comprehension, so trying to look for moments where the very different activity of school would overlap into the activity of shopping is almost nonsensical. However, while implicit in Lave and Wenger's findings is the suggestion that experience influences how learners perceive similarities between different problems, I would argue that seeing experience only as a unit of activity presents an incomplete picture of human cognition. The connections of understanding built through repeated activities is certainly a contributing force in Lave and Wenger's findings, but the learner's/actor's perception of the nature of the different activities also plays a crucial role.

As Perkins explains, part of what seems to make transfer possible is the recognition of what different situations make possible or offer as **affordances**, which he defines as "a feature of an object or situation that strongly lends itself to a certain use. Chairs afford sitting, but so do tree stumps or waist-high fences" (2010, p. 115). People – sensing the affordance of those other objects – transfer their knowledge of sitting to the different context (2010, p. 115). Likewise, transferring strategies from different activities requires perceiving the possible overlaps that provide affordances between the different

activities. Because the learners in Lave and Wenger's study seemingly did not recognize that the unit price calculation they were doing was a situation that afforded the application of school-like division strategies, they did not apply those school-learned strategies. Transfer's concern with the affordance is as old as the original work of Thorndike (1913), and it is for this reason that a great deal of transfer research – both within composition studies and without – has been concerned with creating and testing pedagogies to improve recognition of affordance in multiple situations. This concern leads to a classroom-to-practice focus for research, contributing to the remarkably consistent approach taken in composition research of FYC to other courses, with a lack of consideration for the role of professional experience.

Identity and Transfer

However, when one talks about experience and its role in recognizing affordances, it seems that we need to think about the ways that individuals understand and represent their experience. While there are many ways to talk about that recognition of experience, I propose that one framework is especially important when transfer researchers talk about the ways in which professional experience operates: identity. I recognize that for some readers, as Christine Casanave advises, identity is a term to be avoided in this post-modern era; the preferred terms are now phrases like "subject position" or "subjectivity" (2002, p. 9-10). However, Roz Ivaniĉ acknowledges this shift in terminology, but she compellingly argues that the term "identity" remains useful because most readers have some understanding of it but it lacks an overly restrictive definition. While some may think that the term suggests a stable, unified self, identity can be perceived in postmodern terms: an ever-shifting temporary-at-best unity of repeating

performances always already enmeshed in social structures (2002, p. 13-15). Elements of the term identity have been used fruitfully by Ivaniĉ, Casanave, and Anne J. Herrington and Marcia Curtis, among others. Although these studies were not directly considerations of transfer, their investigation of how identity influences people's response (or, as Nowacek explains below, what they see as affordances) to new rhetorical situations very much parallels the concerns of transfer researchers.

This isn't to say that transfer studies have ignored identity, but in general, I find that Rebecca Nowacek's (2011) assessment that in most previous research, "identity has been underappreciated as an avenue for transfer" is accurate (p. 57). Nowacek's model of transfer stresses the learner's action as an "agent of integration" who "must learn not only to 'see' connections among previously disparate contexts" (in the terms used earlier, to see affordances between two different writing situations) but must also learn "to 'sell' these connections, to render them appropriate and convincing to their various audiences" (p. 39). Nowacek defines identity as "an individual's understanding of his or her role, capacities, affiliations, and worth in a given social context" tied to "that individual's perceptions of other people's evaluation of his or her role, capacities, affiliations, and worth" (p. 24). This understanding of identity as not only an individual's understanding of him or herself but as a social understanding of that individual is, I believe, a useful starting place for understanding why identity, as Nowacek argues, needs to "be central to any robust understanding of transfer" (p. 54).

To understand why, one needs to consider how the performance of identity connects with learning and the perception of affordances. By considering identity as a factor in that perception, transfer research can better understand why learners may

disqualify situations that seem parallel to teachers and researchers but apparently not to the learners. One approach that may be productive is to view identity as a process of performative selection (Goffman, Kohut, Butler). For instance, in Herrington and Curtis's (2000) use of Heinz Kohut's theory of the self, the self is understood not as bound within the body but as composed in relations to extra-bodily objects (including both concrete objects like people and abstract social objects like semiotic systems). Kohut called these extra-body connections 'selfobjects.' In Herrington and Curtis's words, "an object is a 'selfobject' when experienced by the individual as contributing to his or her [own] sense of self" (2000, p. 27). Although Herrington and Curtis do not phrase it this way, this idea of selecting some objects as selfobjects from a pool of all objects inherently implies that some objects are not selected as comprising part of self or identity. While this process of not-selecting might be as simple and 'passive' as foregrounding some objects while downplaying others, I argue that in other situations, the process of selection might be more an outright rejection, an expulsion of some objects as **not** selfobjects. Seen from this way, one can begin to see some overlap between performing identity and perceiving similarities or affordances between different activities. A person, a leader, is constantly engaged in a process of saying, "This is like me/like that" and "This is **not** like me/not like that."

However, this shouldn't be read as suggesting that the selection process is done purely by individual will or that the range of self-objects one can choose to accept or reject is limitless. As Nowacek (2011) argues, since successfully transferring between different writing situations also involves 'selling' the transferred strategies, it "involves a process of determining who the audience is and what the audience wants" and

8

successfully negotiating the relationship between the learner's identity and that of the audience. Thus, the work of building that performance "isn't conducted in a vacuum" (p. 54). The "judgments" about what elements are 'correct' are always already social, built out of a personal history of experiences and relationships. Moreover, as Ivaniĉ argues, people construct their understandings of themselves "not out of an infinite range of possibilities, but out of the possibilities for self-hood which are supported by the socio-cultural and institutional context" in/with which they are participating (p. 28).

A productive way of thinking about this concept is to think about James Paul Gee's idea of Discourses (the capitalization is important in Gee), his most central idea and one that is:

> meant to cover important aspects of what others have called, by different names (though these are not, of course, all synonymous terms), discourses (Foucault, 1973, 1977, 1980), communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), cultural communities (Clark, 1996), discourse communities (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995), distributed knowledge or distributed systems (Hutchins, 1995), thought collectives (Fleck, 1979), practices (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Bourdieu, 1998; Heidegger, 1962), activity systems (Engestrom, 1990; Leont'ev, 1978), actoractant networks (Callon & Latour, 1992; Latour, 1987), and (one interpretation of) 'forms of life' (Wittgenstein, 1958)." (2000, p. 110)

With as broad of a range of concepts listed above, it is important to pause and provide the specific definition of this concept that I will be using here. Discourse, in this project, can be defined as a semiotically-centered social structure "'owned' and 'operated' by" different people who "get appreciated" and recognized as performing a certain type of Discourse

because their semiotic actions are intelligible to others (1992, p. 107-108). The self is built on a dialectic process of definition and negative definition, a process of identifying what *is* and what *is not* part of the Discourse they seek to be recognized as performing (p. 107). In Gee's words, "Discourse-defined positions from which to speak and behave are not, however, just defined internal to a Discourse, but also as standpoints taken up by the Discourse **in its relation to other, ultimately opposing, Discourses**" (p. 112, emphasis mine). Gee's theory of opposing Discourses provides transfer research with a way to discuss the range of what can and cannot be recognized as selfobjects, especially when we are talking about the complexity of a writer taking different rhetorical and subjective positions in relationship to different audiences (in Nowacek's terms, successfully "selling" themselves and their writing strategies to the new audience), one of the central goals of First Year Composition instructors everywhere.

Returning to the idea of affordances, if performance of identity is such a central process to learning – and thus, a significant part of what we call experience – then a significant part of a learner recognizing affordances for transfer may have to do with this process of selection and rejection. In Herrington and Curtis's (2000) words, "When we attempt to learn a new discourse, particularly as writers, we are entering a subjectivity, and how we experience that subjectivity depends on how it fits with our private/personal sense of identity and values" (p. 35). When we attempt to perform a type of writing associated with a performance of a specific Discourse, we are inherently put into a point of conflict between the Discourses in which we already participate and the one(s) into which we are attempting to enter. Because of that conflict, Herrington and Curtis are correct when they suggest that "when students seem to be choosing to 'not-learn,' we

should recognize that the choice may be related to their sense of personal/social identity, and may even be a defense against an assault on that identity" (p. 38).

An example of how identity performance affects the possibility for transfer can be seen in Linda Bergmann and Janet Zepernick's 2004 study, in which students associated with more explicitly scientific discourses (engineering and mining sciences, mostly) seem to outright reject the possibility of transfer from their FYC courses. In their comments in their focus groups, they reference a tension between "subjective" and "objective" knowledge and represent FYC's writing tasks as "flowery" and "personal" writing that shared nothing with the writing in their majors. Bergmann and Zepernick believe this demonstrates a conflict of disciplines. However, if identity is understood as participation in disciplinary norms that are part of a Discourse, as selectively drawing from what is and what is not part of that Discourse, then the students' comments may more represent performance of identity, of forcefully rejecting practices taught in FYC as **not** selfobjects. Thus, I would suggest that we need to consider that disciplinarity not as an object in itself but more a component of the identities the students are performing, the Discourses that are forming the practice of recognizing what is and what is not part of part of their ongoing, evolving, always socially-complicated performance of self.

Seen from this understanding of identity and its relation to how learners perceive affordance, the consistency with which composition's studies of transfer have used mostly traditional students who have consistently been engaged in school or school-like activities for most of their lives seems potentially limiting. As Nowacek (2011) argues, since the performance of identity is a key contribution to learners' understanding of their previous knowledge and the affordances of their current situation, focusing consistently

on similar populations makes it impossible to ask "if other student populations draw the same number of connections and . . . trace the same strategies they use when confronted with contexts that challenge their ability to see and sell connections" (p. 140).

When such a large percentage of our student population is non-traditional and has gained a significant amount of experience with writing outside of school or school-like settings, not considering the complexities of their identity performance and how it influences their relationship with the different subjectivities they are asked to assume and "sell" to their audiences may be blinding researchers to why they may be outright rejecting an affordance that those researchers perceive. This blindness is especially problematic when we recognize that a significant portion of non-traditional students are enrolled in specialized "professionalization" programs that they see as a way to advance their already established career or as a way to enter into a new career. Although these work-related courses seem likely to attempt to draw on previous student experiences, whether gained through school, work, or other activities, for potential use as part of their structured learning process, including the writing which they are assigned to do, these courses are typically taught by academics who are functioning successfully within the broad boundaries of academic Discourses. As a result, despite their desire to build on or assist in the transition to specific professional identities, these programs are a likely site for a conflict of Discourse-level identities.

Addressing Concerns with Site Selection

An example of such a program, a site for gathering non-traditional students advancing their professional identities while experiencing potential conflicts with other Discourse-level identities, is the site of this research study, the Southern Police Institute

located at the University of Louisville. In brief, the Southern Police Institute (SPI) is one

of three programs in the United States that provide advanced training for police officers

in a variety of areas. Some of these are technical training courses, including courses in

specific investigatory techniques. In addition, the SPI offers a semester-long program

called the Administrative Officer's Course (AOC), a combination of four courses

designed to help mid-level police leaders (sergeants and above) develop into candidates

for the upper levels of police leadership. In chapter two, I provide a detailed overview of

the history, structure, demographics, and courses of this program. However, at this time I

wish to explain why this site provides an optimal location for research into identity:

1. While, as Nowacek argues, transfer studies needs to consider identity as a
   strong factor in whether or not transfer successfully occurs (and is recognized
   as successfully occurring by the audience), it is difficult to assess any First
   Year Composition course as a site of shared identity. While all potential
   participants are students in an early general education course, their
   background experiences and their own perception of their potential identity
   will vary widely across the potential population. As a result, any attempt to
   assess the performance of identity would really only be able to approach it on
   an individual level, making it difficult to draw conclusions about larger
   population segments. In the case of AOC students, however, they share
   something of a similar background that provides them with a sense of shared
   identity. They are all police. Of course, I am not arguing that all police are the
   same or that each individual's understanding of what it means to be a police
   officer is not distinct and unique. Rather, being police is a remarkably social

profession that requires, as I will explain below and in chapter three, that a police officer be recognized as a police officer, both in their interactions with the public they police (when they demand that someone stop, they must be recognized as police) and, importantly, because they wish to become leaders of other police, they must be recognizable to other police officers. As a result, though each individual is an individual with unique experiences, the students enrolled in the AOC are under a stronger pressure than most to draw from a shared identity.

2. Importantly, that shared identity is one that includes both significant training in a specific type of writing (discussed in chapter three) and a professional need to write a great deal. As one of the participants in this study commented, "In police work, writing never stops." However, this training in writing is, as chapter three discusses, quite different from the types of academic papers that are assigned for them to write (see chapter two for a description of these assignments).

3. Although student expectations (as identified in chapter two) are that the writing they will do in the AOC will be designed to mimic the genres they will use as police leaders, with the exception of one assignment, that is not the case. Although a significant portion of the instructors at the SPI have a background in policing, not all of them do. Because of this mixed background, like the AOC's students' need to be recognizable as police to their community, the AOC's instructors are under pressure to be intelligible as members of the academic community, both to the students they teach (inside

and outside of the SPI) and to each other and other academics. As a result, the

assignments they give are much more school-based genres than anything that

would be used within a police department, which increases the tension

between the different sets of identities. Although this sense of conflict is

present in most if not all college courses, since students and instructor

identities are automatically in a kind of oppositional binary, because of the

shared background and shared identity of the AOC, this site afforded a richer

ground for comparison than most.

For these reasons, the SPI and the AOC in particular provided an incredible location to

consider the performance of identity and its role in enabling or disabling successful

transfer.

An Identity Taxonomy

Now that the reasons for why this site is nearly ideal have been explained, I need

to explain how I will be approaching identity in this study. It is one thing to call for

identity to be considered as part of the question of transfer, but without a framework for

understanding identity and its points of conflicts, the completed analysis will have limited

application. In a particular example, although the multiple studies of identity and its role

in writing done in composition have employed sophisticated frameworks for

understanding identity (especially Ivaniĉ), these frameworks have tended to either

informally or formally embrace what might be called the "trinity of identity" in that they

focus in one way or another on constructions of race, class, and gender (Gee, 2000, p.

119-120). Since these three terms may seem easily comprehensible and somewhat

neutral, they may at first seem ideal for understanding identity, but since identity is

performed and thus always in the flux of being enacted, we must recognize that these terms are constructions of political and philosophical concepts that different Discourses use to create definitions. As such, they are inherently unstable and always under debate.

Moreover, I would argue, along with Gee (2000), that these terms, while very productive, are limited for the same reasons that they are debated. While they seem like explicit and limiting terms, their use in different situations and different discourses reveals that they are constantly in flux. Certain constructs, like the nebulous "American middle class," are so broad and value-laden that they are powerful but incredibly imprecise. If anything, the use of such a label provides more information about the identity being performed, the way that identity is being constructed and recognized through the use of semiotic systems, than they do about a fixed set of criteria. To better recognize that the trinity of identity (as well as other defining terms) are about how they are used rather than about what they define, Gee offers a taxonomy easily remembered as NIDA: Nature, Institutional, Discourse, and Affinity (p. 100-102). This taxonomy is not a framework for absolute conditions but rather for the ways in which we talk about the different aspects of identity.

In some ways, it may be useful to think of this taxonomy as an identity-specific version of the ancient rhetorical technique for argumentation known as stasis theory. Stasis theory breaks down argumentation into distinct levels, typically fact, definition, quality, and policy. The first level, fact, is a question of existence. At this stasis, the argument is over whether or not something exists or actually happened. The question asked might be, "Did someone do something to someone else?" To advance to the next stasis, definition, all parties involved in the argument agree that the answer to that

16

question was "yes," so now they want to understand what it is and what it means. At this level, the question might be, "Was that thing the person did a crime?" The criteria for the category of "crime" are defined, and the act is compared against them. Once all parties involved agree that the answer is yes, they move onto an evaluation of the quality of the definition. How bad of a crime was it? When all agree at that stasis, they move to the final level, that of policy, in which they decide what the action will be in response. At this stasis, the question becomes, "What will the punishment for this crime be?" Stasis theory, like most of ancient rhetoric, is rooted in the rhetor's role in courts of law, but it also provides a useful framework for different parties involved in a discussion to understand exactly where their points of disagreement are. Understood from stasis theory, it isn't productive to discuss policy decisions if there are fundamental disagreements about how the things being discussed are defined (Purdue OWL, 2013).

As stasis theory provides a way for parties to see beyond their individual positions and to analyze the points of their disagreement, to see the terms and concepts of their argument through the ways in which they are being used rather than as unchanging constructs, Gee's NIDA taxonomy helps a study of identity to see the trinity of race, class, and gender as flowing, shifting concepts defined not as fixed concept but by their social use by revealing the ways in which these different terms are being used. In the example of stasis theory above, terms like "crime" and "accused" and "suspect" might be in use at all the different levels, but the ways in which they are being used are very different. In a discussion of identity, the words that signify elements of race, class, and gender appear on all levels of the NIDA taxonomy, but they are being used in very different ways. As in stasis theory, the enhanced understanding of what's being discussed

comes from recognizing the different ways those terms are being used, the different modes in which all speakers/writers/thinkers are engaged.

With this in mind, Gee's taxonomy can be explained. By Nature, Gee means the ways in which we attribute identity to biological or inherent character traits. Examples of this level would include something like "being an identical twin." It is a characteristic of one's identity (one either is or is not a twin) that seems to develop only out of an accident of birth and is defined by what are generally understood as empirically recognizable characteristics. However, these factual attributes are not in themselves representations of identity. Rather,

> [N]atural identities can only become identities because they are recognized, by myself or others, as meaningful in the sense that they constitute (at least, in part) the "kind of person" I am. Thanks to "nature," I have a spleen, but this (at least, for now) does not constitute anything meaningful, for me or others, in terms of my being a certain kind of person. Thus, [Nature-level identities] must always gain their force as identities through the work of institutions, discourse and dialogue, or affinity groups, that is, the very forces [on the other levels of this model]. (p. 102).

Thus, while Nature-level identity markers may be empirically factual (a person has a spleen or doesn't), like some might believe race, class, and gender might be (gender can be seen as the physical presence or lack of certain organs, for instance), these markers are not the most important elements of identity. They exist, and like the existential level of stasis theory, are useful for identifying a point of disagreement. However, as in stasis

theory, it is how these basic conceptions are used at other levels that matter, especially as they pass into social institutions and the Discourses that they represent.

In the first of these social levels, Institution, Gee means that this is an identity that develops out of one's place within a social structure. An identity at this level is something like "being a professor" or "being a police officer." In the case of the twins, while the Nature level is a discussion of their identical genetic makeup, their Institutional identity is being recognized as twin siblings when enrolled in a school system for the first time. Like discussions of identity at the Nature level, discussions of identity elements at the Institutional level often take on an empirical, factual tone. A person simply adjusts to fit into a definition already in place at the Institution, like the often complicated and frustrating act of selecting from a provided list of race, class and gender choices on a survey. However, it is important to acknowledge that these categories are not 'neutral' or 'natural' but rather the product of prevailing ideological structures with which the institutions in question are aligned. In many cases, these Institutional identities are created and enforced by organizations that promote what Gee calls "dominant Discourses," organizations whose semiotically-centered ways of being that carry significant amounts of what Pierre Bourdieu called "cultural capital" (1989, p. 7). As a result, the Institutional codification of Nature-level identity elements are those tied to questions of social justice. Central to this power is "[the] process [of] authorization; that is, laws, rules, traditions, or principles of various sorts allow the" Institutional forces to recognize N-level elements and codify them within the Institution (p. 102).

Since Institutional identities come from organizations tied to dominant social organizations, they are highly related to the Discursive level of identity. However, while

highly related to Institutional definitions, Discursive identity performances go beyond the definitional categorization of the institutional level. An example that Gee that provides is labeling someone as "charismatic." One can only be recognized as charismatic through the performance and recognition by others of being charismatic. As Gee (2012) indicates the "key to Discourses is 'recognition.' If you put language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places together in such a way that others recognize you as a particular type of who (identity) engaged in a particular type of what (activity), here-and-now, then you have pulled off a Discourse" (p. 65). Being charismatic is not something one simply is; it is something one does that others recognize. This mode of being is inherently tied to the Discourse in which it is performed. The NIDA model can help explain why some find the performances of someone like Sarah Palin to be charismatic (folksy, straight-shooting) and others find that performance to be offensive (ignorant, overly simplistic).

The final of the three social levels, Affinity, draws from Gee's consideration of what he terms "Fast Capitalism," a concept that emerged around the time of his work with the New London Group in the early 1990s (2000, p. 105). Affinity is an understanding of identity that is tied to participation within a social organization that isn't fundamentally an institutional structure. Instead of someone being a professor or police officer, one is a Trekkie, an identity constructed through shared affinity for the social practice of being an obsessive fan of a television show. As Gee notes, "For members of an affinity group, their allegiance is primarily to a set of common endeavors or practices and secondarily to other people in terms of shared culture or traits. Of course, they need these other people . . . for these practices to exist, but it is these practices and the

experiences they gain from them that create and sustain their allegiance to these other people" (p. 105). Of course, this doesn't not eliminate the ways in which the levels overlap. Being an American police officer is not only an Institutional identity (a rank) or a Discourse identity (speaking "like" a police officer in order be recognized by the public). Through social organizations, trade magazines that focus on law enforcement, and other forms of media, being a police officer is also about sharing an Affinity for the symbols, actions, and reified social concepts of American police work.

The four levels of NIDA, then, provide a taxonomy that can encompass a great number of the ways in which we talk about questions of identity and identity performance. While it recognizes standard frameworks for identity, it allows us to see the ways in which those terms and concepts are being used. For instance, one might talk about being an African-American on each of these levels in productive ways. Easily, one can talk about it as a Natural level of identity (levels of melanin, differences in hair structure, the experience of 'ashy' skin, etc) while still discussing the complexities involved at the other levels, including the Institutional ways in which "being African-American" are (mis)recognized, the Discursive ways in which "being an African-American" is performed (AAVE, the ways in which Obama's middle name was used during the 2008 campaign, etc), and the ways in which the social performances associated with "being an African-American," including expectations of affinity for certain music, clothing, and activities. Furthermore, this framework can be focused on the specific and local conditions of identity and thus bring in questions of gender and class performance.

In addition, because Gee's framework is about the ways in which we discuss identity and not about identity as a fixed point, it "is crucial to realize that these four perspectives are not separate from each other. Both in theory and in practice, they interrelate in complex and important ways. Rather than discrete categories, they are ways to focus our attention on different aspects of how identities are formed and sustained" (p. 101). For instance, let's consider the idea of Asperger's Syndrome. At the Natural level of identity, it is seen as the expression of physical neurological conditions. However, as Gee, pointing to Foucault, notes, this assessment doesn't include the complexities of the way that the labeling of Asperger creates Institutional identity. Someone with Asperger is, when placed into the institutional discourse of a school, labeled as a student with a learning disorder, an entirely different level of identity that draws from the discussions of Asperger's as a Natural identity but weaves them into the needs of the institution. Once codified, discussions are then complicated by the ways in which that concept of disorder is understood within the epistemic and axiological norms of the different Discourses that intersect at the institution: the family of the student, the teachers of the student, the special education department, the academic administration, the medical specialists, and others. Finally, thanks to the Internet's ability to provide a communication structure that transcends some levels of physical boundaries (see Henry Jenkin's (2008) idea of "convergence culture," from which Gee draws), Asperger's can become a way to construct a shared affinity. Communities of people who define themselves as "Aspies" then can use the diagnosis as a way to create a shared sense of an "Aspie culture," including liking specific types of television programs, movies, video games, books, etc, over others that do not appeal to the "ways that Aspies are." These, of course, are always

complicated by the race, gender, and class trinity, in that at each level of the taxonomy, the distinctions drawn between those categories produce profoundly different understandings of what Asperger's means. For example, consider the ways in discussing "Aspie" affinity, which are typically coded masculine in the popular representation of the science-fiction obsessed Aspie 'nerd,' becomes complicated when questions of gender – and the interplay between different "Aspie" gender segments – are invoked. Ultimately, however, what this taxonomy helps to overcome is that what could be seen as a singular term becomes complicated and is brought to a new level of understanding that simpler frames might miss.

In applying this framework to my research, I applied it for both sets of population: my student participants and the instructors. Through my previous examples, the usefulness of this framework for understanding and discussing student performance of identity should be evident, and its application for discussing the performance of instructor identity should also be understandable. However, the NIDA framework allows for discussion not only of the performance of identity but for the discussion of the recognition of identity. This is important when discussing transfer because as Nowacek (2011) notes, in order for identity not to block the perception of successful transfer, instructors "not only need to make spaces for students to see and sell connections, they need to create spaces where *instructors* in their capacity as *audience* can recognize and value connections" (p. 90, emphasis original). Students do need "to negotiate the differences between their own self-identities and the identity they feel is required to successfully appeal to their audience" (their own Discourses and the Discourses within which they feel their instructors participate), but using the NIDA framework also helps

understand how instructors *present* the identities that students see as 'successful' for appeal (Nowacek, 2011, p. 54).

Thus, the NIDA framework is used for understanding identity throughout both chapter three (the analysis of student experiences and approaches to writing) and chapter four (the analysis of how the instructors did or did not facilitate transfer). However, although NIDA provides a useful way of foregrounding the interplay between the different levels of discussing identity, at times, it will be deemphasized in favor of close reading and a detailed analysis of student experience. In some ways, discussing the lived experience of a conflict of Discourses through the framework can, like stasis theory can when discussing the process of determining and punishing guilt, minimize the immediacy and emotional struggle of the process involved. At times, this will cause me to focus on more specific elements of identity, especially gender. As I will discuss in chapter three, although policing certainly involves questions of race and class (and often in extremely problematic ways), its long history as a gendered institution is one of the most compelling forces defining the possibilities for Discursive identities. Race and class certainly provide strong influences, but for my participants in this study, I believe that complicated gender history was the strongest factor. However, this doesn't mean that I have avoided thinking about identity through the NIDA framework when emphasizing that portion of my participants' experiences. Gender, while apparently a Natural-level identity marker, becomes meaningful mostly through the Institutional and Discursive levels, especially when it comes to the performance of identity. Especially when it comes to the world of police, it seems as if the historic legacy of dominant American masculinities is sometimes an overbearing force.

The Dominant in Discourses

Though both the use of NIDA and the remainder of my analysis draw from Gee's Discourse theory and his Discourse analysis, it was sometimes insufficient to explain the experiences of my participants. While Gee's model is able to identify that some Discourses are dominant in that they possess greater degrees of cultural capital (at least within the limits of certain institutional structures) and he correctly identifies that each of us participates in multiple Discourses with greater and lesser degrees of recognition within those Discourses, some elements need greater clarification. In particular, I wish to clarify two dimensions of how the dominant status is obtained and maintained.

First, while Gee acknowledges that there are different levels of participation and thus different levels of recognition within Discourses, he does not explicate what forces enable these levels of recognition and are thus dominant within that Discourse. An example of this might be a collection of fans of a particular musical act, especially one that persists for some time and is attached to a certain cultural representation (ie, bands like The Grateful Dead, Phish, etc). While these fans may all know the same songs and have a sense of the band's history, some may be called more "real" fans by virtue of being able to explain more specific details of that history, their musical lineage, and other elements that have become valuable to the Discourse connected to that band. However, while I can say "by virtue of" these things, given that Gee's "key" to "pulling off a Discourse" is being recognized as performing those Discourses, there is nothing intrinsically more "real fan" in that knowledge in that it isn't the knowledge itself that matters. It is that other people see being able to talk about that knowledge, to act out that portion of the identity, as an expression of the deep immersion in that Discourse. This

recognition, moreover, must come from within the Discourse, so what is necessary is a way to understand how these Discourse-recognizable characteristics become reified and the dominant way to signal membership in that Discourse.

To provide a way to understand that process, the second dimension that needs to be expanded in Gee's model is to explore the relationships that exist between this dominance within specific Discourses and those Discourses that have achieved, for various reasons, a degree of overall dominance. As an example, because of their near social ubiquity and social gatekeeping function, the Discourses associated with schooling are dominant in the United States. What is called Standard Edited American English (SEAE) is much more than a standardized way of spelling and applying grammatical rules; through demonstrating its use successfully, a person is able to be recognized as someone who is compliant with those school-based Discourses. Through standardized writing tests and other mechanisms, those who cannot or choose not to use SEAE are denied access to scholarships, college entry, and other dominant social mechanisms.

However, since we all participate in multiple Discourses at different degrees of recognizability, the effects of one dominant Discourse are not limited to the one social apparatus with which that Discourse might be most easily associated. Instead, I suggest that since, as Gee argues, Discourses are not discreetly bounded units but are rather overlapping segments of being, the effect of these Dominant discourses is like ink bleeding through a page. Since "Discourses have no discrete boundaries because people are always, in history, creating new Discourses, changing old ones, and contesting and pushing the boundaries of Discourses," the Dominant discourses, which I would argue encounter the most boundary-pushing with other Discourses, are always influencing that

which is prized most within those other Discourses (Gee, 2011, loc 880). For a Discourse aligned with the dominant Discourse, the qualities in that Discourse that most overlap with what is valued within the dominant Discourse echo and become its dominant qualities. However, for those Discourses that are negatively defined against the dominant Discourse, that draw much of their power from providing those who are part of the Discourse with an alternative method of being and being recognized, the qualities that are furthest from those of the dominant Discourse could become dominant within the alternative Discourse.

To return to the school-Discourse example provided earlier, in which SEAE use signaled compliance and membership in that school-Discourse, consider two different smaller Discourses that might be present in any American high school: two different social cliques. The first hypothetical such group might be the school's quiz bowl team, in which a group of students, representing their school, compete against other schools to demonstrate their mastery of trivia-style knowledge. This group would represent a smaller Discourse than the larger school-based one because they would develop specialized language and other semiotics for their activity (terminology like "buzzing in," specialized mnemonic devices, in-group jokes, etc), but because the values of that Discourse are largely parallel (concerns with specific knowledge, on-demand knowledge regurgitation demonstrating mastery, and achieving higher status by being able to do so) with the school-Discourse, those who participate in that smaller Discourse are unlikely to want to use any form of English other than SEAE.

However, another social clique, one that for various reasons has not found that their activities, abilities, or interests are valued by the dominant school-Discourse, would

find little reason to maintain that alignment, instead choosing expressions of language that deviated strongly from the "normal" English represented by SEAE. They may embrace forms of language heavy on specific types of slang, acronyms, alternative spellings, or other language structures that, in their indecipherability to those strongly within the school-Discourse, signal their "otherness" and distinct difference. These alternative language structures, because of their resistance to the dominance of the school-Discourse, become the dominant force within that Discourse, and closer adherence to them – and rejection of the dominant Discourse's norms – signifies stronger membership in that Discourse.

Thus, the process of certain ways of knowing, certain ways of using language, and certain ways of acting becoming dominant within a Discourse depends on a relationship with those Discourses that are dominant within a given social situation. At all times, of course, it is a process of recognition, being recognized as being aligned with or opposed to the values of the dominant Discourse, that matters. In Gee's (2000) words:

> [E]lites, [those aligned with dominant Discourses], often define or make sense of themselves in opposition to nonelites, . . . to whom they ascribe inferior properties . . . that contrast with the elites' more positive properties. This, historically, leaves nonelites with ascribed [identities], which they may either "internalize" (and, in a sense, accept) or oppose. Opposition often takes the form of solidarity with other nonelites through the formation and celebration of achieved [identities] that are defined in opposition to the achieved [identities] elites have fashioned for themselves, leading to class divisions defined in identity terms. (p. 113)

Since in Gee's model, all Discourses are defined in relational terms with other discourses, revealing this relationship between dominances provides a level of historical analysis to Discourse analysis approaches. Since dominant Discourses become dominant through their association with institutions of social power (schools, governments, churches, and constructs that might be recognized as Gramscian ideological state apparatuses), then the history of those institutions creates a history of Discursive influence. By understanding how dominant Discourses have evolved over time, one can better understand why and how Discourses caught in relations with those dominant systems have shifted.

One way to talk about this relationship between dominant Discourses and the dominant ways of being in individual Discourses is to invoke the concept of hegemony, the social dialectic that provides elites with a way of justifying their dominance and provides non-elites with a framework for understanding the 'naturalness' of a social order and thus accepting their own subordinated state (and condemning those non-elites who reject such subordination). In the case of this research project, police, as the enforcers of the codified rules of dominant Discourses, are typically understood as part of a larger network of hegemonic structures, so from the framework of Discourse analysis, while they certainly possess their own Discourses (from the local department's banter to the larger sense of "cop talk"), they are under a strong pressure to be recognizable as connected to the dominant Discourses of the elite. As such, the Discourses of police bear a direct historical parallel with the history and development of those dominant Discourses, including reifying the same values as dominant within their own Discourse.

These reified values cover a wide range of possible ways of being, including ways of understanding such complicated ideas as race, class, and, importantly for this project,

gender. As will be discussed in detail in chapter three, gender is an extremely important element when discussing the ways in which police Discourses overlap with dominant Discourses, so much so that I believe that one of the most productive ways of discussing gender within police Discourses is to draw from the work of Australian sociologist Raewyn Connell, one of the most recognized names in masculinity studies.

Connell's most frequently cited contribution to gender theory is the idea of hegemonic masculinity, which Connell defines "as the configuration of gender practices [that] embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (1995, p. 77). However, it is important to note that hegemonic masculinity is not only the dominant Discourse's way to justify the dominance of men over women; as Connell has refined this concept, it became important to note that it was about emphasizing specific modes of "being masculine" that were more valued than other ways. In Connell and James W. Messerschmidt's (2005) words:

> Hegemonic masculinity was distinguished from other masculinities, especially subordinated masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity was not assumed to be normal in the statistical sense; only a minority of men might enact it. But it was certainly normative. It embodied the currently most honored way of being a man, [and] it required all other men to position themselves in relation to it. (p. 832)

Understood from the framework of dominance spreading between Discourses discussed above, hegemonic masculinity is the reified way of being masculine in the dominant Discourse. All other Discourses define themselves in relation to this dominant way, either through seeking to be recognizable as performing it or working against it.

Importantly, astute readers will note that while Connell defined this concept as the justification for the dominant position of a certain type of man, I have not defined it as the dominant form of "being a man" but rather as the dominant form of being masculine. As Judith Halberstam (1998) argues in *Female Masculinity*, masculinity is not (to use Gee's NIDA framework) an expression of a Nature-level identity. It is not the expression of genetics, higher levels of testosterone, or any other element rooted in the body. Masculinity is not equivalent to maleness; it is the performance of gender practices that give rise to recognizable identities at the Institutional, Discourse, and Affinity levels of identity. Thus, hegemonic masculinity, the most recognizable form of masculinity in any given social time or context, influences all the concepts related to itself in other Discourses, including social power, certain ways of knowing, certain types of appearances, and other social actions that are recognized as coded masculine, and both bodied males and females can be recognized within it.

In Connell and Messerschmidt's (2005) words, "Gender is always relational, and patterns of masculinity are socially defined in contradistinction from some model (whether real or imaginary) of femininity," a definition that fits well the oppositional relations through which Discourses define themselves (p. 848). Likewise, following the relations explained between dominant Discourses and Discourses that define themselves against the dominant, alternative Discourses reify oppositional qualities to hegemonic masculinity as their own, seeking recognizability as performing the opposite types of actions. In the case of hegemonic masculinity, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) define the most recognizable of these oppositional Discourses as "emphasized femininity," the collection of gender practices most recognized as the most honored way of being

feminine (p. 848). As Judith Butler and other gender theorists have demonstrated multiple times, these feminine practices are likewise not manifestations of Nature-level identity but performances built for being recognized at the other levels of identity. However, as Connell (2005) notes, these relations shouldn't be read as built in isolation from each other, only constructed by those who perform those elements (ie, men teaching men the ways of masculinity and women teaching women the ways of femininity) (p. 848). Rather, hegemonic masculinity, subordinate masculinities, and emphasized femininity are built in a complex interchange of ongoing recognition with each other, meaning that those who are performing these different gender practices are always reinforcing each other through that recognition, always causing shifting reifications of dominant qualities for each as the values of the most dominant Discourses change through time.

When refocused on my previous thinking on how dominant elements within Discourses emerge through relations with dominant Discourses, the concept of hegemonic masculinity, its relationship with the expectations of dominant Discourses of power over American history, and its relationships with other gender performances all provide a way to understand why gender performance is so crucial to considering Discourse-level conflicts of identity. As I explain in chapter three by drawing on gender histories of police work in the United States, after the collapse of the distinct gender roles of police man and police woman and the construction of the ostentatiously neutral police officer, the need for recognition by the dominant Discourses of power led to most Discourses of police work reifying the practices of hegemonic masculinity. What was understood to be the "ideal man" became the "ideal cop." This shift occurred even as the actual demographics of police work have changed to include more women and men with

different backgrounds, leading to points of Discourse-level conflict. Understanding this gender-based pressure helps, as I show in chapter three and chapter four, elucidate both the experiences of my student participants as they perceived affordances for transfer and the experiences of the AOC's instructors as they positioned themselves to recognize or not recognize different transferred strategies.

Two Frameworks for Understanding Conflict

Understanding the interplay of dominant Discourses and dominant performances of identity within Discourses, including the tensions of gender performance, provides a clarified framework for understanding how individuals arrive at the types of identity conflict that Gee describes as the nature of Discourse conflict. However, another underdeveloped area of Gee's theory is understanding the exact nature of those Discourse conflicts. As Gee (1990) notes, "The various Discourses [that] constitute each of us . . . are [often] not fully consistent with each other; there is often conflict and tension between the values, beliefs, attitudes, interactional styles, uses of language and ways of being in the world," but without a more specific framework to understand that conflict, it is difficult to say more than the conflict exists (p. 145). Understanding the mechanism for that conflict could, potentially, provide not only a better way to discuss the points of conflict, as I do in chapters three and four, but as I will argue in chapter five, a potential way to address it pedagogically in order to ease the tensions caused by the performance of identity.

To accomplish this, I propose that while all of the terms Gee provides for Discourse conflict are accurate, we can address the wide range of performances and recognitions they represent by dividing them into two fundamental frameworks: conflicts

of epistemology and conflicts of axiology. I will define epistemology very simply as the philosophical study of different ways of knowing things, including questions of how one knows what is true or factual, although I recognize that the term is complicated and that this definition will not satisfy everyone. Similarly, although axiology could be understood as the study of any axes of values, I define axiology here as the unification of two distinct philosophical schools, aesthetics and ethics. The values of these systems are then placed on axes like a Cartesian coordinate system, with one line representing a sliding aesthetic scale from beautiful to ugly and the other line representing a sliding ethical scale from the right action to the wrong action. Axiology provides the framework for thinking about the ways in which these two evaluation systems are linked together. If this seems confusing, consider the classic story of "Beauty and the Beast." In most versions of this narrative, the prince is transformed from his handsome/beautiful state into the hideous beast as punishment for his immoral actions. When he corrects his immoral actions, choosing the right moral path, he is restored to his beautiful form. Beyond fairy tales, current popular rhetorics of fitness also apply. In many advertisements for gyms, weight loss centers, and health products, achieving a higher degree of fitness and losing weight is achieving "the better you." In such a construct, losing weight is not only an aesthetic achievement, but a moral one, proof of a person's ability to control desire and demonstrate dedication towards a goal. Those who are overweight, under this construct, are not just committing an aesthetic failure and thus are ugly; they are also immoral for being lazy and gluttonous. Note that I am not, importantly, attempting to suggest that these values are fixed or objective systems or attempting to deny any scientific evidence of weight issues. Rather, as I will explain

further, talking about axiology represents a way to talk productively about the conflicts between these values as reified within different Discourses.

Before I further explain axiological conflict, however, I need to explain epistemological conflict as I use it here because it often informs axiological conflicts. Epistemology, as I am using it here, is fundamentally about how different ways of knowing are socially accepted within Discourses. Rather than simply 'neutral' frameworks for providing comprehension, these social constructs provide ways for different Discourses to define what sources they accept as valid, what methods for understanding they accept as valid, and what types of conclusions will be accepted as valid. As an example, consider the American religious group Answers in Genesis and the Creation Museum they built in Petersburg, Kentucky. The displays of this museum represent an epistemology that differs wildly from the displays that could be found throughout other North American museums because the organization that designed and sponsors it views the Bible as the most accurate source of knowledge, rejecting epistemologies that accept the results of carbon dating and fossil analysis as accurate. As a result, despite the massive amount of criticism the organization has received from scientific communities that reject its representation of geological and biological history, the thousands of visitors the Creation Museum welcomes each year come to have their views reinforced because they participate in the same or a similar version of the Discourse as the founders and operators of the Creation Museum. Because of the strength of their epistemological conflict, they resist and reject sources of knowledge that are accepted, valued, and expected in other Discourses.

Although this may be an extreme example, these types of epistemic conflicts happen at a high frequency. When a student submits a paper that depends almost entirely upon the student's experiences and personal knowledge, a professor may reject it because the source of knowledge – the epistemology used – does not match the ones to which the professor subscribes. In many cases, the student's actions may simply seem like laziness or improper socialization to school, but to at least some degree, the student may also believe that his or her experiences are just as valid a source of knowledge because the Discourses in which he or she participates value, rather than reject, individual experience. For that student, the professor's expectations of drawing from published sources may seem like drawing from second-hand hearsay, an inferior form of knowing to actual experience. For instance, in the student's life, he or she may value the review of a friend who has actually seen a movie rather than a friend who has gone to a review aggregator and can relate the most frequent assessments of a film. After all, the idiom "straight from the horse's mouth" has achieved its popularity partly because it matches commonly held epistemological values.

Moreover, these epistemic values are not isolated from axiological values but inform them. In the case of those who support the Creation Museum over modern scientific consensus, they do so not just because of what they accept as sources of knowledge but because of their belief that they have an ethical responsibility to prize that source of knowledge over others. It is not just the right way to know; it is the right thing to do. When the professor finds that the student is not using sources but drawing only from his or her own personal experience, the rejection of what the professor believes to be the right way to gather knowledge translates into an ethical failure.

However, axiological conflicts remain distinct from epistemic conflicts, even if they are often informed by epistemological differences, because they manifest not in conflicts of how one knows things but how one expresses that knowledge. Returning to the hypothetical example of the professor reacting to the student using his or her own experiences as the primary source of information for the paper, the professor might choose to try to explain his or her frustration by turning to something that the professor believes the student will have heard before: advice not to use "I language" in a paper. What the professor is reacting to is an epistemic conflict (the knowledge should, from the professor's point of view, come from or at least be connected to peer reviewed sources), but when communicated as avoiding a specific type of language, it sounds like a stylistic choice, so it becomes perceived as an axiological conflict. Importantly, although I say "stylistic choice" here, stylistics, while part of axiology, are not the entirety of it. In the students' perception of avoiding a certain type of language, he or she may see the professor as upholding a system of behavior, a moral code, like a kind of etiquette. Thus, the "right" stylistic approach, would not simply be aesthetics, not just style, but ethics as well. Frustratingly for both the student and the professor, without being able to recognize that the suggestion to shift language is an overlap between axiological values and epistemic values, without being able to recognize the interplay between the way of knowing and the way of communicating that knowing, the student may go on believing that the choice of language is only a stylistic rule, a writing etiquette, rather than the representation of a deeper and more significant conflict between the Discourses.

In other cases, however, axiological conflicts are not expressions of epistemic conflict but only of conflicts between the different norms that make up the Discourses

colliding with each other. A classic example of this type of conflict is that expressed by

Joseph Williams in his later editions of his extremely popular *Style*: *The Basics of Clarity*

and Grace. In his second chapter, "Correctness," Williams explains that "[m]ost of our

attitudes about correctness have been encouraged by generations of grammarians who, in

their zeal to codify 'good' English, have confused three kinds of 'rules'" (2003, p. 8).

The first of these three kinds of rules are the actual rules that make English English, the

type of rules that if you get wrong interfere with comprehension, such as remembering

that English places its adjectives before its nouns, so we have a "pink book" rather than a

"book pink." The second type of rules distinguish SEAE from nonstandard Englishes,

even though comprehension is achieved between the variations ("He doesn't have any

money" versus "He don't have no money"). The third type of rules are what Williams

calls "hobgoblins," invented rules that are made to further distinguish SEAE from

"higher" types of educated grammar and include advice to avoid splitting infinitives, to

remember the subjunctive, and other such guidelines (Williams, 2003, 8-13). Axiological

conflicts occur at the second and third level because these types of conflicts are not about

communicating meaning (both versions communicate meaning successfully) but about

signaling and being recognized as performing the types of Discourses that enforce those

rules. In addition, axiological conflicts include rules that define 'taboo' language,

including what words are labeled as "cursing" and "uncouth" to different Discourses.

As such, though Williams' analysis of these rules may suggest that axiological

conflicts are somewhat arbitrary and trivial, when they are combined with instances of

social power, such as assigning a grade or selecting a person to interview or hire for a

position, these differences matter a great deal. Also, as noted earlier, because of the

ongoing negotiation between dominant Discourses and what is dominant within all Discourses, the social power associated with SEAE and grammatically or socially reified "rules" (including the exclusions of certain language by social groups) also produces inverted axiological values. Some Discourses, through a process of making dominant that which is suppressed in dominant Discourses, will embrace language use in ways that directly invert the values of the second and third groups of language rules. For instance, members of the punk rock cultural movement of the 1980s often chose to emblazon swear words on their clothing to openly signify their rejection of the dominant Discourse that would judge those words and the people bearing them as axiologically unacceptable. Of course, by doing so, the members of this cultural movement were doing more than signifying their distinction from dominant Discursive values; they were signaling their adherence to the values of the alternative Discourse they wished to be recognized as performing.

In a school setting, understanding the role of axiological conflicts is useful because, building on the sense of Williams' three types of rules, they provide a way for researchers to understand how different members of the classroom are signaling and attempting to request recognition of their relationship with the dominant Discourses associated with school. Students using versions of English other than the expected SEAE may not be doing so because they are unaware of SEAE conventions; they may be doing so because they are positioning their identity as oppositional to the Discourses they understand to be using SEAE. Likewise, teacher attempts to encourage students to use modes of English other than SEAE may encounter resistance because the students may desire to be recognizable as aligned with the dominant Discourse, and regardless of their

abilities with alternative Englishes in other social situations, they desire to perform and be recognized as aligned with the axiological values of the dominant Discourse when in the school setting. Asking them to do otherwise could be seen as a denial of that recognition.

Taken together, these frameworks for epistemic and axiological conflict are not revolutionary. They are implicitly within Gee's understanding of Discourse theory, but like the application of stasis theory to arguments or the NIDA framework to discussions of identity, seeing these different types of conflict helps to understand the way in which those conflicts are working. Applied to classroom pedagogy, as I will suggest in chapter five, they can provide a way for students and teachers to better understand why they may feel at times that they are not being understood or accepted by each other. While understanding the nature of those disagreements as conflicts with epistemology or conflicts with axiology will not in itself lead to resolution of those conflicts, it provides a more productive starting point for discussion that, "We're just not the same type of people." By understanding the vectors that provide this distinction, students and teachers can begin to address how they might bridge those conflicts towards their mutually intelligible goals for the course and for the course's assignments.

For example, consider the case in which a student is consistently not achieving the page length that a teacher is requiring. When asked why, the student might reply with something like, "I'm just short and sweet. I get to the point. I don't waste my time. That's just the type of person I am." However, while the student suspects that the conflict is between a professor who holds axiological values that value long-windedness and overly wrought sentence structure, the actual point of conflict is not an axiological one, but an

epistemic one. In being as "short and sweet" as the student is, significant amounts of

information are being assumed as common knowledge, social facts and conclusions that

don't need further explication. The professor, on the other hand, sees that what the

student is assuming to be common knowledge actually isn't, and that throughout the

paper, huge segments exist where further explanation of ideas are necessary in order for a

reader unfamiliar with the topic to understand the student's meaning. By directly

addressing the student's perception that this is a moment of axiological conflict and

showing that this is instead about epistemological conflict, about different understandings

of what counts for given knowledge, the professor can soothe the Discursive tension and

work towards a revision plan that better addresses the real concerns of the assignment and

the real reasons for the student's lack of success.

The Interplay of NIDA and the Conflict Framework

Axiology and epistemology, as conflicts of identity, are not separate from the

NIDA framework explained earlier; no conflict occurs without a relationship that can be

understood through the taxonomy. The majority of such conflicts occur on the Discourse

level of identity performance as one Discourse's answers to "How do we know things?"

and "How is does the good behavior of good people look like?" clash with another.

However, these Discursive conflicts are not isolated from the other levels, especially the

Institutional level, because these identities influence Discursive possibilities.

In the example I used in the conclusion of the previous section, where my

hypothetical student explains that he or she is "the type of person" who is "just short and

sweet" and "[gets] to the point," these expressions of conflict between the Discourse of

the student and the Discourse of the teacher are being partly fueled and defined by the

Institutional identities that have put them in this relationship. Because their Institutional identities provide the teacher with a greater share of social power (he or she holds the "right" Discourse answers to what is given knowledge and what type of knowledge counts as well as what the "good" ways are for that knowledge to be expressed in order for the student to be a "good" student), the student's Discursive identity begins with this uncomfortable power relationship. Their Institutional identities are defined through these interactions with each other, interactions built upon one group possessing social power (the power to grade, thereby rank in the Institution and assign elements of an Institutional identity) over the other, making the Discursive identities defined through the Institutional identities begin with an oppositional action. As explained earlier, because those Discourses that are most aligned with dominant Discourses end up echoing the values of the dominant Discourse, those students who maintain alignment with the school based Institutional identity (and are ranked through grading as positively aligned) will do their best to emulate the epistemic and axiological values of the dominant Discourse in this situation, the teachers. Those who have been punished through the Institutional identity system (given lower rankings, placed in behavior modification programs, etc), will participate in Discourses that invert the dominant Discourse's values.

The hypothetical student in this example is, thus, signaling through the statement of values his or her membership in a Discourse that defines the values of the Dominant discourse (the teacher's) in oppositional ways: long, wordy, and confusing. Through this statement, the hypothetical student is barring the possibility of perceiving affordances for transferring writing strategies into the new Discourse. The performance of identity, the agonistic relationship between the epistemic and axiological answers of the Dominant

42

discourse and the student's Discourse, blocks the perception of similarities between the different writing situations. If faced with a very different situation such as explaining a concept to a significantly younger child, the student is likely very capable of understanding that what counts as given knowledge or the right way to use language shift in different social situations. The student, recognizing the differences, might see the affordances of specific Discourses (storybooks, strategies used in television learning programs, etc) and transfer their use into the situation, ignoring any epistemic or axiological conflict. In such a situation, the identity possibilities for the student are very different, since the Institutional power being wielded is quite different.

However, partly because of the strength of the Institutional identities that reinforce Discursive differences, in the case of the assignment and the teacher's expectation that he or she expand a section to address assumed knowledge or inappropriate style and language, the student's insistence that he or she "just is" an opposition set of epistemic and axiological values blocks that willingness to adapt, to transform, and to transfer knowledge and strategies. Even if the affordances are there, the performance of identity, understood through the framework for conflict and the NIDA taxonomy, blocks the student's ability to perceive them.

Summary

At the conclusion of each chapter of this document, I will provide a quick overview of the ideas that I see as important for understanding my whole research project. In order to make this information as quickly accessible as possible, I have chosen to use an adapted bullet-point structure. My hope is that readers will not be too frustrated

by this axiological transition but will find the strategy useful when reviewing this document.

In this chapter, I have addressed the following points:

1. In order to develop a more complete picture for understanding transfer, **research needs to incorporate the performance of identity**.

2. **I have chosen to apply James Paul Gee's Discourse theory** as a framework for understanding the performance of identity and the framework for why identity conflicts occur in situations of transfer.

3. One area that transfer research has not done well with is to **consider the growing so-called 'non-traditional' student populations.** Doing so is needed because identity develops through a process of experience with different Discourses in different social conditions, so these students with experiences other than schooling will carry with them a more complicated variety of backgrounds.

4. For a variety of reasons explained here but more fully developed in chapter two, **the site used for this research project provides a nearly ideal location to approach identity and its role in transfer.**

5. In order to provide a stronger framework for discussing the performance of identity, **I explained the structure of Gee's NIDA identity taxonomy and made productive connections between it and Raewyn Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity.** These frameworks are used in chapters three and four to address both the performance of identity and the reception of that identity.

6. In order to develop better clarity when understanding Discourse conflicts, **I introduce two frameworks for understanding conflict on the epistemic and axiological levels.**

7. Finally, I have shown how **the NIDA taxonomy and the framework for conflict I have introduced work together to better identify, analyze, and understand how the performance of identity affects learners** and the possibilities for perceiving affordances for transfer.

CHAPTER TWO

RESEARCH SITE OVERVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I outlined and provided literature support for the

importance of considering identity performance when engaging in studies of knowledge

transfer and introduced the two frameworks I will be using to discuss the performance,

discussion, and conflicts of identity. In this chapter, I will provide an overview of the

methodology, approved and performed as University of Louisville IRB number 11.0390,

used in this study and the theoretical underpinnings of that methodology. This overview

will include: an introduction to the site of the study; a description of the courses offered

by the program; a description of the writing assignments required for these courses; the

reasoning for focusing my observations on one course; an overview of the general

demographics of the site's population; a description of how subjects were recruited; a

description of the intended observational methodology and discussion of why this

methodology employed a participant-observer approach; and short description of each of

the five student participants in this study.

A Site of Displaced History

On the day that I first visited with Tad Hughes, the Director of the Southern

Police Institute (SPI), to ask about gaining access to the program's Administrative

Officers' Course (AOC) for this study, I arrived too early for our meeting. While I waited

outside his office, my eyes were drawn to the large glass display case that covered, from top to bottom, the north wall of the waiting area. As I walked along its more than fifteen feet of wall space and tried to take in some sense of the crowded tiers of shelving, it quickly became clear to me that the display case served the SPI in a rather unique way. Although display cases are common across the University of Louisville, most of these display cases are meant to serve as advertisements of accomplishments (athletic or otherwise) or to provide information about academic programs. The SPI's case, however, seemed to serve as a kind of repository for the history of its students and its faculty. The oldest item on the shelves, a flag from the island of Formasa (now Taiwan) that flew on the military car used by the first director of the SPI mixed with a multitude of model police cars representing the different eras since the SPI's founding in 1951. Plaques and badges given by departments around the world in recognition of the SPI mixed with formal and informal photos taken of previous classes and graduates. In some ways, the collection seemed a bricolage of moments taken from the last sixty years, but as I would learn over the course of this study, the sense of history they represented is one that is crucial to understanding the way that students understand the purpose, goals, and meaning of their time at the SPI, which importantly informs how they think about the writing they are asked to do.

The reason for the importance for this sense is history comes partly from the long shadows past leaders cast on their police organizations. American police leaders are typically selected from within, if not from within the same department, then from within the profession. Almost all of senior management typically began their career as graduates of a police academy, assuming a "street" or first-tier position and then later

worked their way via various opportunities to higher levels within their department or within other departments. Some of this promotion occurs because of organizational forces like attrition and expansion; however, this type of promotion is typically limited in scale, enabling promotion only to second tier or middle-management levels. Those seeking higher positions are expected to go outside the experiences they can gain through their departments and receive advance training from an external organization, training meant to prepare them for the transition from the "more reactive, day-to-day technical level" (to use the phrasing of one of the instructors in the SPI) that they understand so well from their long experiences to the "more guiding, planning, politically fraught conceptual level" (again, using his phrasing) that might benefit from the ways of thinking done outside their departments.

This level of outside professionalization for leadership wasn't always expected in police forces, but after World War II, as part of the overall increase in college education following the success of the G.I. Bill, police departments began to feel and respond to an increased emphasis for training. Recalling the first time the Southern Police Institute was conceived, the first director of the SPI, David A. McCandless (1951), wrote:

> In early February, 1949, [Dr. Joseph D. Lohman, Chairman of the Illinois
> Division of Correction,] discussed the recent strides made toward
> professionalization of police forces throughout the country. Dr. Lohman thought
> that these strides were due to an increased departmental emphasis on training. At
> the same time, he pointed out, there are relatively few schools, particularly in the
> South, offering to police officers comprehensive courses in police science and

administration. Although the demand for training is growing, the schools are not

keeping pace. (p. 105)

This discussion sparked the idea for the Southern Police Institute, and after two years of

evaluating police desires, obtaining funding and designing the curriculum, the first of

what would become the Administrative Officer's Course, a course designed to help

professionalize and train the next generation of police leadership, was held in 1951.

Of particular interest in the development of the SPI is its focus on Southern police

agencies during the beginnings of the civil rights era, a period of immense social struggle

and change in which police, for better or worse, were heavily involved. Multiple sources

have documented the complicated history and role of Southern police agencies in the

maintenance and enforcement of segregation. However, when the first of the AOC

classes (in the spring of 2013, the 130th will meet) took their seats in 1951, they sat down

at a university that had desegregated the year before (University Archives, 2012). From

the beginning, the SPI included material on what McCandless (1951) termed "Socio-

Legal Problems of the Southern Region," a unit in the original curriculum that contained

units like "Background of Racial, National, and Religious Tensions" as well as "Role of

the Police in Dealing with Tensions" (p. 108). The current director the SPI, Thomas

Hughes, believes that from the beginning, the SPI was meant not only to enhance police

professionalism, but to serve as an agency of organizational change by bringing police

leaders into contact with ideas and methodologies that would challenge the maintenance

of the social status quo, promoting social transformation in an extremely potent and

practical way. Hughes believes this approach persists in the SPI's current courses,

teachers, and role.

Although not the first of its kind, the SPI has since grown to be one of three nationally recognized programs for developing police leaders. The other two are the FBI's National Academy (NA) and the School for Police Staff and Command at Northwestern University (also known as the Northwestern University Traffic Institute or NUTI). Each of these programs shares the common goal of enabling that transition from the 'technical' actions to the more 'conceptual' framework required for effective top-tier leadership, but there are significant differences in approach. The FBI's program, because it is not connected to a university like the other two, is considered to offer more a concentration of specific police skills through laboratory work and other simulated practice, where the other two, especially the SPI, use their university settings to provide a more academic approach, including traditional academic assessment mechanisms, specifically abundant amounts of writing that often differ quite significantly from the type of writing police do as part of their profession. Effectively, while the NA is an "outside" program, its connection to the FBI means that, for many students, it is more of an "insider" organization than the academic programs, where instructors may never have worked in police capacity.

This distinction is not lost on those considering attendance. Like many professions, police officers have made use of the Internet's social capacities to promote networking, knowledge sharing, and to discuss career development, including their understanding and evaluation of these three programs. The following post was written in 2007 on the forums of Officer.com in response to a question about which of the three programs was the best, and I believe it to be indicative of the general thought regarding the three programs:

The "Big 3" of command level schools are the NA (National Academy), Southern

Police Institute, and Northwestern University Traffic Institute. SPI and NUTI are

more academically oriented and, as a result, for command level training you'll

actually learn more at either of those. . . The NA is different . . . . The NA is a

legislative mandate by Congress many years ago. Congress passed the law

because they saw a need to get local [agencies] better training than many of them

have.

The distinction made in this post between the academically oriented SPI and NUTI

against the FBI's program is one I repeatedly encountered while surveying law

enforcement forums. While this by no means suggests that the users on these forums

were in any way demeaning the training provided by the NA (indeed, the NA's specific

emphasis on "practical" elements was repeatedly praised), there was a repeated sense that

it was more like an advanced and refined version of the training they already received. In

terms of the framework suggested earlier, it is a program that enhances their already

existing "technical" skills. It may provide some enhancement of their "conceptual"

frameworks, but that is not its specific focus.

Regarding the other two programs, however, many postings voiced a set of mixed

sentiments about the programs and their academic approach. While, as the earlier quoted

post indicates, many officers do believe that the academic style used by SPI and NUTI

might lead to more generally useful leadership knowledge, many value the immediate

and the concrete and expressed some concern over the programs being "too academic."

Moreover, although academic disciplines often thrive and grow by drawing on ideas from

a variety of soaurces, police tend to view ideas from those who haven't experienced the

police experience as suspect. As Hughes explained in our first interview, "The world is full of good ideas, but police organizations are so not permeable to new ideas that – if they come from police departments, if they come from other agencies [like the FBI], they're accepted. Diffusion is pretty good. But I don't think other ideas permeate all that well." Elements of this conflict carry through even to testimonies left by SPI graduates as to the effectiveness of the program. Stanley Lampkin, a retired major who attended the 103rd AOC, wrote in his testimonial to the SPI's effect on his career, that "Prior to attending the Southern Police Institute, I did not fully understand or appreciate the benefit of leadership training for upper level law enforcement management for someone who had been in law enforcement for more than twenty years" (2012).

Ultimately, however, the SPI and its AOC is built –as it has been throughout its history, enduring and thriving as a site of police leadership training through all of the major social changes that have occurred in the US (and beyond, as international students from post-Soviet Bloc and some Middle Eastern countries have attended) over the last sixty years – by enriching, challenging, complementing, and contradicting the knowledge gained by working in and as law enforcement. More importantly, for the purpose of this study, most of the instructors consider the writing they assign as part of this process of creating a conflict between the knowledge already established through work development and theories and frameworks being presented in their courses. As Hughes explains, "So that's what I'm trying to get them to do, is to - through their writing, get in the habit of seeing that there's other information out there they can use and apply it." However, I would argue that this type of thinking is more than simply a "habit" one obtains or uses. Rather, I see Hughes and the coursework of the AOC as being about creating an overlap

of Discourses, a moment when existing knowledge and the language of its use (the world of law enforcement as lived) is put into conversation with another body of knowledge and the language of its use (the world of law enforcement as theorized in the framework of modern organizational science and criminal justice studies).

This, thinking back, is the reason why the display cabinet and its history struck me as so important on my first visit to the SPI. Although its collection of items – flags, model cars, badges, plaques, pictures, and emblems – was a seeming bricolage of the semiotics of "being police," it wasn't the representation of that identity that mattered so much. Rather, it was that the identity of being police – so tied to the times and places represented by the flags, badges and model cars – had been displaced, removed from their point of origins and stability all around the globe, and repositioned as testimonials to all who had come to study at the SPI and leave as something slightly different: graduates of the AOC, a program designed from its inception to create change both in actions and in the theories and understandings that supported those actions.

Structure of the Administrative Officer's Course

Since 1951, when the AOC was the only course series the SPI offered, attending the program has been in some ways something of a pilgrimage. To attend, then as now, students are expected to be mid-level managers (sergeants) or above and be recommended for the training by their department. To apply, they take an examination designed to demonstrate basic academic ability, including reading comprehension, reasoning, and writing ability. Once they have been accepted to the program, they travel to campus and live, if they are not in the immediate area, in one of the student dormitories on campus for all of the twelve-week period of courses. Although originally

designed to serve Southern police agencies, from its inception there was some

assumption that at least one student would attend each semester from a different region of

the country (McCandless, 1951, p. 107), and that expectation has only grown. As I

previously noted, over the last decade, it has become not uncommon for international

students to attend, including students from former Soviet Bloc countries like Kazakhstan,

as well as Middle Eastern countries, including Turkey and others.

Even for non-international students, for all but the regional students, attending the

AOC means travelling and living in a very different way than they are used to. They are

displaced from their regular lives and lifeworlds; their work, the work the participants in

this study so often phrased as "getting the bad guy," is replaced with coursework and

assignments that often refuse to provide clear right and wrong ways to approach them.

Even for those who have recently attended college (the AOC coursework is offered at

both undergraduate and graduate-level credit levels), the experience of attending the

AOC can be challenging and draining. Of the five student participants in my study, only

two lived close enough to the campus to be able to visit home frequently, and the

personal and professional stress of being away from their lives and their work for so long

deeply affected the other three by the end of the semester. Moreover, as a population, the

students are highly motivated because they are, as Gennaro Vito, one of the three

instructors in my study, phrased it, "here for the reason . . . [a] dedication to task." Terry

Edwards, another instructor in my study, said that their sense of motivation leads them to

"put themselves under a lot of pressure over there academically . . . Every point is

valuable . . . points are gold. Points or half points or three-tenths of a point. They debate

them all."

At both the undergraduate and graduate level, all students in the AOC are expected to take four courses, which are a Managing Organization Performance course, a Criminal Justice Leadership course, a Legal Issues in Law Enforcement Administration course, and a course in Law Enforcement Administration. A description of each of these courses and the writing assignments that they include is provided next.

The first course, **Managing Organizational Performance**, is taught by Hughes at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This course involves theories of policing and applying those theories in creating and applying metrics to measure how effective different policing approaches are. Students read a great deal about the history of policing with special attention paid to the different paradigms of thought (terminology adapted from Thomas Kuhn, whose work students are introduced to) that informed the different policing approaches used over history. The resulting course resists simple "old bad/new good" binaries and instead presents a complicated understanding of the uses of different data gathering and analysis approaches and how these approaches directly affect policing policy. In addition to two tests, writing is used as both a pedagogic element and as kind of final evaluation.

In the undergraduate version of the course, students wrote short papers drawn from examples in the textbook as case studies. These are presented to the class and discussed. Near the end of the semester, graduate students complete a longer paper that they generally perceive as the most difficult assignment in the AOC. This longer paper (the average paper length produced by my participants was sixteen pages) is composed of three distinct sections that related to each other at a theoretic level. In some ways, this assignment employs a structure similar to the stasis theory I discussed in chapter one in

that students move through different forms of a similar idea. The first section requires students to define, with examples, their definitions of the concepts of efficiency and effectiveness. The second section has students identify a policing concern in their home area and describe it. The third section has students discuss potential solutions, viewed through the framework of efficiency and effectiveness, to that concern.

The second course is **Criminal Justice Leadership,** taught by Vito. In earlier versions of the AOC, students were required to take an organizational management course, but across various semesters, students expressed a desire for a course focused entirely on understanding how to be a leader, a goal possibly more fundamental than learning about the broad applicability of leadership theory to manage an organization. In response, Vito developed this course and focused it on the popular text The Leadership Challenge by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. During this course, students are asked to consider the leadership examples presented in popular films, including standards like Twelve O'Clock High and Patton as well as newer films like Secretariat, Freedom Writers and Remember the Titans. Vito developed this approach by searching through the syllabi used in various leadership courses around the country and by drawing from texts like Becky Pluth's Movie Clips that Teach and Train. Vito's use of The Leadership Challenge is not based entirely on its popularity and its accessibility; indeed, it has carried into his research. In 2010, he and George E. Higgins published a study evaluating the book's leadership model that concluded that "the results suggest that the Leadership Challenge model is valid for understanding leadership capabilities among law enforcement officers" (p. 319). Beyond class participation, almost all of the evaluation of

this course comes from writing assignments that explore, in different ways, this same model.

The undergraduates complete two different papers; the graduates three. The first of these papers is a reflective application of the leadership framework of Kouzes and Posner to someone who they felt was an important influence on their perception of leadership. The second asks them to apply the same principles through reading and evaluation the leadership of a figure as presented by at least one biography. The third, the graduate only paper, requires that the students read a different book on leadership (which varies from AOC to AOC; in the one I examined, it was Stephen Sample's The Contrarian's Guide to Leadership) and to review its understanding of leadership in comparison to that of Kouzes and Posner.

The third course is **Legal Issues in Law Enforcement Administration,** taught by Edwards. This course focuses on civil law issues that police may encounter, specifically those situations in which they find themselves the named defendant of a lawsuit, including use of force and improper training. Most of this course uses a more traditional lecture format, but a significant portion of class time is dedicated to discussion or response to different ideas and suggested scenarios. The primary methods of evaluation for both undergraduates and graduates are four different writing assignments and multiple tests.

The writing assignments in this course can be grouped into two different segments: the P-series project and the Legal Services paper. The P-series is the course's major project, asking students to pick an area of civil law that can be used to sue a police force. Once the topic is selected, students are asked to "conduct an in-depth legal research

project with the ultimate objective being to become an 'expert' on that topic and to perform an evaluation, or risk management assessment, of their own agency's policy/procedure with regard to that topic." The first of the three papers, P1, asks students to propose a topic, indicating their reasons for their interest in it, and is evaluated on a pass/fail with unlimited revision opportunities. No other section of the P-series can be written until P1 is approved. P2 provides a definition of the existing law on the topic approved but is capped at five pages, so students are evaluated on both succinctness and thoroughness. The final paper, P3, asks students to apply their knowledge of the law to evaluate their own department's policies for occurrences involving a lawsuit. The Legal Services paper is a smaller project that is meant to have the students interact with their legal services department back at their police department so that, before the students may have reasons to use the department, they have some sense of how the department works, how it processes cases, and how successful the department has been in the past at defending students. I discuss student reactions to this legal services paper further in chapter three.

The fourth course, **Law Enforcement Administration**, is taught by Lt. Colonel (Ret.) Cindy Shain, a former executive officer of the Louisville Police Department. This course provides students with a sense of the day to day requirements for upper management in a police department, including budgeting, human resources, and other administrative functions. Shain makes extensive use of adult learning theory, so much of the coursework is designed around groups developing their own knowledge and expertise of different areas of the course and then sharing that knowledge with their classmates. Each week, student groups prepare lesson plans and materials based on different chapters

of the course texts, and these presentations compose the majority of their course evaluation. The remainder of their evaluation is composed of a small writing assignment and an individual presentation of a grant or policy proposal for their own department.

The small writing component consists of a two page paper that asked students to discuss a moment of collaboration between their department and other entity, such as a school, a citizen group, or another regulatory agency. While this was the only direct writing assessment, and many students, like one of my participants, did not see it as difficult as the papers they were required to create in their other courses, the grant or policy presentation section also required significant composition efforts, including the creation of an effective PowerPoint presentation. However, because I had limited observation time, I was unable to follow my participants' drafting and delivery process of this proposal.

Focusing on Leadership

Although each of the four courses involved significant composition efforts, after I observed several meetings, I decided to focus my observation time on Vito's Criminal Justice Leadership course for three specific reasons: the centrality of writing to the course; the conflicts between student expectations and the type of writing being assigned; and the course's desire to promote a transition in identity, a goal that was present in the writing assignments.

First, while each of the courses contained at least one writing component, Vito's course was the only one in which they were the central method of evaluation. Only the papers and course participation contributed to students' grades, and given the emphasis

students placed on grades, each of my participants took these writing assignments very seriously. Additionally, while the other instructors held different understandings of the purpose of writing within their courses and within the AOC itself (which I elaborate on in chapter four), Vito designed the writing assignments as part of the intended learning of his classroom. When we were first discussing his assignments, he quickly gave his opinion of writing and its role in his courses:

> I've always thought [writing is] the best way to learn . . . Multiple choice exams to me are almost a waste of time unless you're just trying to see that the people have read the material. But I mean, learning to develop an argument, defend it, reading your sources - I mean, you learn so much more from doing a paper. There's just no comparison . . . When I was putting this course together, I thought [the writing assignments were] a good way because they can apply that model.

This understanding of the purpose of academic writing is one that strongly parallels the "Writing as Learning" approach championed by many Writing Across the Curriculum programs, in which writing is understood not as a demonstration of knowledge but as a way of working through that knowledge to create the learner's individual understanding of it.

Second, understanding writing as a way of discover and learn leads to conflict with understandings of language and writing as the transmission and reception of already processed information. As a result, I felt that the writing in this course was more likely to be a potential point of conflict for my participants, most of whom, because of the type of training they receive in writing as police writers, thought of writing only in a kind of transmission model. It communicated the important details of cases and incidents; it

explained policies. It was not used a way for police to explore their thoughts about and reflect on their understanding of policies, cases, or procedures. Moreover, the design of Vito's writing sequence, relying on purely academic genres that asked for synthesis between the course texts and personal experience, also seemed like it might be a productive point of possible tension. As Alaric Danube (a pseudonym selected by one of my participants) explained, student perception of the type of writing they would be asked to do at the AOC was tied to their sense that everything was about moving forward in their career, including the type of genres they would see in their writing assignments. Thus, he assessed the purpose behind the writing assignments as:

> I think that there's gold in their hearts, and I think they're trying to prepare individuals for projects that they may have to [do] in the future. They're proving the point that, not necessarily proving the point, but they're giving you things that they know that you will see again and that these will help prepare you to deliver at the highest levels by doing the assignments that will mimic [those things done at the highest levels]. And that's what you would hope - I would assume that would - **any other line of thought would probably be misguided** (emphasis added).

Based on comments like these, I felt that Vito's writing series, because it was fundamentally academic in its approach and so unlike any of the genres used by upper levels of police leadership, would potentially be a point where conflicts between Discursive identities and expectations could lead to conflicts with the writing assignments.

Third, I felt that the course was the one most intentionally designed to promote a transition of identity, moving from whatever the student might currently understand

61

himself or herself to be to that of a leader. However, individuals' conceptions of leadership are complex and inherently tied to the Discourses from which they are received, including (as Vito's course made central) images in popular culture. For my purposes, then, class discussion of the different cases presented provided an excellent moment to see those Discourse conflicts in action.

In addition, because most of my undergraduate and portions of my graduate education have involved training and intensive practice in literary textual analysis, the methodology of the course was very recognizable to me. Although the type of textual analysis I was trained to do used different theoretical frameworks (feminism, queer theory, New Historicism, etc.), the fundamental approach was the same: a theoretical apparatus was developed and applied to a text (although Vito, using sociological language, called them cases) to highlight specific elements. In this case, the theory was the Kouzes and Posner model of applied principles of leadership as demonstrated by the films' characters. As a result, as I observed the course and student reactions and discussion of the different characters, scenes, and direction choices, my familiarity with the methodology used made it less likely that I would be confused by police-specific terminology, which might carry epistemic assumptions of which I could be unaware. Thus, the course served as more of a neutral ground than the other courses, which were often laden in profession-specific jargon and assumptions of police knowledge.

However, while I chose to focus most of my observational time on Vito's course, my involvement with student writing was across the four classes, and many of my discussions with students about their writing involved the challenges of those other courses. Thus, although I will spend a great deal of chapter three discussing how my

participants' experiences with these assignments revealed some of the tensions between the different and multiple Discourses of policing and academia, I will also discuss how their experiences with other writing assignments both further and complicate my experiences in and observations of Vito's course.

Gaining Access and General Demographics

While I pondered the glass display case and its significance, Hughes finished his earlier appointment and emerged from his doorway. He looked around and, finding only me, tentatively asked, "Robert?"

I nodded, breaking the display case's hold on me, and walked over to meet Hughes. We shook hands and took our respective places at his desk. I had come to our meeting uncertain of what someone who directed a program like the SPI would be like. Admittedly, although I knew better from my positive encounters with multiple AOC students in the university's writing center, stereotypical images of a supremely authoritative slightly militaristic figure had found their way into my imagination. I was relieved to find that nothing except for his shaved head fit that image. Over the next half hour, Hughes and I rapidly discussed my proposed project and his interest in it, and I was surprised by how little selling I had to do when it came to the rationale. He quickly approved the project and pledged to act on my behalf to gain the participation of each of the AOC's other instructors.

Later, I would learn that a possible reason for Hughes' interest and quick approval was that the faculty of the SPI had recently discussed the findings of Richard Arum and Joseph Roksa's controversial 2011 <u>Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College</u>

Campuses. Arum and Roksa argue that college students do not consistently demonstrate

significant gains in critical thinking as a result of their experiences in college classes.

Although Arum and Roksa do not argue a causal relationship between writing and

learning, they do argue that "when faculty have high expectations and expect students to

read and write reasonable amounts" (defined in their study as forty pages of reading a

week and more than twenty pages of writing over the course of the semester) "students

learn more" (loc 2362). This linkage between significant reading and writing expectations

and student gains is a repeated theme in Arum and Roska, and during my first interview

with Vito, he brought up this element of the book as a justification for why he assigned as

much writing as he did despite the large AOC class size (about fifty students). Although

none of the other instructors who participated in the study mentioned Academically

Adrift, I suspect that the book was on Hughes' mind that day.

Once he had agreed to the study, he helped me understand the general

demographics of the students who make the AOC's course:

- Regionality: In general, the students who attended were primarily from the

  Eastern or Southern United States, though this varied by semester and had

  recently begun including significant numbers of international students.

  During this study, most students did hail from these regions; however,

  there were students from the Pacific Northwest in attendance as well.

- Age and Experience: Because applicants to the AOC had to be

  administrative officers, sergeants or higher, the typical age range for these

  students was between 30 and 45 years, though there were students both

  significantly younger and older. Their age might have varied, but their

experience level largely did not. Most of the AOC students have between

ten to fifteen years of experience as police officers, though their

experiences and backgrounds in policing ranged across all possible

policing backgrounds from School Resource Officers to computer crime.

- Gender and Race: [1] Although the current AOC is not the "middle-aged

    white men's program" it once was, to quote Edwards' description of the

    program when he started teaching there twenty two years ago, attendance

    is still predominantly male. Similarly, although diversity in policing

    (phrased as "having a police force that represented its constituents" by one

    of the students) was something all of my participants spoke about during

    our interviews, white students still dominated the AOC in number. During

    the period of this study, only three African American students, one

    Turkish student, and two Hispanic students were attending the AOC.

- Education: Over the years, this is one element that has changed

    significantly. Although the courses of the AOC are offered at both

    undergraduate and graduate levels, until the last ten years, the

    undergraduate populations have largely outnumbered the graduate

    students. In the last ten years, however, the graduate students have come

    to dominate, so much so that when I recruited for this study, only one of

    my five participants was an undergraduate. This portion was

---

[1] The distinction between gender and sex is an important one for me; still, for the purposes of this study, the recognizable performance of gender is what I considered paramount here. As such, I am intentionally collapsing the distinction between masculine/male and feminine/female, though I remain aware of the complexities of doing so.

representative of the number of students from each type who applied to participate in the study.

Recruiting Participants

Gaining Hughes' approval proved to be the only mechanism needed to secure the participation and support of the three other instructors in the SPI. As Director of the SPI, Hughes forwarded my intended methodology to all of the instructors, explained that he had approved it, and encouraged them to participate. None declined, so the challenge remained recruiting a varied pool of student participants, especially given the narrow demographics of the group. Thankfully, Hughes was kind enough to allow me to speak to all of the students during an orientation session, although I learned on the day of the proposal that my request for participants was to be combined with information about the campus writing center and its functions. Because I wasn't prepared for this section, the delivery was a bit muddled and may have confused potential recruits in that some of them seemed to believe I represented the campus writing center. Still, after Hughes gave me a brief introduction, I explained that the project was interested in how they would approach their writing assignments, and provided an outline for how I intended to conduct the study, including providing one-on-one tutoring with me as part of their participation.

After I was done, I was surprised to find Hughes standing next to me; without waiting for me, he began speaking on my behalf. We hadn't spoken about this, and I don't know whether it was because of the muddled delivery of my request or a pre-existing plan to support my request, but I was both pleased and surprised when he began explaining that, in his opinion, I was "an honorable man" who had "come through the front door" with my request for this study because I had deep respect for the work of

police. While I think that his evaluation of my esteem for the importance of police work is correct, we had never discussed any of the other elements, but after he was done speaking, several members of the class looked at me and nodded, seemingly indicating that his endorsement held significant value in their estimation of me and my request.

With Hughes' praise supporting my request, I gave them contact information and left the orientation. Hughes also agreed to send out emails to the class with that contact information. Of course, such a recruitment method has its own problems; chief among these is a problem of a self-selection bias. Although all of the students in the AOC tend to be highly motivated to succeed in the program, the type of student likely to respond to my request for participation was likely to be one performing an identity that already had a positive relationship with schooling and its resources, especially when participating in the study was explained as a way to receive academic support. Still, given the limitations of working with volunteer participants who may withdraw from the study at any time, such a limitation would be inevitable.

Within three days, twelve different individuals had made contact with me. Because I only intended to recruit between four to five individuals, I decided that I would attempt to filter these applications based on regionality because I thought that being police in different regions of the country would likely reflect very different experiences with the culture of policing. Thus, drawing on various Internet searches, I used the information they provided (their names and rank, typically) to locate their departments and any other information they had posted online. In some cases, this yielded a great amount of information, including service records, awards, and personal websites and videos. From this information, I was able to gain a sense of the identity these individuals

had selected to represent (or not represent, as sometimes, their only web presence was a listing on their organization's page) themselves online, and with this information, I prioritized the potential participants, attempting to create as diverse a population for the study as possible.

With this list in mind, I returned to site observation hoping that by identifying the volunteers and observing them in class, I could further winnow the pool of participants down. Even before the first class had begun, however, I received more verification of the instructors' assessment of these students as driven. I didn't have to identify those who had decided to participate; they came up to me while I got coffee, while I tried to locate a bathroom, and while I waited for class to begin. The most striking thing about these interactions was the way they seemed to represent mixed identities, combining speaking to me both as police to citizen and as student to potential tutor, a mix of both a position of authority over me and recognizing me as an authority in some area where they might need help. These interactions made me interested in specific individuals for reasons I'll discuss in the following section.

After these initial interactions and my first observations of classroom activities, my initial goal was to recruit the only female interested in participating, to recruit the only African-American interested, and to select the remaining three participants based on both their regionality and the impressions they had made on me. Unfortunately, after I approached the one African-American individual who had expressed interest, he became concerned about the amount of time spent doing interviews and chose not to participate. Otherwise, I managed to recruit a reasonably regionally diverse group that I believe represents a good variety of personalities and experiences with education.

68

Becoming a Participant Observer

I originally intended to use a more restricted observer model in which the participants would use the University of Louisville's Writing Center and its tutors for support; however, during my initial recruitment presentation, Hughes suggested that I might help the students more directly. As I went through my presentation, I found myself echoing his statement. After all, I didn't want to seem like I was offering less than Hughes had suggested, especially once he recommended me as "honorable" after I concluded my request. As a result, I became something more of a participant observer. I observed multiple sessions of the courses, but I also became the primary writing consultant to the five participants, willingly receiving drafts and preparing feedback via email as well as meeting with them in person frequently to discuss their ideas.

Looking at the data I collected now, I do not believe that I would have been able to produce as rich a study without this change in methodology. Through it, I not only engaged in more phases of the writing process than I had anticipated, but because I was able to get to know and become friendly with each of these five individuals over the course of their semester, I was able to gain access to important moments of their expression of their identities that went beyond the classroom. Without that trust, I believe that my observations and interview questions would never have been able to touch on some of the topics that I represent in chapter three.

Participant Descriptions [2]

Of my five participants, all five were white. Four were male; one was female. All
were between the ages of 35 and 50, meaning that in one case, a group member was
slightly older than the average SPI student. Otherwise, the group was representative of
the earlier demographics, included years of experience and their rank within their
respective departments. As far as regionality, one hailed from the Midwest, one from the
Pacific Northwest, and three from the Southern United States. As far as personalities, for
people who shared one profession, they were often strikingly different people, though
they were still bounded, both in positive and negative ways, by the need to be
recognizable to other police as police. I am thankful for the general openness and honesty
I feel they showed me during the course of this study, for tolerating questions that at
times felt very strange and disconnected from a study on writing, and for sharing their
writing process with me.

Katy Shim, the only female participant in this study, hailed from one of the states
on the Gulf of Mexico, where she served as a commander for one of her department's
patrol divisions. I had noticed Shim during my first presentation. With so few women in
the program, it would have been difficult not to, but Shim had seemed to be one of the
people who were likely to be interested in participating even before Hughes'
endorsement. She met my eyes several times during my presentation, so I was pleased,
but not surprised, when I received her email indicating her interest. I also wasn't
surprised when, from her initial email, she identified herself as a "strong writer" who felt
that she would probably do well in the assignments. Her interest in the study, she

---

[2] All names are pseudonyms. Two of the participants, Ken Powers and Alaric Danube, selected their own
aliases; the others were generated by me.

indicated, was in getting a professional writing teacher's help in understanding her own writing process, specifically the frustration she felt in starting writing without feeling, as she put it, "inspired."

This element of confidence carried through to the first time we formally met. Sitting calmly in a chair in the SPI's lobby, Shim hailed me as I walked past carrying a cup of coffee on my way to do class observations. Although I suspected she was the same Shim who had expressed interest in the study, that suspicion wasn't confirmed until she called out "Hey Terry" with a sense of familiarity that caught me a little off-guard. I sat and we chatted for a few minutes about her thoughts about writing and her expectations for the study, and I was struck by the ease with which she began a conversation with a stranger, something that carried through to the way she participated in class discussions, boldly and without hesitation. I have no doubt this sense of her identity also contributed to her being nominated a few weeks later for president of her AOC class, becoming possibly the first female in the history of SPI to be nominated for that leadership position. Although she did not win, the speech she gave to win support was bold, direct, and demonstrative of the same confidence she had displayed in our first communications.

However, through our interviews and over the course of the semester, I learned that her communication style, including her experiences with writing, hadn't always positively influenced her career. This kind of mixed relationship is something that I feel spilled over into her experiences with the AOC and the writing she was assigned. As I'll discuss in chapter three, Shim certainly engaged fully in her writing, especially Vito's assignments, but she also probably felt the strongest sense of conflict between how she wished to perform her identity and the boundaries of the assignments. In some ways, the

ways in which she experienced these conflicts were surprising, since I think she also feels the same tension in her professional writing. In many ways, conflict between her performances of her identity and the expectations of the Discourses in which she has pushed to enter was one of the defining themes of our discussions, including when it came to talking about her experiences with writing in her education. At the time of this study, she was completing her undergraduate degree in criminal justice, but had earned enough hours to enroll at the SPI as a graduate student.

Derrick Ross, the oldest participant in the study, hailed from the Pacific Northwest, where he held the rank of sergeant in a small department. This smaller size meant that his rank, while nominally lower than that of my other participants, was equivalent of the other participants, and later, as the semester drew to a close, we would learn that he was likely soon to become the new assistant chief of his department. Unlike Shim, I hadn't noticed Ross when I was recruiting individuals. In many ways, if he had not applied to participate in the study, I might have ever noticed him. During my early observations, he sat quietly but attentively in the same row as Shim and was overshadowed by her energy and confidence. Still, I was interested in speaking with him because he was the only applicant from his region, but I became even more interested when he first came up to speak to me while I was getting coffee.

He was not the first to greet me that day, but I noticed him early on. While other potential participants were coming up and greeting me, making sure I knew their names, Ross stood in the corner of the SPI's small break room and watched me interact with the others, his body language suggesting that he was waiting for his break to introduce himself. Where all of the others had introduced themselves without a seeming element of

nervousness, seeing Ross's hesitation was interesting in itself, so when he finally managed to come up and talk to me, I wasn't surprised when he almost entirely bypassed the small talk of introductions and asked if I'd selected my participants already. When I told him I hadn't, he seemed to deflate, his disappoint visible, a stark contrast to the in-stride confidence displayed by the others who had received the same answer. This contrast with the overt confidence of his classmates is what convinced me to ask Ross to participate, an offer he eagerly accepted.

As I'll discuss in chapter three, as I worked with Ross, no participant relied as heavily upon my writing advice or engaged so dutifully in the writing process as he did. At times, he'd request feedback on a draft every day of the week; he often immediately revised after he received my comments and returned an updated version within a few hours, seeking to make his papers "perfect." Where this type of drive was not uncommon among the students, in Ross's case, the type of perfection he sought wasn't just the mechanical perfection that other students seemed to want to pursue, but a sense of performing academic writing **as** academic writing, as a paper written not by a temporary visitor taking graduate classes, but as a graduate student writing graduate-level papers. I don't believe this occurred because Ross saw himself as an academic, but because I perceived a kind of tension in Ross when it came to the expectations and norms that came with the police Discourse that may have rooted in the way he entered the profession. Unlike the other participants, Ross became a police officer because, in his words, he "needed a job" and not because of a calling or conversion narrative. While his commitment to his profession had grown into "something intrinsic, within, something with some passion," his college education, completed before he began his twenty two

year career, had been a double major in anthropology and sociology with an interest in obtaining a teaching certificate. As a result, Ross seemed to experience a tension between some elements of his sense of identity and the police identity performances that were displayed by many of his colleagues, a tension that spilled into his desire not only to receive a high grade, but to write recognizably academic papers, to show himself that he was capable of that type of work.

Ken Powers hailed from a mid-sized sheriff's department in the interior Southern United States. He was the youngest participant in the study, the only undergraduate, and the one with the least experience with formal education. Based on his recollection, he had never actually written an academic essay. Midway through his K-12 education, his father had responded to Powers' experiencing a series of discipline problems in school by deciding to relocate to Alaska, where he and his son became caretakers of a hunting lodge. During the hunting season, they assisted lodge guests in a variety of ways; during the offseason, they stayed at the lodge, relatively isolated, and maintained it for the next season. Because of this isolation, Powers' father elected to teach his son by himself, usually relying on a method that Powers described as "read a lot." As guests left, they often left books behind because of weight issues, and his father would gather these, the lodge's existing library, and books he would request, and Powers would read all of them. While some math and other direct instruction was provided, this text-based method was Powers' primary education until he returned to the continental United States at age seventeen. [3]

---

[3] I recognize that Powers' account may seem unbelievable; however, during our interviews, he was consistent with it, and such positions (caretakers) do exist. Moreover, for the purposes of this study, because of its focus on **performances** of identity, the actual reality of this narrative doesn't matter.

Whatever his relationship with academic Discourses, he was certainly fluent in what one might call the Discourse of the Southern Cop. When Powers first hailed me from behind, barking my name in such a way that it almost sounded like "Stop!", I had an immediate sense of déjà vu. Although I was walking, not driving, I suddenly felt as I were being pulled over for speeding. Surprisingly, I felt anxious and guilty. The mirrored wrap-around shades he was wearing, despite our meeting occurring indoors, didn't help dispel the illusion. However, perhaps sensing my reaction, Powers quickly removed his shades and broke into an easy grin that instantly broke my momentary paralysis. He put out his hand, and we shook even before I said hello. Then he began telling me about his concerns about his first two papers without confirming whether or not he had been selected for the study. Still, I instantly knew I wanted to work with him. The combination of comforting confidence he radiated made him charismatic and seemed almost archetypical for someone in his position. I doubt I was the only one who responded that way, since he was nominated and easily elected for a leadership position for his class.

However, for all the ease he had with communicating with his classmates, Powers had the most complicated relationship with the writing he was asked to do. Although he worked quite hard, despite maintaining more social activity than the other participants in this study, and was willing to work through multiple drafts, he always seemed to be in tension with both the axiological and epistemic values of his assignments, producing papers that relied heavily on the styles he had learned working as an officer and that seemed to reject some of the nuanced thinking that several of the assignments called for. Although we worked through multiple drafts attempting to address these concerns, he

Rather, what matters is what this narrative does to present an identity – and how that relates to the decisions he made in his writing.

would often resist making significant changes in areas that I highlighted for lack of epistemic complexity. However, I do not think this was because Powers did not perceive the complexity. Although he was often self-deprecating about his intelligence, his perception of material in class and the types of questions he raised in discussions demonstrated an agile and highly capable mind.

Rather, it seemed that his sense of what he was and what he doing at the SPI influenced how he thought about the assignments he was asked to do, and where individuals like Ross would suppress their frustrations with instructors or assignments, Powers openly expressed his anger at how a particular professor taught, how the assignments were designed, and how his papers were evaluated. That conflict, which I'll further explain in chapter three, seemed rooted in a conflict of Discourses that led to a rejection of possibilities.

Alaric Danube, whose age fit in the middle of the participants, hailed from mid-size Midwestern police department, where he serves the department in a variety of administrative functions, including leading recruiting efforts. Although he sometimes referred to his area of the country as a place for "us hicks," Danube was clearly proud of his department, his work there, and the level of education he had achieved – degrees in both accounting and finance. Pride was, in fact, kind of a key word to Danube, both one he used to describe his own actions and one I feel is appropriate to use to describe his choices as well. Unlike other participants, even Powers, Danube was clearly confident in his abilities, the rightness of his thinking, the importance of his work, and his sense of what he had come to the SPI to do.

I can best explain this sense by discussing our first meeting, which occurred while I was attempting to recruit the one African-American student who had an expressed an interest in participating in the study. Although that student eventually chose not to participate, Danube sat on the same row and listened intently to our conversation. When I provided the potential participant with a copy of the study's informed consent form, Danube leaned over and asked, "Hey Terry, do you have another one of those things?" At first, I declined, but the impression stuck with me. Unlike Powers (and, to a lesser degree, Shim), who had created a situation where it was as if I were under his authority, or Ross, who gave me the authority of a teacher, Danube suggested a kind of equality. He recognized me as capable; he wanted me to recognize him as capable. He was interested in participating in the study, but he was pursuing that curiosity about the study, not any sense of need for the help I had promised. As he made clear over our discussions, he was interested in what participating in an academic study would be like.

However, when it came to the writing he was doing for the program, that interest always came into conflict with his pride when it came to requesting assistance with his writing. Danube requested the least assistance on any participant, finally telling me during our second meeting that he felt that it was his sense of pride, rather than a belief that my help wasn't needed, that kept him from requesting assistance. Indeed, he thought that as far as questions of grammar and style, my assistance may have benefitted him, but Danube seemed to feel that using me as a support wasn't getting the full benefit of his education. This performance of identity is one that I'll explore further in chapter three, and it is significant because of his reluctance to receive assistance with his writing and what that reveals about a certain type of Discourse conflict.

John Thornton, the final participant in this study, was only a few years younger than Ross, but perhaps because of the range of his career – by far the widest of the group – nothing about his attitude revealed that age. Hailing, like Shim, from one of the Gulf Coast states, Thornton had worked in a variety of positions at one department over his seventeen non-consecutive years, in addition to four years serving as a military police officer. Unlike the others' stories, which were mostly narratives in which they had advanced in one career with one department (perhaps after transferring from one), Thornton had actually left the profession at one point and returned to college with the intention of becoming a nurse. However, because he was frustrated with the way that the school he attended treated returning students (as he recounts, treating them like elementary school children), he left and returned to working in his department, accepting that he would not be able to resume his previous rank and would be "starting right at the very bottom again." This experience will be one that I develop further in chapter three as it reveals important elements about how students may develop a more flexible performance of identity that does not bar moments of potential transfer. Upon returning to the force, because the senior officers at his department valued education and anyone who left to pursue education, Thornton was able to make rank more quickly than he had the first time, advancing to his current position over a computer crime section of his department.

Unlike the other four participants, Thornton never approached me. He sat a row behind Shim and Ross, and he watched my interactions with them, but it wasn't until I began to review the remaining potential participants and saw his placement, unique among those who wanted to participate, in computer crime that I decided to follow up on

my own. At the time, I wondered if his experience with a division of police work that often contained a great deal of writing (since a forensic analysis of a computer's contents requires a great deal of writing) would influence the way that he approached his academic writing assignments. In reflection, I agree with his own evaluation that it probably did not affect such approaches because the assignments did not draw from or activate the types of Discourses associated with technological knowledge. Our actual first meeting was remarkably unremarkable. Since he had watched me go through the consent forms with Shim and Ross, he seemed to take my asking him to participate as a given, taking the form and signing it without consideration.

This kind of attitude also describes some of the approach Thornton seemed to take with his writing. Although he always submitted a draft to me and seemed to take my advice seriously, he never engaged as deeply in his use of the tutoring as Ross and Smit did, but neither did he reject revision suggestions like Powers sometimes did. Instead, Thornton seemed to take what might be termed a complicit approach. If he resisted any element of the writing assignments, the resistance was never deep enough to cause him to reject any assignment or its implications, but his level of engagement with it remained ambivalent. As I'll further discuss in chapter three, Thornton's performance of identity neither enabled nor disabled potential points of transfer; rather, because he seemed to understand the SPI as a tool for his career advancement, he looked for what "worked" and would be successful enough.

Summary

In this chapter, I provided the following information:

1. By exploring my first experiences at the Southern Police Institute, I provided **an overview of the SPI's history, design, course structure, instructors, and general student demographics.**

2. Through further detailing the course designs, **I provided an overview of the different writing assignments given throughout the AOC**.

3. After discussing these course designs and their writing assignments, **I explained my reasoning for focusing most of my observation hours on the experiences of one course, Vito's Leadership course**.

4. I quickly **described the recruiting process for this study and the transition to participant observer that took place early in the study**.

5. Finally, **I provided a brief overview of the five student participants, their experiences with education, and some sense of their experiences as writers in this study**.

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT EXPERIENCES

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I provided an overview of the Southern Police Institute

(SPI), the site for this study, including a brief overview of its history and how it seems to

be generally perceived by the law enforcement industry. I also provided an overview of

the different classes that make up the Administrative Officer's Course (AOC), the

semester-long program offered by the SPI that is designed to help mid-level police

leaders further develop into potential top-tier police leaders, and gave some details about

the different instructors in this program. After this, I explained why this study focused on

one of the four courses and then introduced the five participants in the study.

In this chapter, I focus on the experiences of those five participants and how those

experiences illustrate the interplay between the performance of identity and the

possibility for productive transfer of knowledge. I first discuss the experience of Katy

Shim, whose experience demonstrates how the desire to perform some forms of identity

(and the Discourses that provide the "identity kit" used for that performance) can lead to

moments in which productive transfer of knowledge can become limited. After, I discuss

the experiences of Ken Powers and Alaric Danube, who both illustrate different elements

of how the performance of identity, especially the components of identity related to

dominant gender expectations, can close off productive exchanges with other Discourses

and thus lead to moments of so-called 'negative' transfer and the rejection of offers by tutors and teachers to help bridge the gaps between their identities' Discourses and other Discourses. Finally, I discuss the experiences of Derrick Ross and John Thornton to discuss how certain flexible performances of identity might better position learners to bridge those gaps between Discourses without feeling that doing so threatens that performance of identity.

Shim: The Cost of Being "Creative"

A key example of how the performance of identity negatively affected the selection and transfer of previously successful writing strategies is the experience of Katy Shim as she drafted the first of her assignments for Vito's class, the leadership case study paper. In this assignment, the students were asked to relate their experience with a leader who shaped their understanding of what it means to be a leader by applying the leadership framework of The Leadership Challenge.

This is a long standing assignment in Vito's course, and most students, including Shim, had access to submitted and graded papers from previous classes, and as I noted in chapter two, current students were highly likely to share drafts with each other. Moreover, because other students knew that Shim was receiving feedback from me as part of this study and because she represented herself as a strong writer both to me and to her classmates, she reported that often, her fellow students came knocking on her door seeking her help. Thus, Shim had numerous examples of antecedent successful approaches to the assignment and was made aware of the approaches being taken by her peers, including other participants (Ross and Thornton in particular) in this study.

In most cases, one would think that such exposure would lead a student writer motivated to achieve the highest grade possible to draw heavily on the same writing strategies she saw being used by most, strategies that had been rewarded in papers submitted in earlier years. Moreover, these strategies frequently employed many of the writing strategies that are valued in police writing, including clear headings, topic sentences, focus on concrete details, and an unornamented style. As such, a writer well versed and successful in performing as a successful police writer would perceive those overlaps as moments of affordance to transfer. Surprisingly, however, Shim chose not to adapt any of these strategies and went a different direction, drawing from a different Discursive identity. She wrote, as she phrased it, "from [her] heart," resulting in a drafting process that was extremely messy, extremely frustrating to her, and seemingly about attempting to build a bridge between two Discursive identities: the police writer and a writer with a very different subjectivity.

To understand why Shim's approach was such a radical rejection of the approaches she would normally use as a police writer, consider the following section (answering the rhetorical question "What is Style?") from Kelly Roger Rupp's Police Writing: A Guide to the Essentials (2005):

In your English Composition I and II classes, you probably used expository style. That means you used colorful language, long sentences, long paragraphs, and vivid descriptions . . . In terms of style, criminal justice writing is very different from expository writing. In fact, in many ways, it is exactly the opposite. The K.I.S.S. method (Keep It Short and Simple) is a rule of thumb for criminal justice writing. You have to write a 10-page research paper, but it needs to be full of

facts, figures, observations, and direct quotes rather than interpretation, personal

feelings, and speculation. (p. 4).

Such comparisons are echoed across police writing guides, each one creating binaries

between the type of writing that police do and the type of writing that others – especially

college English programs – train students to do. As a result, these guides project two

Discursive identities tied to different Institutional identities and place them in opposition

to each other.

Ross's approach, which was developed by looking at multiple example papers,

demonstrates how the stylistics often associated with "being a police writer" were

typically applied:

Leadership Methods

I first met L.H. in the winter of 1989. He was a member of the oral board that was

evaluating me for hire. The five member board consisted of four civic leaders who

were wearing shirts and ties. L.H. was the only member of the Department on the

board. I quickly noticed that L.H. was wearing his Department- issued uniform.

This brief excerpt demonstrates the norms used by police Discursive identity that may, as

discussed in chapter one, be potential points of conflict between two different Discourses:

the axiological norms and the epistemic norms. First, the aesthetic approach matches up

with the sample papers Ross and others had received from previous generations of SPI

students. As here, all of them kept with the consistent use of bolded or underlined section

headings, clear topic sentences, short sentence lengths, and the predictable subject-verb-

object sentence structures Ross uses in this example. All of these tendencies are taught and valued in police writing.

Epistemically, Ross demonstrates – either consciously or unconsciously – the ways of knowing stressed by his police writing training. The inclusion of important factual details of the room (the number of people present, the type of board, the season, his leader's physical appearance) all speak to the types of knowledge that police Discourse values, what is often called the "just the facts" approach of police writing. Axiologicallly, it also demonstrates many of the values of police Discourse. Instead of evoking a description of the feeling of cold, it is simply winter. Instead of communicating the pressure of speaking to a group of strangers, it was simply an oral board. Rather than revealing his leader's choice to wear his uniform as part of a character-defining action, Ross used the strategies of police narratives in that he neutrally "noticed" the clothing choice.

In contrast, Shim's first draft of her essay eschewed all of these strategies, creating points of conflict between both sets of norms. Long at fifteen pages, it contained a brief discussion of Kouzes and Posner's framework for leadership that lasted for only the first paragraph, a nod toward the assignment's request, and then abandoned all direct reference to the model or the analysis requested of her. Instead, Shim's essay became a tribute piece to "one such great leader" and "how he impacted [her] life," a deeply personal biographical sketch of a man who, in many respects, appeared to serve as a kind of father figure for her, an important connection to her understanding of why she entered police work in the first place: the stories told to her by her father and grandfather. Although those stories turned out to be exaggerations, Shim's repeated references to a

kind of "following in the footsteps" narrative in both interviews and her paper reveal the importance of this element of her understanding and thus performance of her identity as a police officer and what police Discourse meant.

Instead of using the strategies highlighted by the quote from Ross's draft, Shim's tone and stylistic elements would be more commonly encountered in the expository Discourse that Rupp's writing advice identified as the binary opposite of the values of police Discourse. For example, the first body paragraph in her second draft demonstrates the strong stylistic and epistemic differences between her approach and those typically used by police writing:

> On a cold December night in West Union, Ohio, H. and N. B. received an early Christmas present, the birth of their first child, a small baby boy who entered the world that night quietly. He did not cry until prompted by the attending doctor. Once in the arms of his mother, he settled quietly and looked at her deeply with patient eyes.

The scene-setting used in this approach, so dramatic and laden with stylistic adjectives (his "patient eyes", the placement of the child as a Christmas present), represents not only an axiological difference in the sentence length and sentence structure, but also an epistemic difference in the types of details given.

In contrast, consider the approach used by Powers, the writer most dependent on the strategies of police writers. He opened his description of his leader in the same way one might write the description of a suspect:

R.G. is a white male 5'11" 56 years old around 230 pounds. He is from B., TN, which is a small farm community in [the Midwest]. The population of B. in 2003 was estimated at 1852 with a police force today of eight officers. Chief G. was the oldest of six with three brothers and two sisters.

With this information, a reader is more likely prepared to pick R.G. out of a police lineup than to understand what he might demonstrate as a leader, but as Ross's inclusion to begin his description of his leader with distinctions in his physical appearance demonstrates, Powers' version is simply a stronger version of the hallmark axiological and epistemic norms of police writing.

However, it isn't just the use of narrative that makes the approach Shim uses as different as it is. After all, Ross's opening is narrative as well, and the physical description he provides of his leader's clothing choice does more than provide the type of information that police Discourse would expect. Although not developed in a dramatic way, it serves as an element of characterization because the distinction of his leader's choice to wear his uniform becomes an important element upon which Ross builds. Shim's approach might draw more from dramatic tropes and use more figurative language, but otherwise it still conveys important information.

As her paper advances, however, the most striking difference is her ongoing resistance to providing the type of textual guidance represented by the use of section headings and clear transition elements, axiological norms that support the epistemic goals of police writing and demonstrated in the selection from Ross. For instance, in the same draft, she provides a description of her leader's (T.B.) experiences with education and then switches topic to his abilities with a firearm:

87

T.B. himself was an amazing shooter. He was on the range regularly. He believed that every skill a law enforcement officer was trained with had to be honed to perfection because one never knew when they would need to pull it from the tool box. No matter what, survival was the goal. T.B. wanted every cop to go home at the end of the shift.

At first, the reader may look at this selection and think that it demonstrates that as Shim began to speak more about police writing activities, elements closer to her sense of police identity, she began to more closely represent the norms of police Discourse. The shorter sentences and the subject-verb-object structure would suggest such, and this opening of a new paragraph provides a topic sentence to indicate what will follow.

However, where such a paragraph would normally proceed out of a related description, the transition between it and the previous paragraph was almost entirely missing, which became a repeated concern during the drafting process of this paper. At first, when I received these drafts for feedback, I thought Shim was simply being overwhelmed with the different stories of her experiences with T.B. and wanted to relate them all one by one without a structure that connected them all to the assignment and to each other, but after I met with her, it became clear that this was a conscious decision. Rather than building on the strategies she possessed as a successful police writer, strategies that both her peers and the antecedent papers she had access to had used, she was choosing to relate her experiences with T.B. from a different perspective.

I scheduled a meeting with her to go over the drafts because I was confused. After all, Shim had described herself as a strong writer, and each of the individual stories of T.B. were all written with demonstrable skill, albeit with strategies that were quite

different from what police writing would have asked her to use. They painted, in vivid and often moving language, powerful images of the man, his life, and the impact he had made on Shim and her understanding of what it meant to be a police officer and a police leader. Taken individually, they were often quite powerful, but seen holistically and through the framework of the assignment, they were desperately in need of some type of organizational structure, like the headings and chronological organization that would have been emphasized in police writing, to guide the reader. None of her other writing, including her emails to me and an earlier essay, demonstrated similar concerns with transitions between concepts. Why, then, did this paper suffer from such problems? If she had access to previously successful papers from the course, saw the approaches being taken by her peers in the program, and had received writing instruction that should have led her to take an approach similar to those she saw, why did she refuse to act upon those affordances, those moments of potentially productive transfer, and elect to follow her own path?

When we met, I asked her a version of these questions. After she took a moment to think about it, she told me that she knew what I was talking about because she had seen those elements in the drafts of her peers and understood why they would include them. However, she didn't want her writing to have them, even if it would harm her grade. She explained that she looked at her "approach to . . . learning, and . . . I tend to think about my work and it's important to me to make it meaningful, not just okay, got to do this, get the A, and then move on," and that using the section headings and other elements she had seen in the others reduced the meaning of the writing to her. The stories mattered; the analysis, especially if it got in the way of telling those stories, didn't.

One particular approach that she saw in multiple drafts (and which appeared in both Ross and Thornton's approach) was breaking the last section of the paper down into the different elements of Kouzes and Posner's leadership style. In Ross's version, which was similar to the more common approaches used by both Shim's current and antecedent peers, each of these sections told two narratives, one that revealed a strength of his leader in that element and one that revealed a weakness in that element, an adaptation of a kind of comparison and contrast approach. Potentially, this was a moment of productive transfer from school-like writing instruction, not necessarily a strategy valued as part of police Discourse. Shim, however, revealed that she felt that such an approach "sucked the life" out of the paper, making it seem dull and something she was "only writing for a grade." It wasn't that she was rejected the leadership model, its qualities, or even the idea of doing the analysis; instead, she rejected the idea that she would need to apply such an artificial structure to the assignment.

"Structure" was, in many ways, something of a Burkean devil term for Shim. In our first interview, when I asked her about her biggest concerns about the writing she would be required to do for the AOC, she responded:

Shim: Heartburn. [laughs] Because there's so much structure.

Me: So many of the assignments seem so structured?

Shim: Well, yes and no . . . I think I'm going to be okay, for the most part, with mostly everything. It's just keeping up with it because I've got that hiccup where I feel that I need to be inspired to write to get it right. But . . . I'm apprehensive about [the ones that are] going to be more analytical I think.

The contrasts Shim created at this point in our interview between the "so much structure" of the writing assignments and her "need to be inspired to write" is one that she repeatedly turned to in our discussion. When she was explaining her relationship with her previous academic writing, she explained that in many cases, she had felt "like it was just going through the motions[, and she] didn't feel that there was any value to it. It was just an assignment" because you had to "give the professors what they wanted." Only rarely did she encounter professors and evaluators who saw "beyond just the proper structure" of the paper towards the deeper meaning that really mattered to her.

Only one course, a required university colloquium course, had provided Shim with a writing experience that matched her desires and in which she felt she was really capable of fully engaging. Instead of insisting on writing that was formally structured and resembled the section-by-section analysis that Shim resented, this teacher would:

> . . . take us out to the field, and we'd sit and close our eyes and listen to the wind and stuff. And then we'd have to draw what she called a sound picture. Different things like that. But actually, I really learned a lot from her, and I liked that her writing allowed me to express more than just facts. That was the first class that I had that allowed me to explore more than just facts. It allowed me to be a little bit creative, it allowed me to reach inside, for feelings and things and be able to express my thoughts on how I took the world in. It was really, really nice.

If "structure" was a devil term for Shim, then "creative" was a bit of a god term, a word intrinsically linked to the values she held for herself and which she wished to be understood as part of her identity. Her repetition in the above quote of creative writing allowing her to reach beyond "just facts" when police writing is synonymous with "just

the facts" illustrates the strength of this conflict for her. Rejecting the framework used by Ross and many of the other writers in favor of the collection of stories approach she had taken was a clear decision to assert that independence, to celebrate her sense of being creative while simultaneously communicating these narratives about this figure.

However, the tension between the terms "structured" and "creative" was not one that began with Shim; like all elements of a Discourse, it was something that always already existed antecedent to Shim, and is strongly tied to the performance of one Discourse with and against others, since as Gee notes, all Discourses are partly defined through contrastive definitions with other Discourses. The values and sense of identity Shim associated with the word "creative" provided a way for her to reject the alienation, denial of self, and "just an assignment" perception she saw in the word "structured." Moreover, Shim is clearly capable of successfully writing within highly structured genres; police reports, above all, are highly structured and predictable in their format, and she had been successfully writing them for the majority of her career. Those reports must be so structured in order to satisfy and survive inspection by multiple audiences. Her rejection of the term in this instance, her choice to turn against those elements of "structure" she had mastered in other situations and not transfer them here, wasn't so much an epistemic rejection but an axiological rejection of one Discursive identity assignment against another.

Understanding why that rejection was occurring, I believe, requires consideration of Shim's complex identity not only as a police leader but as a female police leader. It is important to note that Shim was visibly female at all times, performing many of the values of what Raewyn Connell calls emphasized feminity, at least in the United States:

long hair, feminine clothing styles, and augmenting her appearance with makeup. She was recognized not just as a police officer but as someone participating in a feminine Discourse. This recognition is important because, as Courtney Franklin (2005) notes, criminal justice researchers have long noted the disproportionate underrepresentation of women in the ranks of police officers, as well as the tension and "extreme resistance by fellow officers" to their increasing membership in police ranks and in police leadership (p. 2). Women report that they "have difficulty penetrating the police organization in terms of promotion, deployment, and other pertinent opportunities like networking, information access, and supporting managerial relations because [the masculine-dominated organization believes] they do not belong there in the first place" (2005, p. 4). In Franklin's analysis, this is because policing, as one of "the most male dominated of institutions," is a gendered organization, meaning that it is an organization "defined [by] the process and structure of social relations constituted by and through gender or gender relations" (p. 5). This definition includes all activities of policing, including the epistemic and axiological norms associated with police writing. In other words, police writing, its norms, and its expectations, are inherently gendered because those standards were created to serve gendered social activities.

Seen from the synthetic framework of Connell's idea of hegemonic masculinities and Gee's Discourse theory I proposed in chapter one, understanding policing as a gendered organization means understanding policing as a site in which the historically dominant Discourses of the United States, tied as they were with the historical image of police as "white, middle-class men", led to a profession in which relatively few versions of the performance of gender would be accepted as legitimate, right, or valid.

Historically, as Deborah Parsons and Paul Jesilow (2001) note, the gender divisions of police labor before the 1960s/1970s meant that "men and women worked in separate spheres" of policing (p. 32). Policewomen were encouraged to use "the special qualities of womanhood" to perform police labor that was different from the work that policemen performed; indeed, "women recognized and promoted their unique differences in philosophy and ability . . . [and] viewed themselves as social workers and not as 'cops'" (p. 32, 36). The result was that "crime fighting and law enforcement were male domains" while women were tasked to prevent crime through entering the social sphere (p. 37).

This division of labor encoded a hegemonic masculinity for policing based upon attributes perceived as male (action-oriented, tough, capable in a fight, etc.) while reinforcing popular concepts of emphasized femininity (insurers of domestic peace, soothers of struggle, etc.) for the policewomen. The genres of writing served social actions within those spheres, unifying the exigencies for writing with the social norms dominant in each.

However, when the equality movements of the 1960s and 1970s lead to policewomen being reassigned from their "special" duties to patrol work, the conception of these separate spheres disappeared, leading only the genderless police officer who happened to perform all of the duties of the former policeman and none of the duties of the now forgotten policewoman (pp. 42-43). In Parsons and Jesilow's words, "[the] unique professional position of quasi-social worker, which the pioneer policewomen had worked so hard to create, vanished, leaving the crime control function" and its hegemonic masculine Discourse as the sole recognized role of police (p. 43). This shift lead to its

nature as a gendered organization in which the only intelligible performance of policing was fundamentally rooted in masculine-associated performances of identity. As Parsons and Jesilow note, the result is that:

> To be successful, the female officer, or for that matter any officer, must share the values and norms of the police culture. The female recruit who wants to win the approval of her colleagues must either bring with her to the job the values and norms of the police culture or she must adopt them early in her career. Rookies who do not conform to the group's norms are shunned or ridiculed by orthodox members of the culture and expect their police careers to be difficult and probably short-lived. Certainly, they would have little chance for promotion since they would be excluded from the departments' information social networks, which are the keys to opportunity for mobility within the organization. (p. 47)

Although Parsons and Jesilow do not include writing as part of their study, it seems reasonable to assume that the collapse of roles also lead to the collapse of genres, leaving the only style for police writing as the one associated with the male function of police work before the collapse.

Shim's narrative of her early experiences in policing supports Parsons and Jesilow's history of women in policing. When she entered policing in the 1980s, she "was one of three women working the road, only one of two who didn't look like a truck driver, and the other one who didn't look like a truck driver had a reputation for going in, putting on makeup three or four times a shift, and not engaging" in her law enforcement duties. While recognizable as feminine and so compatible with expectations of emphasized femininity, when it came to communicating with her supervisors and

95

wondering why certain policies continued or required certain actions, her supervisors saw Shim as challenging them and the system they represented. This led to repeated conflicts, which Shim admits she "didn't always handle well," but eventually she became determined to "learn some better skills at sending [her] message" and changing the way in which she interacted. As Parsons and Jesilow note, "[w]omen who do enter policing and are successful either possess or assimilate the values already established in the system," and thus, Shim's acquisition of "better" communication skills was a process of assimilating communication values and norms that were inherently, because of the history of police Discourse, gendered masculine. In turn, like many of the female police officers who participated in Parsons and Jesilows' study, she "hid [her] feminine side while on the job, presumably in order to fit in with other officers and to conform to the public's image of police officers" (p. 179).

However, the key to this hiding of a feminine side is that it is only hidden "on the job," not deleted from a person's understanding of themselves or from the collection of Discourses that make up identities. As such, I believe that Shim's decision to resist the norms of police writing, the "structure" she dreaded so, was based on her desire to perform Discursive approaches culturally associated with emphasized femininity, all of which she lumped under the term "creative." By this, I am not suggesting that "creativity" is a Nature-level identity for women. Instead, because Shim represented her most positive writing experience in college as when a female instructor took the class outside and engaged in free-flowing writing that didn't depend on representations of "facts," at the Discourse-level, the strategies used for this type of writing were oppositional to those stressed by the dominant "just the facts" Discourse of policing.

Furthermore, I think that positive recollection of a very different writing style and writing moment indicates the tension she continued to feel with the dominant and gendered norms of police writing, and she never squelched her desire to do otherwise, to be otherwise.

Importantly, rather than rising to her position through the manipulation of and recognition by the social network of advanced police officers that Parsons and Jesilow note is so crucial for ascending to leadership positions, Shim believed that her opportunity for advancement was created by a literal force of nature. When an extremely powerful hurricane ripped through her region, the damage disrupted the normal command structure, leaving a leadership vacuum. People who, according to plan, should have stepped up to assume command of different resources simply could not be contacted. Based on Shim's recounting, she simply did what needed to be done, which might be true, but she demonstrated a high level of capability with leadership, communication, and organization. As a result, she seized the opportunity, took control of a communication system that was not working effectively, and used her force of will to organize efforts that were in chaos. Notably, the storm had muted the normal command flow; those who would normally speak to create order were unable to use their communication systems. Shim, however, never lost the ability to communicate, so she spoke into that silence.

When the storm cleared, the chaos it had sown left her town rebuilding and her department forced to recognize her leadership capabilities regardless of the social order that had existed before it. Thus, Shim ascended, but she did it without moving through the normal needing to become recognizably acceptable to the social network of existing leadership that might have limited her ascension had "business as usual" not been

disrupted by the storm and the chaos it caused. Importantly, I am not suggesting that Shim's rise was accidental. Rather, I am suggesting that it occurred because of a moment of exploiting kairos in which the Discursive boundaries that defined who could lead were momentarily sundered. Doing so was not luck but an expression of the abilities she already possessed.

In a parallel way, I think that Shim, because she had benefitted from taking advantage of situations that allowed her to act differently than expected, saw the leadership essay as an opportunity to express elements of identity she felt were denied to her by the limitations of police Discourse. Rather than repeating the assignment in ways that had been successful, ways she understood through her years of successful police writing, she wanted to draw from her "creative self," the self that existed in other Discursive relations, to tell the story of this important police leader who mattered to her more as a person than as an object of analysis. As such, rather than selecting to take advantage of the affordances she clearly (based on our discussion) saw being used in both the antecedent drafts and her peers' drafts, she chose to write expressively, emotionally, and poetically, all stylistic approaches rejected by the hegemonic masculinity of police Discourse.

As one might imagine, when a writer was so strongly motivated by a desire to perform one identity over another, asking that writer to make concessions to the other identity is not often successful and never easy. Despite this, Shim and I ultimately managed to find a third way, a bridge between the two identities able to write a paper all recognized as successful. My experiences working as Shim's tutor during this process informs much of my thinking in chapter five about how we, as composition instructors,

can help students like Shim to avoid rejecting affordances and to smooth the conflicts between identities they perceive. I believe I successfully negotiated a middle ground, an alternative sense of identity, between Shim's rejection of "structure" and her desire for the "creative" by operating from the following three principles:

1. First, building on Gee's argument that the central element of identity, as it relates to Discourse performance, is being recognized, I strove to recognize both performances of identity I saw in what Shim was doing. After my initial confusion cleared, I began to understand that she wanted and needed to be recognized as the creative writer she felt was normally silenced when she was recognized as a cop, but that this did not mean that she did not want to still be recognized as the capable police officer and leader she was. Shim, in the way she positioned "creative" and "structure" against each other, created a binary opposition in which the two possible recognitions were exclusive of each other. In order to make it possible for her to perceive that synthesis was possible between them, I had undermine that opposition by recognizing both at once, creating a pedagogic space in which they could work together.

2. Second, the key to that recognition was understanding how important it was to Shim that her successes as a creative writer were recognized by those, like me, who existed outside the confines of police Discourse and the distrust it held for "colorful language" (the "patient eyes" of Shim's leader as an infant). As someone participating in some version of an academic Discourse, I was someone she could show a different Discourse-identity to in hopes that I would recognize it and validate it. Thus, a significant portion of our sessions were spent in analysis

of the moments when she had skillfully created imagery, provided a touching detail, or carefully revealed a compelling bit of character. Where another approach might suggest that the proper strategy would have been to advise Shim to "get over herself" (to quote advice I received regarding this experience from a peer) and her commitment to this approach, since it so interfered with any form of clear analysis as required by the assignment, I believe that only by recognizing those successes, only by valuing those successes, could I negotiate the oppositional binary that Shim saw between the "structured" Discourse-identity of police writing and the "creative" Discourse-identity she wanted to present in this writing. Telling her to "get over herself" would have meant telling her to reject one of the Discursive selves, and thus it would have positioned me as a member of a Discourse against which she was struggling.

3. Third, to accomplish this division, I needed to recognize that I, too, was split between these recognitions, and that while I understood that while her current paper did not satisfy what I understood the assignment to be calling for, the elements that I was frustrated by were not objectively 'wrong' but emerging from a social legacy. This isn't to say that such norms (clear headings, topic sentences, transition elements, etc.) were not ways to remedy the confusion I saw in her paper; it is to say they weren't the only way. Forcing them on the paper would not create a meaningful revision that satisfied both of Shim's writer selves. Whatever solution we'd reach would have to be just that: one we reached together.

Experienced teachers will, of course, look at these principles and think that they illustrate generally well-accepted elements of good teaching. However, what these

principles contribute to those elements is an understanding of **why** they work, why they enable a writer to take on the norms of another Discourse as compatible with their own and successfully bring writing strategies from other Discourses into new writing tasks.

In the case of Shim, what these principles enabled was a middle ground between the two extremes she perceived. Together, we constructed a sense of a new hybrid Discourse, a way of being that bridged between the "creative" collection of powerful narratives and the "structured" paper that drew so heavily on the norms of police writing. By recognizing how successful those narratives were, I was able to convince her that they could remain intact and not be harmed by adding what I termed "signposts" to guide the reader towards understanding what each of the stories was meant to illustrate. These signposts began as short paragraphs, but by the end of the final drafting period, she had developed these into multi-paragraph segments that integrated useful quotes from Kouzes and Posner to provide the reader with clear guidance as to how to see her leader in the same way she saw him, as embodying, through his actions, many of the qualities of one who took up The Leadership Challenge.

As a result, rather than receiving a paper that might not have been seen as meeting the requirements of the assignment, Vito was extremely satisfied with her paper and awarded her (and a few other students in the class) a small prize when he handed out the graded papers. When I asked him later why those papers had received the awards, he said that they moved him and went beyond the expectations of the assignment. According to him, most of his police writers "have a tendency to write about people that they work with and how they're a good role model," the facts of police leadership that are emphasized in police writing and within police Discourse. However, while those papers were successful

enough, they lacked the type of personal connection he valued, the expression of experience that went beyond the detailed explanation of facts. The awarded papers wrote "about brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers and grandfathers, and they really thought about it, and they expressed themselves well by telling a personal story." In other words, they drew from the type of writing strategies that Rupp, in her guide to training police writers, rejected.

Ultimately, although all of the students in the study received high grades on this paper, Shim's resistance of the easy affordances led, in this moment, to a higher degree of success than those who more easily depended on the antecedent genres and norms of police writing. As I will explain in chapter four, this result provided interesting insight into what moments of transfer Vito (and other instructors) were prepared to recognize.

Powers and Danube: Doing it the Police Way

Shim may have resisted the productive transfer of strategies from her police Discourse-level identity in favor of her desire to apply "creative" writing strategies that she had developed as part of a very different Discourse-level identity, strategies she consciously or unconsciously felt were repressed by the gendered norms of police Discourse. However, the experiences of Powers and Danube highlight how a very different relationship with police writing norms and their associated Discourse-level identity might inhibit the possibilities for productive transfer to academic writing situations. These experiences included negatively transferring strategies, embracing an agonistic stance against the values of academic writing, and resisting the efforts of academic resources like university writing centers that are designed to offer support as a

writer navigates his or her sense of self through the different academic Discourses they will encounter throughout his or her education.

Powers, in particular, demonstrates how a rigid allegiance to one identity and the Discourse associated with it might lead to unproductive conflicts. As noted in chapter two, Powers was the lone undergraduate to participate in this study, a status he owed to the narrative he told of his experiences in Alaska with his father (in which education became, as he phrased it, being told to "go read some books" left by the visitors to the hunting lodge at which he and his father worked). As a result, unlike all of the other participants, Powers had the least amount of training with academic writing genres and approaches, much less than a typical first year college student who had been apprenticed into versions of them through their high school experiences.

However, this isn't to say that Powers had a negative relationship with writing, although he strongly identified himself as "not a writer." Rather, Powers represented himself as a strong advocate for the importance of writing in police work. During our discussion of the type of training he and other police received during their time in the academy, he shifted the conversation from his experiences in that class, which he described as mostly textbook-based and worksheet-dependent, to his experiences as a Field Training Officer (FTO) teaching recruits how to write successfully for the department.

Key to Powers' approach was a version of what Parsons and Jesilow refer to as "stress training", a common feature of police academy training that was imported from military boot camps (p. 86-87). Powers explained that when a recruit would be asked to write a police report of an incident, the law of his state required that the witness of the

incident sign the report. Normally, this approach was satisfied by having the witness sign

a blank version of the document. The reporting officer would then create the narrative

based on his or her notes. Adapted to the field training process, Powers explained that he

would bring six or more blank copies of the police report template along with him and

have the witness sign all of the copies. The recruit would then be expected to write the

report and bring it to Powers on one of the signed templates. If Powers didn't approve of

the approach the recruit had taken, he would give the recruit feedback on what was

wrong, and require that he or she write it again, rendering the signed copy of the template

useless.

This process would repeat until the recruit produced an acceptable report. If this

took more than the number of signed copies of the template, then the recruit would be

required to locate the witness again and get more copies signed, a time-consuming

process that both shamed the recruit (in both the eyes of the department and the public)

and stressfully reinforced the importance of writing the right way (as defined by the

department and Discourse in which they all participated). This stress-training process also

forged a transition of Discursive-identity. Whatever training the recruit had received in

writing before coming was no longer the "right" way to write. The right way to write was

determined by his or her FTO, the representative of the "right" way to write for the

department's Discourse. The recruit would either find a way to bridge between previous

identities and the one required of him or her, or he or she would never complete training

successfully.

In contrast, Shim, when asked about how she worked to help officers get past

writing difficulties, explained that she often required that officers enroll in first year

composition courses at the local community college in order to improve their writing styles. This push causes students to go outside the bounds of the police community for training in writing, to go to a place where the type of writing being taught (as Rupp's Police Writing notes) often represents a very different set of epistemic and axiological values than the ones that police Discourse hold dear. Moreover, as Parsons and Jesilow note, college campuses in general tend to provide a very different experience in becoming recognizable to police Discourse; training "conducted on college campuses . . . likely involved less belittling" and other elements of stress training "than training conducted at other sites" (p. 87). In the community college, failure to meet Discursive expectations would not mean the same type of social embarrassment that failing to complete a successful report before running out of signed blanks did in Powers' recounting of his training.

Powers' method, then, speaks to a more exclusive (in that it excludes other possible senses of identity) way of training a police officer, one that connected to a reported benefit of stress training. The older participants in Parsons and Jesilow's study reported that while stress training might have been harder on recruits, the other alternative was "'wishy-washy' rookies who . . . still had not decided 'whether they wanted to be cops or not'" (p. 87). Powers' writing instruction and its extremely low tolerance for "doing it the wrong way" left no room for writers who were uncertain how police wrote or uncommitted to adding that way of writing, and all of its elements of identity, to their own. If Discursive conflicts were too strong, then the recruits would find no way to bridge those differences and find a place within the department's community,

but those who did overcome those differences would find themselves more committed to the new Discourse they had learned.

As a result, Powers felt a strong sense of mastery over a certain "right" way to write, a way that was intrinsically tied up to his sense of how to be a police officer and how to be recognized as such. As indicated in chapter two, Powers was successfully elected as a leader of the Administrative Officers' Course I observed, but that election was more a popularity contest than it was a contest of ideas. Although each office held some duties, such as speaking at graduation and creating a history of that specific AOC section, these roles were largely symbolic rather than actual expressions of power. Like most symbolic honors, what was being honored was not only the 'likability' or 'popularity' of a specific candidate, but how well he – or she – represented the Discourse that gave those symbols power.

Powers' victory in the election wasn't simply a one-time thing; as far as I could tell, he remained extremely popular in the program throughout the entire semester. In many ways, I believe he achieved this not just because of a list of positive personality attributes (which he no doubt possessed) but because he matched in so many ways the public and internal expectations of what it is to be a police officer, especially in the Southern United States. His Discursive performance was eminently recognizable by all.

During our first interview, when we were discussing Vito's course and its reliance on popular movies as examples for leadership, Powers told me that he completely accepted Vito's pedagogical approach because he believed that one could learn a huge amount from such videos. "For example," he said, "you can learn everything you need to know about to be a cop from watching <u>Andy Griffith</u>. Everything you need is there. Be

nice to people. Pay attention. Build relationships. Keep calm." He said this with absolute

conviction, and I believe that for Powers, as fictional and far from the real work of

policing Mayberry might be, there was an absolute truth in his words. Griffith's Sheriff

Taylor walks around Mayberry certain that he is completely intelligible as a police officer

because he simply "has that way about him"; in other words, he is a perfect

representation of a certain Discourse. Powers, likewise, had "that way" about him, a

certain mixture of bravado that never bothered, a certain kind of friendly self-

disparagement that never cut too deep. As Gee (2012) notes:

> The key to Discourses is 'recognition'. If you put language, action, interaction,
>
> values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places together in such a way that
>
> others recognize you as a particular type of who (identity) engaged in a particular
>
> type of what (activity), here-and-now, then you have pulled off a Discourse. (p.
>
> 65)

When Powers walked around the AOC and chatted with his classmates, every bit of him

and every one of his actions were as recognizable to his classmates as Sheriff Andy

Taylor was to the citizens of Mayberry. In many ways, I believe that it's fair to say that

Powers was what some might call a "cop's cop."

As much as it benefitted him in his social interactions in the AOC and

undoubtedly in his career, I believe that this recognition is a core reason for the problems

that Powers experienced with adapting to the writing situations he faced in the AOC. As

someone who performed so many of the actions of his chosen Discourse so well, I

believe that he experienced some unconscious reluctance to take up the phrasing and

strategies of another. It wasn't that he held to animosity about education or what the AOC

might offer him. Despite frequently derogatorily describing his intelligence (part of that casual self-disparagement he did so well) and his capacity for the type of work he was being asked to do, Powers frequently spoke in positive ways about education. When asked to explain what he wanted from his time in the AOC, he responded, "To better myself. What kind of man doesn't want to better himself? What would be the point otherwise?"

This phrasing – "what kind of man" – is important in this context. Because police are, as I earlier contended, part of an intrinsically gendered organization aligned with dominant forms of masculinity, Powers' capability of being perceived as a "cop's cop" is also highly parallel to being perceived as a "man's man." As Gerber (2001) notes, "Those traits associated with the ideal male are almost interchangeable with those of a model police officer" (qtd. in Wester and Lyubelsky, 2005, p. 52). Thus, understanding Powers' comfort with the ways of speaking and writing as a police officer is also his comfort and understanding of performing a certain type of masculinity, a dominant type that gave him access to many sources of social power. Unlike Shim, who rejected successful transfer of her writing strategies from police writing partly because those strategies were part of a Discourse that may have restricted her, Powers had reason to resist switching from the strategies he knew so well because he benefitted so much from the Discourse they were part of. As I hope to demonstrate, only experiencing failure would push him to stop transferring inappropriate strategies into his writing.

Powers' struggles emerged in the two distinction dimensions I added to Gee's Discourse theory in chapter one: conflicts of axiology and conflicts of epistemology. As a reminder, conflicts of axiology are conflicts of the norms of what is "right" (ethics) and

108

what is "beautiful" (aesthetics). In terms of the clashes of two different Discourses, these are conflicts over what type of language is appropriate for use, including such questions as sentence length, frequency and type of adjectives and adverbs, and forbidden vocabulary (not always profane words; in some situations this can include things like banning contractions). Conflicts of epistemology are conflicts over what counts as knowledge, what assumptions one might make about what another person knows, and what "givens" are to be expected in that conversation.

In terms of axiological conflicts, the first struggle Powers had was with the use of paragraphing and transitional phrases. Early in the semester, he would sometimes switch to structures like this, which appeared in the first draft of his leadership case study:

Here are a few key points that I see in him as a leader.

1)   He is honest

2)   He leads by example.

3)   He has integrity and good moral character.

4)   He truly cares about the people that work for him.

5)   He makes you part of the "big picture".

6)   He fights for his people.

7)   He can be depended on.

None of these statements were further developed. They were simply left self-evident, and the paper advanced to a section that provided an analysis of entirely different qualities through the framework of The Leadership Challenge. Even if he resisted the actual bullet points or lists, this earliest draft contained sections that would break away from the flow of ideas to list a series of accomplishments or programs. Often, from the reader's

perspective, it would be challenging to understand why that shift had occurred, and he would often return to his main idea without any established transition.

Clearly, Powers was operating under the assumptions of what can be left unsaid and what was normal within his Discourse. This assessment seems to bear up based on his response when I asked him about why he used bullet points or lists like this on occasion:

Powers: I used bullet points to break each individual one down separately. I thought that would be the easiest.

Me: Is that the way you write when you're in the workplace?

Powers: In the workplace, that's all you use is bullet points. Pretty much in law enforcement, when you're doing stuff, you're doing it on the PowerPoint or you're – basically, the writing I do, I type up memos and directives and policies. And policies, you'll start with a – our use of force policy will say what use of force is, that's the definition. You'll have a bullet point for that. Below it will describe all of what will be in there, what the definitions of each will be. Then bullet points of the types of use of force, then more bullet points for the use of force continuum, then more bullet points. You see what I'm saying? Everything you do is broken down into bullet points.

However, he wanted to stress that the reliance on bullet points wasn't a feature of general police writing. Reports, he indicated, were always written in paragraph format, so the general police writer would write as "telling a story". Only as "you go up, then you get into bullet point writing and memos and stuff like that, because you tend to be as clear

and concise as you can be." It was as he advanced that he'd come to rely more on the strategies that he attempted to employ here, and I suspect that being told that they would be seen as unsuccessful was a frustrating experience, a conflict between the Discourse-identity he had developed so well and the one I (and the AOC) seemed to be asking him to accept.

The second axiological conflict Powers experienced was a smaller one, but real. As several others of the instructors had indicated before the semester started, Powers wrote as he spoke, drawing freely from his Discursive identity without feeling a need to shift. For instance, when recounting how he had earned his first nickname in the department, Powers wrote, "I had backed up to that heater and singed all the hair off of the back of my head. Oh I knew I was in deep shit, and sure enough for the next two or three years, C.G. called me 'Singe' every time he saw me." Although this casual cursing would have been perfectly acceptable and even mundane in normal AOC discussion, Powers' casual inclusion of it here is indicative of his desire to continue to represent himself as the police Discourse identity he performed so well, and to resist any desire to shift into something else for his academic writing assignment.

Beyond these axiological conflicts, Powers experienced conflicts at the epistemic level with his assignments. On one level, these conflicts appeared in the type of information he provided, such as the quote earlier in which he described his leader by providing his height, weight, and approximate age in a structure more appropriate for identifying a suspect than introducing a character. In general, these approaches probably would not have been punished by the instructors of the AOC; even if they weren't cops, they knew what type of information was valued by officers as a result of their work.

Where more severe conflicts occurred was in moments where Powers resisted providing

information required by assignments because he seemingly rejected the need for it. Such

information would be self-evident to most cops, and in some cases, it might also have

crossed the line into a slight ethical conflict. As many scholars have pointed out, police

culture tends to protect its members, penalizing those who cross the "blue line" and talk

about problems within departments.

A possible example might be Powers' choice to leave his bullet point sections

alone and undeveloped, since he could have been assuming his readers would understand

the connections he was leaving there. As such, there would be no reason to make them

clearer as anyone who shared his Discursive identity would be able to comprehend them

and their meaning. Despite those assumptions, even if they were both axiological and

epistemic conflicts, Powers never resisted making changes to those sections during our

tutoring sessions. Possibly because he felt that since I made no claim to having any sense

of police Discourse but clearly had a strongly developed sense of how at last some of the

Discourses of the academy functioned, in most situations, he was willing to make the

changes I suggested without any fully expressed sense of conflict.

However, in one case in particular, Powers resisted expanding a section to include

details that were specifically required in the assignment. In Edwards' class, he struggled

in particular with the requirements of Edwards' "Legal Services Paper." The goal of the

assignment was to have students make contact with their internal legal support services,

to cross from the normal police Discourse to the specific department that was assigned to

assist them in situations involving lawsuits aimed at the police. This connection was

something Edwards suspected many of the officers of the AOC had not been required to

do, both from his own experience as a member of police legal support services and from his experience as an instructor in the AOC. He felt that if these students better understood their departments' past experiences with legal issues and how they had been handled, they would be better prepared as leaders to handle their departments' future issues. Seen from the Discourse-based framework I have been using, Edwards wanted to provide a moment where the Discourse conflicts created by different Institutional identities reaching for different goals (police seeking to enforce the laws and "catch the bad guys" and police legal services divisions seeking to protect the department from public lawsuits) could begin to be eased.

Powers, however, seemed to reject that reasoning, at least when it came to meeting the requirements of the assignment. I believe that part of that decision was because of an ongoing personality conflict between him and Edwards (the only person with whom Powers did not seem to immediately get along). Perhaps this was because of all the instructors, Edwards drew most strongly from the Discourse of his former police identity, since before entering academia he was both a military and police lawyer. He frequently mentioned his police experiences during lectures, and posted to the outside of his office was a list of things one ought never to say to a Kentucky State Trooper.

Because he had worked both as police and as a police lawyer before his academic experience, Edwards also had an understanding of the conflicts that police often feel when it comes to their own legal services team. In particular, he seemed to understand the ways in which these distinct Institutional identities created moments where police often found themselves frustrated with the experience of having legal services settle complaints rather than fighting them, all in order to avoid legal costs. On the day that this topic arose

in class (the same day he assigned the Legal Services Paper), Edwards flatly addressed the frustration being expressed by multiple members of the class about the ways that their lawyers had undercut their police work by settling when the police officers felt that in their eyes, they had done nothing wrong. "What would rather have," he asked, "a trial that you can't guarantee you'll win and a chance at losing your job?" For the most part, this line of questioning reduced most of the complaints to just grumbles, but I doubt it soothed any of the real anger.

What was being expressed was a strong moment of axiological conflict between two Discourses. The teleological argument, rooted in the values of police lawyer Discourse, pointed to the ultimate result of the decision to settle, noting that it benefitted both the department in costing less and the police officer in preventing him or her from facing penalties. However, from the more ontological ethical argument, the reasons for being police, for enduring the job's difficulties, took precedent because of how strongly they are rooted in police Discursive identities. Honor and pride are almost first principles within police Discourse. One needs only to read the infamous Facebook manifesto of Chris Dorner, the former Los Angeles police officer who killed fellow officers and was hunted for over a week in the spring of 2013, and see its repeated insistence on the importance of a police officer's name and the record of a person associated with for an example, even if it is an extreme one (McKay, 2013).

Thus, I think that when Powers was asked to provide an "overview of the nature, number, and resolution of department related legal actions over the past ten years" in the Legal Services Paper, he resisted it on two levels that were expressions of Discursive conflict. On one, it was axiologically wrong to explain all those failings because they

114

were his department's issues, not those of outsiders. On the other, the epistemic level, he resisted it because he may have felt that such a question wasn't about the real work, the real knowledge, of policing. Even if Powers and Edwards not had been in conflict, this understanding causes me to believe that Powers would have still bristled at such a question. When it came time to write his response, Powers' first version succinctly replied (he chose to write in a question-and-answer format rather than an essay) with, "There is too much to list over a ten year period." After I advised him that it would be unlikely that Edwards would see his response as an acceptable answer, Powers revised it to "Because our department has over 480 personnel, there is too much to list over a ten year period. " Edwards, unsurprisingly, did not see the revision as an improvement, and Powers' paper was among the lowest grades in the class because of it.

This isn't to say that Powers did not grow from these failures and frustrations. Indeed, by the end of the semester, his essays were consistently incorporating many of the elements I had been suggesting, including avoiding his bullet points and lists, explaining his reasoning, and providing more sufficient transitions between his ideas. Unlike Shim, who grew by finding success in recognition of both her identities, the creative and the police writer, working together, Powers grew from experiencing failures. By the end of the semester, his papers became much like the papers produced by the others in this study, students who had all, unlike Powers, gone through a bachelor's degree. Consider this selection from the final essay written for the AOC, in which he discussed the leadership philosophy of Al Gore:

> I believe that Gore would define leadership in many ways. If you look back on his beginnings, he has always tried to be honest with people and to have integrity.

One example of this is when he graduated from Harvard and faced the first big dilemma of his life, one that would shape him forever. The Vietnam War was being fought, and as a college student, Gore was exempt from the military draft. Now that he had graduated, he would likely be drafted. He did not want to fight in the war because he did not believe in it. He had protested the war in college, and with his father being an influential senator, he could have pulled some strings to avoid being drafted. He had two options: one, he could enlist himself in the Army; or two, he could go to Canada to avoid the war all together. Another factor that he had to consider is that his father at the time was a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Gore's father opposed President Nixon's view on the war, and this hurt him politically. Al Gore Sr. was also facing a tough Republican opponent in his upcoming reelection, and if his son skipped out on his obligation to serve his country, he would likely lose. Gore went to his parents to seek their advice and his mother told him, "If you want to go to Canada to avoid the draft, I'll go with you" (Jeffrey, 1999, p.23). After much debating, he decided to enlist in the Army in 1969.

This untouched selection from Power's essay demonstrates many of the rhetorical and stylistic techniques valued in many academic genres. Indeed, the sentence length, use of narrative language, and careful development of ideas would have fit well with Shim's more successful pieces.

Despite this ultimate success, even when the course was nearly complete and he had successfully met the requirements of the majority of his writing assignments, when I

asked Powers what writing he had enjoyed the most over the course of the semester, he responded:

> I hated all the writing. I feel good about getting it done. I feel a lot better, I'm not anxious about it now. When I do take classes and go to get my degree, I won't feel as anxious about the writing part of it. But I still hated doing it. It's just not something I enjoyed. I don't enjoy writing. It's not like I'd just write to write. I enjoy reading. I can escape in a book. I can't escape writing. To me it's a task, it's a job. I mean, I'm just not a writer.

In this final declaration – "I'm not a writer" – Powers helps underscore the importance of identity in understanding why some learning opportunities are perceived and others rejected. Shim told me in her first contact that she considered herself a "strong writer" so that I would understand that she wanted to be recognized as such; Powers' strong push against being recognized as a "writer" (despite his growing comfort and capability in his academic writing) kept me from seeing him recognize himself as a member of any other Discourse other than that of the cop's cop who valued writing for its instrumental use.

My experience with Powers helped me understand that the principles I developed to help Shim find an alternative middle ground would need to be modified in other cases. Powers' final insistence that he wasn't "a writer" was effectively a Discursive warning to me not to prioritize that performance of identity, no matter how successful it had and could become, over the one he valued the most about himself. Powers undeniably incorporated the feedback he received from me into his writing, developing more and more into a competent, capable academic writer as the semester advanced, but this growth was not a desire to be recognized as other than the police writer and only as the

police writer, and had I attempted to recognize him as something else, he may have pushed back and been unwilling to receive my advice to hold onto that constant self-recognition.

Such may have been the case with Alaric Danube, a police officer who sought me out in order to participate in the study but who ultimately decided not to make use of the tutoring services that I offered as compensation for participation. During the course of the semester, Danube consistently sent me the final drafts of his papers, but he only met with me once to discuss a paper in process and that was at the time of our first interview. We worked at the time on Vito's final paper, the biography paper, which was, as the above discussion of Powers' growth as a writer indicates, due at the end of the semester, not at the beginning.

That type of admirable determination was core to how I understand Danube's performance of identity. While Powers embodied many of the Discursive expectations of what it is to be a police officer and seemed very comfortable in that recognition, Danube existed in strained relationship with those expectations. Unlike Shim, who was marked by her body and her performed femininity as automatically outside the gendered legacy of that Discourse, Danube, who participated in competitive power lifting in his free time and had a powerful build as a result, was easily recognizable within the gender expectations of police Discursive identity expectations. However, in his discussions with me, he frequently constructed himself in an oppositional relationship to other police, especially those whom he called "Type A" personality types. As I'll explain later, "Type A" became a way for Danube to represent and resist certain types of hegemonic masculine norms while he simultaneously drew from many of those same norms, all of which were tied up

in what American gender theorist Michael Kimmel identifies as one of the most hegemonic of American masculinities, that of the "Self-Made Man" (Kimmel, 2005).

Of all popularized medical terms, few are as widely spread and haphazardly applied as "Type A," a term first coined by cardiologists Meyer Friedman and Ray Rosenman (1959) in an effort to explain why they saw consistent personality characteristics in their patients with heart disease. Through interview and observation of their patients, they constructed a list of personality traits, including success-driven, rigidly organized, impatient, and quick to anger, that they collectively called the "Type A" personality. At the time, the term simply meant the type of personality more likely to experience heart disease as a result of the lifestyles they led as part of those personality qualities. Since that coinage, however, the idea of "Type A" has spread across culture and into different Discourses that do not concern themselves with its medical heritage. It has become instead a highly variable shorthand way for different Discourses to represent either their own desired characteristics or, in the case of Danube, that which must be resisted.

"Type A" was a term that appeared frequently in my discussions with both professors and students in the AOC, but none of them reached for it as quickly as Danube did. Within the first five minutes of our interview, when I asked him about his first experiences as a police officer and his education, he explained that while initially joining a police force while in college had forced him to take some time off, he never stopped intending to finish his education. This choice, he explained, was a potentially risky move because "[p]olice agencies at the time - and even now - have an apprehension about officers going to college. There just seems to be a negative bias in the old A-type

119

personality for college-educated officers." When I asked him to explain what he meant, he explained that he really became aware of it as he took over recruiting for his department. In a moment that echoes Parsons and Jesilow's comment that departments tend only to recruit for people who are already are compatible with police culture, Danube explained that others had tended to look only for the "A-type", the construction of personality traits that were easily recognizable as similar to those already performing well within police Discourse. However, once he took over recruitment, he looked to recruit "different personality types."

This had led to some conflict, but he recalled that in his own experience in joining the police force, he understood that it was necessary because, as he phrased it:

> While I did have some of the A-type characteristics, I also enjoy education, and other things that didn't maybe fit in normally with them. You know, specifically. Other, newer recruits are the same way. They wouldn't fit that old paradigm of the A-type personality. The A-types went to the military, and they think there's only one way to look at things. There is no grey area, but I've always been a fan of there's probably 95% grey area, only 5% black and white.

While I have no doubt that Danube is and was a flexible, highly capable thinker, when it comes to the performance of identity as reflected in this quote, he is constructing significantly few possibilities than his 95% grey would indicate. In fact, he is constructing just two: people like him, the "other, newer recruits," and the Type-As who represent the legacy mentality of authority-based police leadership. In this way, Danube is demonstrating the way in which Gee describes how negative definitions, signaling who is alike and who is not alike, are the core of Discourse formation and identification. Also

significant is that the two dimensions of Discourse conflict Danube highlights are epistemic ("they think there's only one way to look at things," indicating that only certain types of knowledge approaches are valid) and axiological ("[there] is no grey area," meaning that only the binary of right and wrong can be used to evaluate actions).

In some ways, one could certainly call this an accurate description of the generational shifts from one generation to another. During my observation of AOC coursework, the previous generation's insistence on obedience to authority was frequently discussed, often as a construction against which to present the type of leaders the AOC students wanted to be. However, when it comes to the performance of identity and the Discourses from which the language and behaviors used in that performance emerge, mimetic accuracy is less important than the frequency of invocation, and for Danube, this binary construction was one to which he frequently turned. When asked about what "the future" of police leadership would be like, he explained that they would be:

> students who are diligent . . . [and] predisposed to making leadership in a quick way, which is what most of them want when they come. Today's individual wants quick results, they want to achieve. They're achievers. They want to go to that leadership position. They're like me. When I walked in the door, I knew what I wanted to do, and I had in my mind how I was going to do it. If they want to do that, then they better take writing very seriously very early because it won't go away. It'll only become more and not less a part of their lives. Perhaps it will be the most important thing they do, that along with speech and speech classes.

This newer generation, for Danube, would need to value writing in ways that he has "a sneaking suspicion those in criminal justice" don't.

Many, he indicated, including the Type-A leadership, would have thought of writing in that "old school way" that he admitted holding to during his first college experiences, where he thought of writing as learning to write a business letter and "writing one résumé" in class "and [using] it for the rest of his career." This was especially problematic for the Type-As, he indicated, because for them the forms that they learn early on become the 'right' way to do writing, and so their writing is often "overly rigid, . . . but what [they] find as [they] go up [into leadership] is that [the writing they do] has to lose that rigidity. You can't be all just bullet points down a page. You can't just write like a form, you can't just write in a variety of forms. You have to make things mesh." For Danube, then, the styles of writing being used by these different people were expressions not only of paradigms of policing or police training, but connected with different types of Discursive identity, one he wanted to reject (the Type-A, who couldn't synthesize or mesh sources and ideas together) and one he wanted to be perceived as part of (the more flexible, adaptive thinker who could do these things).

This determination appeared in that first meeting, but I didn't recognize it at the time. As with every other participant, Danube and I scheduled our first meeting together to be part interview and part tutoring session. Where all the other participants brought their early assignments, such as the first leadership reflection paper discussed in the analysis of Shim and Powers' experiences, Danube brought with him the last assignment for Vito's course, which asked the writer to analyze a biography of a famous leader (Power's earlier analysis of Gore was from his version of this assignment). Instead of

doing just one biography, however, Danube had determined to read two biographies on the same subject (Alaric, the Visigoth leader who sacked Rome in 410 CE) and bring them both together in the paper. He wanted to make these "mesh," to go beyond the expectations of the assignment not only because it would be more successful for the assignment (and it certainly was a very successful paper) but because it went beyond a certain 'rigid' approach to the assignment, the one that he had seen in drafts used by previous generations.

Danube, like the other participants, had access to antecedent examples of this paper. In many cases, because AOC students knew about the assignment before they arrived at the AOC, they had already selected and read biographies in order to be prepared to write the paper without having to take on any other reading near the crucial end of the semester. I have little doubt that this strategy had been developed over the successive generations of AOC students, and I believe that for Danube, following that strategy would have been another version of a "Type-A" approach to the assignment, relying too strongly on the forms of others and their thinking rather than striking out on his own, marking a Discursive difference of identity performance and demonstrating his difference as part of the new generation of police. Thus, though he did have his leader already selected and his two biographies already identified, Danube approached bettering the expectations of the assignment as about demonstrating his drive, his diligence. His pride in being that type of person would let him accept nothing less than going beyond the given.

Of course, returning to Gerber's (2001) note that in many ways the ideal policeman is an embodiment of a culture's ideal masculine qualities, Danube's pushing

himself this way was not just a performance of a diligent student. Rather, his frequent

mention of "Type-A" and construction of that antagonistic Discourse enabled him to

draw from the legacy of what masculinity theorist Michael Kimmel refers to as the

archetype of the Self-Made Man, the most enduring influence on hegemonic American

masculinity (2005). This form of masculinity expresses itself in tendencies to resist

'shortcuts' and easier solutions because it reifies concepts of "hard work". Those who

hold to it are often reluctant to reach out to receive help unless it is absolutely needed

because receiving help undermines the concept of being "self-made" and therefore self-

sufficient. As noted in the discussion of why Powers and Edwards likely experienced

such a strong conflict, honor and pride are important concepts to police, and one of the

reasons is this intertwining of the ideal policeman and the ideal American masculinity.

For Danube, how this ultimately expressed itself was in a reluctance to make use

of support resources. Although he sought out participating in this study and the tutoring it

would provide, beyond this first meeting to discuss his biography paper, he never

requested any assistance with any paper. Despite this, he was not only consistently

friendly in any official or chance meeting with me, he sent in his final graded papers at

the same frequency as every other participant. When I asked him why he had rejected the

help, he responded that although he appreciated it and thought my advice was probably

useful, he had chosen not to use it for one reason: "Pride." To be the diligent, successful

writer that he knew he was, he had to do it on his own and accept the results.

Whereas Shim needed both performances of identity to be recognized in order to

find a productive middle ground in order to transfer her writing strengths and Powers

needed a failure to overcome his resistance to abandoning his negative transfer of police

124

writing strategies, Danube's determination to succeed without assistance through his own strength as a writer, student, and thinker, made him willing to push himself outside comfort levels. While I have no doubt he learned from his experience in the AOC and from the writing he did, Danube's experience in tutoring illustrates one other consequence of the performance of identity in that it can lead a learner to reject support, to turn away from scaffolding or other pedagogical elements because they are perceived as 'cheats' or 'shortcuts' and ways to undermine a sense of competence and capability. In Danube's case, this performance didn't lead to any failures because he truly had already assembled the writing abilities he needed and resisted what he called "rigid forms" of writing.

Unlike Powers, Danube didn't rely too strongly on inappropriate police writing strategies. However, in the case of other students who are less prepared, less already capable of performing Discursive identities compatible with our expectations, we need to be willing consider how this sense of personal integrity, this pride that rejects help, can lead students to reject any attempt to ease the tensions that make the performance of identity a barrier to productively transferring knowledge. Although it did not harm Danube, in the general sense, understanding that the performance of this element of identity can prevent students accepting pedagogy seems especially important in the case of young individuals performing senses of identity tied strongly to cultural concepts like the archetype of the "Self-Made Man."

Ross and Thornton: Accepting Alternatives

Although each of the earlier cases have been, in significantly different ways, negative examples of how the performance of identity can interfere or create conflict with

the possibility for successful transfer, identity does not always act to prevent successful transfer. In the case of Ross and Thornton, their performance of identity enabled both of them to draw on what they knew best, to recognize and abandon strategies that were less than successful, and to receive scaffolding without ever surrendering their own sense of competence and capacity.

I believe that part of this capability in Ross and Thornton has to do with the ways in which they both had ambiguous relationships with the dominant norms of masculinity so entwined with police Discourse. Shim struggled against the limitations of a Discourse that was, to a degree, imposed on her and sought to claim a "creative" space as part of an effort to resist those limitations. Powers and Danube, because they both benefitted by being as intelligible as they were within the intertwined norms of the policeman and dominant forms of American masculinity, were possibly reluctant to leave the Discourses and associated strategies that made them recognizable and competent members of that Discourse. However, I believe that because Ross and Thornton both took different roads to policing as a career and had a more complicated relationship with those intertwined norms, they found adapting their writing strategies easier and less of a conflict of identity than Shim or Powers did and found seeking and receiving support less of a threat to self-identity than Danube did.

In the case of Ross, as noted in chapter two, he entered policing because, as he stated, he "needed a job," not because it was a legacy that had been left to him or because of strong social connections to it. As such, although he had eventually developed an "intrinsic" motivation for the work, that motivation wasn't tied to received understandings that combined dominant masculinities with police work. Unlike Powers

and Danube, who so easily were physically intelligible in the gendered expectations of police work, Ross's relatively small physical stature and quiet demeanor did not grant him easy access to the benefits of meeting those expectations. As I noted in my description of his seeking me out during the recruitment phase of this study, unlike almost every other student in the SPI, male or female, I would not have identified Ross as a police officer. Moreover, although I believe he was absolutely as dedicated to pursing criminals as every other participant in this study, Ross was the only person not to mention a version of "getting the bad guys" as part of why he did this work.

Rather, in my frequent discussions with Ross, it became clear that many of the elements of police work he most enjoyed were those tied either to teaching, the profession he originally intended to enter during his undergraduate college career, or to upholding the values he believed he had committed to when he joined the department. The "first thing that [he] jumped in with two feet was investigation of child abuse and sexual abuse and neglect," an area of investigation that was the basis of the first twenty years of his career, including becoming the first School Resource Officer (SRO) for his department, a position he greatly enjoyed and stayed in until he was promoted to sergeant. While he never made clear his motivations for originally pursuing teaching, because the areas of police work into which he "jumped in with two feet" were related to working with children, I strongly believe that Ross's performance of identity incorporated many of the qualities frequently associated with the Discursive identities of teachers rather than police.

One example of these qualities was his total dedication to the task at hand and how it demonstrated his sense of service to his department. Many SPI students,

encouraged by previous generations of students and sometimes by instructors in the program, sought out many opportunities to be social and to visit different events on and around campus, including attending college sporting events. Ross, however, almost totally avoided these events, and when I asked him about this, he responded, "I didn't ask to come here. This isn't a vacation for me. I came here because my department asked me to, and I'm here to get everything I can for my department from it." Importantly, it's worth noting that many of the social events in which students participated were those associated with the same dominant masculinities that benefitted them as police officers: college and professional sporting events, trips to bars and sports bars, and hiking tours of nearby state and national parks. In choosing not to go to join others in these events, Ross was not only asserting his own sense of dedication to the task of excelling at the AOC; he was rejecting the opportunity to be intelligible within that type of masculinity by participating within it.

Moreover, I believe Ross was aware of this tension and the effect it had on him. During our final interview, I attempted to ask him about his feelings on this subject by asking if he had ever noticed some of the tension I had seen between the officers who had history in SWAT and elite military units and those who had never been in such positions. He chuckled, one of the few times he ever laughed in our conversations, and said, "Rob, I think you just described something I've felt my whole career." I have no doubt that Ross is an effective police officer in his department and an effective police leader, but I suspect that just as Shim experienced struggles between the gendered legacy of the department and how she wanted to understand herself, Ross experienced a similar frustration. The dominant form of masculinity associated with policing may have conflicted with his

performance of masculinity, one that did not depend and draw from as many highly visible social practices.

As a result, I believe that Ross entered the AOC with a complicated relationship with those publically hypermasculine representations of police. On one hand, unlike Shim, he received the default "patriarchal dividend" (to use Connell's term) because he did match most of the gender expectations that preceded him, but on the other hand, he did not benefit from them to the degree that Powers and Danube did since he did not fulfill many of the other expectations. Because of this juxtaposition of identity, I believe he was used to being in an ambiguous situation, and after learning how to thrive despite never really being rejected but never really fully 'fitting' expectations, he was predisposed to feeling less conflict when encountering epistemic and axiological disagreements between Discourses. He had been navigating them for most of his career.

This flexibility also translated into Ross's almost complete embrace of the tutoring offered to him. During his one semester at the AOC, Ross went over forty four separate drafts of his different papers with me, sometimes revising a draft and resending it back to me within the space of a few hours. At first, many of his concerns were about grammar and other mechanical issues, as he was reliant on the antecedent and peer examples he saw to provide the organization structure he was using. However, as the semester went along, Ross's approach to tutoring began to shift. After receiving multiple comments about expanding certain sections because of epistemic conflicts in which he was assuming his readers would already know things (mostly instances in which he assumed knowledge of police procedures), Ross began to anticipate my questions, to see where my epistemic boundaries were, and to incorporate sections in his drafts where he

thought such problems might be present. Because these types of conflicts represent epistemic mismatches between Discourses (since, as I explained in chapter one, the epistemic portion of a Discourse is composed not only of what counts for knowledge but also what counts as assumed knowledge), Ross's attempts to spot them ahead of time and willingness to accept that certain ideas, concepts, and approaches were not just 'givens' is a strong indication not only of his willingness to bend rather than defend his sense of identity but also an indication that, to a degree, he wanted to be intelligible as a member of the Discourse he believed I represented.

By the end of the semester, Ross's drafting process relied less on the antecedent examples he received and more on his own generation of ideas and the order he selected to convey and support those ideas. Although this was partly due to many of the final written assignments being relatively new, Ross's decision to work without reference to as many peer examples as he used in earlier assignments was, I believe, more an indication of his own growing sense of confidence in himself as a capable writer within the AOC's academic discourse. During our consultation sessions, he began using the same specialized vocabulary I had been using, transferring the lessons of our tutoring, his apprenticeship in academic writing, into his ways for representing how he wrote.

Thornton represents a similar case, although he did not embrace the tutoring as fully as Ross did. Like Ross, however, Thornton had a bit of an ambiguous relationship with the Discursive expectations of being a police officer, though I think he was more comfortable with it than Ross was. He was certainly aware of many of the tropes that surrounded it. Like all of the participants but Ross, he cited "catching the bad guy" as the main thing he desired from the work. However, a distinction arose when I asked him

about the reasons he had become a police officer. In response, he provided something of a conversion narrative, explaining that at one point he had been one of those "bad guys," in that he was "something of a juvenile delinquent" who had been defining himself through an oppositional Discourse to policing. He changed his mind about police officers as a result of one positive encounter with a police officer. While at first such narratives may seem like a way to maintain separation from the type of heritage narrative Shim and others provide, the specifics of Thornton's story are actually a method of interpellation within the gender expectations of the field.

In Thornton's narrative, he began considering becoming a police officer when, as a teenager, he flipped his pickup truck after making a dangerous driving mistake. While unharmed, he found himself:

> hanging upside down, still seatbelted [sic] in the vehicle, cussing and upset because [he] knows the cops are going to come. And one pulls up and helps [him] unbuckle my seatbelt and helps [him] flip the vehicle back over. [They] started chatting, and [the officer] asked if, you know, did mommy and daddy buy this truck for you or did you buy it for yourself? And when [Thornton] told [the officer] that [he] had worked three summers straight for all the money, [the officer] responded, "You ruined your own truck. That's a learning experience. Get out of here." And at that point, [Thornton] said wow, all cops aren't bad, and said, "I think I could be pretty good at it because I know how to get away with the stuff so I know how to catch the people."

Central to this narrative is the recognition of the same hallmark of dominant American masculinity that likely prevented Danube from seeking help: the Self-Made Man

(Kimmel, 2005). In recognizing that Thornton had "ruined [his] own truck," the officer had recognized Thornton as a man who had built himself, not simply accepted the help of "mommy and daddy." Even though he reportedly placed himself as once on the same side as those who "know how to get away with the stuff," the values that make "all cops [not] bad" are the gendered values associated with police work. Rather than a conversion narrative, Thornton's story is about becoming intelligible to members of a Discourse and thus assuming membership in that Discourse.

Given his background and this narrative that draws on dominant gender assumptions, one might assume that Thornton's experiences would be much like those of either Powers or Danube. However, while he did not use the provided tutoring to a great degree, Thornton always reached out for help when he felt it might aid him. He never overly applied the approaches appropriate to police genres in his academic writing or resisted expanding sections that represented epistemic assumptions that needed to be unpacked for audiences not familiar with would be givens for police work. He built on antecedent and peer examples to provide organizational models, but his papers incorporated novel organizational and transition strategies. Rather than resisting the limits of police Discourse as Shim did or being limited by them, Thornton demonstrated a flexibility similar to that of Ross's without any of the same complications of Ross's relationship with the Discourse of police work.

I believe that the reason Thornton was so flexible when it came to switching Discursive expectations and successfully selecting and transferring different writing strategies was that he had already experienced a massive shift of identity, and the type of personal flexibility required to make such a shift kept him from feeling the tension that

132

Shim, Powers, and Danube did. A few short years before he came to the AOC, Thornton had resigned his first leadership position with a police department to enroll full time as a nursing student. Although nursing's current status as a desirable and well-paying career (the "nationwide shortage of nurses" was the first reason Thornton mentioned for making this career change) has expanded its financial attractiveness across gender lines, it remains, like policing, coded with its gender history. To switch from policing to nursing is, in many ways, a switch in the intelligibility of gender as the attributes that are placed on the iconic image of nursing are almost entirely associated with what Connell refers to as emphasized femininity as much as the iconic image of policing is associated with hegemonic masculinity.

Although Thornton ultimately left this program, the reason for that departure is telling. In Thornton's words, he left the program because:

> The dean of the health sciences section treated everybody like children, and all of her instructors treated everybody like children. "Raise your hand if you want to use the bathroom." "Walk in a line as you're walking between classes." And several of the adult students in the program went to her and said, this is not right. This isn't - you know, you're making a lot of people unhappy. Even the younger students, yes, they're a little crazy and wild, but that's not the way to treat them. She said, "If you don't like the program, leave."

So Thornton left. In comparison to the conversion narrative he provided for the reason he chose to become a police officer, in which his competence and capability were recognized as a version of the Self-Made Man (purchasing his truck through his own hard work and financial sacrifice), the narrative explaining why he left his nursing program

only one semester short of completion is an inversion, a denial of the recognition. Because his competency and capability were rejected and his autonomy denied, Thornton rejected the subjectivity offered him, refusing to accept the Institutional and Discursive identities of the limited student who would have accepted that treatment. As a result, he returned to policing, a world where he felt valued and recognized.

This final comparison reveals a large part of the reasons for Thornton's flexibility. Having already experienced leaving the protection and benefits of being intelligible within one Discourse and trying to enter another, he was already primed for not insisting on a singular recognition of identity. However, his willingness to accept the help was based on my recognition of his competency and capability, something very parallel to the work required to help Shim find a third path between the two Discourses she was attempting to blend.

In the case of Ross and Thornton, their experiences with transfer, in which they successfully applied the strategies of police writing by building on antecedent examples as well as reaching out for and embracing the support offered to help ease the Discursive transition, illustrate the type of students who will experience less of a tension of identity and thus require less assistance in order to successfully transfer than those who, like Shim, Powers, and Danube, have complicated reasons for resisting crossing between different Discourse-level identities. In cases of students like Ross and Thornton, as I will further explain in chapter five, it is likely that the best strategy for making transfer possible is to recognize and value their flexibility, to position ourselves as instructors with the least rigid sense of Discourse identity that we can in order to more quickly anticipate and acknowledge points of conflict before they can become points of rigidity

that will require more negotiation. Because such students are already primed to accept the confusion that comes with crossing Discourses because they have already done so or have never found themselves fully committed to one over another, only by making such transitions difficult do we transform their performances of identity into roadblocks for successful transfer.

Taking It with Them

As I explain in chapter four, the instructors of the AOC believe that their writing assignments are meant to help their students cross between different ways of using language so that may either become agents of diffusion (Hughes), translators between legal jargon and more standard police speech (Edwards), better leaders through understanding a specific leadership theory and how they have experienced leadership in their past (Vito), or more capable police leaders with specific experience in a presentation style that parallels one used by actual police (Shain). In each case, the instructors believed that the transition from the front line and middle management positions in policing to that of upper level police leadership would require a transition in writing, and they believed that, to one degree or another, the assignments they were giving their students would help them be better prepared for that future writing. Students shared this expectation. As I explained in chapter two, students like Danube believed that the instructors were "trying to prepare individuals for projects that they may have to" do in the future" by "giving [students] things that they know that" those students "will see again and that these will help prepare [them] to deliver at the highest levels by doing the assignments that will mimic" those "highest levels" writing tasks.

However, as my description of the writing assignments in chapter two and my discussion of student experiences with those writing assignments in this chapter indicate, students did not always approach the assignments with a sense that they would mimic or indeed help them with future writing tasks. To a degree, I believe this conflict of expectations was complicated by the performance of identity, since among my participants, those who more rigidly held to a sense of being police perceived less likely use for the writing than those who did not.

Shim, for instance, came out of the writing she did for the program strongly believing that the techniques she had developed, especially in finding ways to integrate what she referred to as her more "creative" side, would be useful for her writing. Although she recognized that the more stable and specific genres wouldn't tolerate new approaches, she talked about two more general annual reports that she felt were primed for restructuring. "After working on organizing all my ideas," she said, "I have big ideas for how I can make those work better." The positive experience of finding ways to be both a successful academic writer and a police writer at the same time led her with the belief that she could use those strategies to achieve more writing in the future.

For others, however, the experience was not as positive. Powers, as mentioned earlier, left the program with the firm sense that he wasn't "a writer" and that he had "hated all of the writing." Although he was proud of the successes he had achieved (and, as demonstrated above, he certainly became a more adept academic style writer during his time in the program), he didn't see much direct connection between the writing he had done and his work. He did feel that he was now better prepared for academic writing and that he wouldn't "need to be afraid of it as much when [he goes] back to school," but

there wasn't much of an alignment between that and the type of writing, so reliant on bullet points, he used as a police leader. Where Shim's successful experience led her to seek out ways where she could continue to fuse the different performances of identity, Powers continued to see the two worlds as separate from each other and held them rigidly apart.

Interestingly, although Ross had pushed himself so diligently to acquire more capability in writing academic style papers, using any opportunity he had to advance the quality of his writing, he joined Powers in believing that he "wouldn't be any to use any writing like [he] did here" when he returned to his department. However, for Ross, this belief was not rooted in his own sense that there wasn't a connection between the two but in his belief that policing, as an institution, would resist any attempt to do things a different way. In his department, the handbook and other materials were written by outside agencies to ensure full compliance with the law, and the majority of communication between their small department and other departments required that they mimic examples they had received before. Only very rarely did an opportunity for a novel document emerge, and while Ross very much valued the type of writing he had done in the AOC, he did not believe that any of his colleagues would want him to try to use the approaches that had served him well in class.

The different perceptions of these three individuals on the potential transfer of the writing skills they developed through the AOC helps illustrate how the tensions of Institutional and Discourse-level identities can limit not only the possibilities for transfer into a writing classroom but the possibilities for transferring those skills elsewhere. Even if a teacher and a student can find a way to bridge between conflicts of identity and

soothe epistemic and axiological differences, if a student continues to believe that the Discourse to which he or she sees him or herself as primarily belonging would be hostile to different epistemic and axiological approaches, then the student may close off productive transfer before it could have happened. In the case of Bergmann and Zepernick's (2007) study, the students in engineering who reported no overlap between their first year composition courses and their later engineering courses may have chosen, even when they were in those first year composition courses, to block out potential elements for transfer because they believed they would be inappropriate for how engineers wrote. In chapter four and five, I will further explore how teachers might prepare their students to resist shutting down in the face of anticipated conflicts.

Summary

In this chapter, I have addressed the following points:

1. In my discussion of Shim's experiences, I have highlighted how the **historic legacies of Discourse-level identities can lead some learners to resist productive transfer** when they feel that assuming one Discourse denies them the ability to perform a level of identity they value. In the conclusion of that section, I have **provided three principles to use to assist such learners in finding a middle ground between the conflicting Discourses.**

2. In my discussion of Powers' and Danube's experiences, I have highlighted how **successful recognition within one Discourse and sense of conflict between that Discourse and the one(s) valued in a specific writing**

situation, especially in the case of axiological conflicts, may lead some learners to negatively transfer or resist support.

3. In my discussion of Ross's and Thornton's experiences, I have highlighted how **learners with less successful recognition within a Discourse or with experience with crossing multiple Discourses may be better primed to productively transfer and resist negatively transferring strategies** from one Discourse performance to another.

4. In my discussion of what Shim, Powers, and Ross felt they could transfer from their writing strategies developed during their time in the AOC, I highlighted how **student expectations of what epistemic and axiological approaches would be appropriate to their 'home' Discourse can shut down the possibility for successful transfer before it can happen**.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTOR EXPERIENCES

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I discussed the experience of my five student participants, highlighting how the performance of identity, especially as related to the concept of hegemonic masculinity and gender expectations within police Discourse, complicated the transfer of writing related skills from police work and other education-based experiences. In the conclusion of each of these sections, I discussed the strategies I used to assist these students and explained why I believed they worked or failed to work through the framework of identity established in chapter one.

In this chapter, I focus on the ways in which the instructors of the AOC positioned themselves in relation to the students, the writing they were assigning, and their expectations for student writing through analysis of both interview responses and classroom observations. As Nowacek (2011) notes, because teachers are the evaluators of student work, they determine what counts as positive and negative transfer in classroom spaces. Thus, I particularly focus on how the instructors of the AOC perceived the possibilities for transfer and how, if at all, they addressed expected moments of what would become negative transfer in the context of the classroom. These classroom possibilities for identity, as situated practice in the shared Discourse of the classroom, help inform the types of identities students perceive are proper and acceptable in the

140

writing they do for those classrooms and those instructors, enabling or disabling the perception of affordances for transfer.

The Instructors' Sense of the AOC

My analysis begins by discussing how the instructors of the AOC understand the program and student relationships with it. This approach helps reveal how the instructors think about the types of writing assignments they assign and the performances of identity they expect. As explained in chapter three, these writing assignments are something that the students are typically aware of before they enter the program because they have received examples of earlier submitted papers from previous generations of students. Although they may not see the assignments themselves until later, as they look over the submitted and evaluated papers from their predecessors, I believe that they begin to build a sense of what the program is, what it does, and what criteria will be used to evaluate their work. While the instructors are aware of this legacy, they are also constantly thinking about how they can complicate that process to maintain the value of their original intentions. Thus, these assignments have been revised multiple times over the years, though students still come with antecedent examples of at least some previous version of a current assignment and some sense of what 'right' approaches look like.

Part of the reason the instructors work to complicate the tendency of students to use these earlier examples is because, as Edwards noted in my first interview with him, the "reputation of the [AOC] is that it is a hard academic program," and while these instructors all would probably "like to use the word 'challenging' rather than hard," they all wish to maintain that reputation. As noted in chapter two, the SPI competes with two

other programs for students, and although it currently faces no shortage of potential students, it is important to the instructors that the AOC remain well-regarded.

Recognizing that the perception of difficulty is important to the community that the AOC serves, the faculty of the AOC find themselves also understanding that for their students, enrolling in the program is both an opportunity and a career risk. As Hughes noted during our first interview, he believed that despite the perception one might have of these students are "tougher" than most students, they were actually at a higher degree of risk than most students. Hughes thought that AOC students were at risk because attending the AOC "is a career defining experience for them. If they manage to fail, their career is - I mean, they won't be fired, but they won't be promoted. I mean they have to survive this experience." However, survival is not enough. Because attending the AOC has been a rite of passage and credential building for generations of police leaders, instructors are aware that students are placed under significant social pressure from those who came before. As Hughes explained:

> For example, the poor . . . State Trooper [currently enrolled], the last four
> Troopers who came through here were the valedictorians, so I'm sure he's been
> ribbed. I know the commissioner would never step on him [for not maintaining
> the same standard], . . . but I'm sure those other four guys were like, hey, you
> know what, we were the valedictorians, you better show up for the organization.
> You know? They'll give him some shit if he doesn't. His career won't be in
> jeopardy because he's not valedictorian, but there's all these kind of other almost
> familial bonds between the organizations and SPI. Those people who come here,
> they rib each other and raz each other. "I got five A's, why didn't you get five

A's?" And so there's career pressure, and there's kind of social pressure, and so I

try to make sure that [all of the instructors] remember that. They're also away

from their homes, and some of them haven't been to college in twenty years, and

so I try to remember that everyone remembers that they are at risk, and that they

are in a state of agitation for a lot of this time here.

This sense of a "state of agitation" is an important assessment that I will return to later in

this chapter as I address how instructors tried to soothe the Discourse conflicts that

contribute to that agitation.

In addition to being aware of this social pressure, AOC instructors recognize their

students' drive to overcome those challenges. Vito feels that the students in his leadership

course are among his most successful students because unlike typical college

undergraduates and graduates, they are here for what he calls "the reason," the strong

desire to advance their careers. In his words: "They're driven, they're dedicated. I think

also they want to succeed. They have a purpose in what they're doing . . . They see it as

part of their personal development, make them a better supervisor and a better manager.

So they have that, you know, they're professionals." Although, as my discussion of

Powers' "What type of man does not try to better himself?" rhetorical question in chapter

three indicated, the reasons for seeking the advancement are likely much more

complicated and tied to the social recognition of identity than to an individual's isolated

desire to achieve a higher rank or status as a professional. The instructors' anticipation of

this drive, this "reason" to succeed, informed their perception of what identities they

would see and would reward, including the approaches they would value in their writing

assignments.

Instructors' Perceptions of Writing, Transfer, and Conflict

With this understanding of how the instructors of the AOC understand the program's place in their students' lives and professional world in mind, I can begin to explain how the instructors understood the goals of their writing assignments and how that related to their preconceptions of where and when students would be able or unable to transfer writing strategies from their professional identities into the work of the AOC. In particular, addressing their anticipation of conflicts between student writing strategies and their expectations as evaluator shows how these anticipated conflicts were addressed or unaddressed in classroom interactions.

Understanding instructor preconceptions of conflict is important because, as Nowacek (2011) notes, while "[t]ransfer is an act of individual cognition," one individual's perception of potential affordances between one situation and another and reuse of strategies in the new situation, the concept of negative transfer (transfer that is inappropriate between the two situations) is not inherent in the situation itself but rendered negative by the "largely invisible . . . power differentials that determine the value of any given instance of transfer" (p. 65). After all, as Nowacek (2011) notes, "[a]though students may perceive a connection" or affordance between two different writing activities or two different Discourses, "they do not generally get to determine its worth" (p. 65). That power of evaluation lies in the words of the instructors, those who have already achieved recognition and capability within the Discourse to which students are attempting to enter. If we do not recognize that successful (positive) transfer is tied to this power dynamic, we "make a grave mistake" by "not [recognizing] the broader

institutional and epistemological contexts in which students" are being asked to "recontextualize their knowledge" (Nowacek, 2011, p. 64).

In addition, from the NIDA framework for discussing identity introduced in chapter one, examining the instructors' understandings of their assignments and their expectations for conflict helps highlight some elements of their Institutional and Discourse identities. As discussed in chapter one, these levels are not completely isolated from each other but are always informing each other. The Institutional identity of the instructors within the AOC provided them with a way to contextualize and understand their Discursive expectations and the relations that they would have with their students and their Discursive identities. Of course, I am not suggesting that these identity levels are as simple as teacher and student, although such a fundamental dynamic influences, as Nowacek noted above, the ways in the two groups understood and anticipated conflicts of power. Importantly, the Institutional identities involved were not as simple as academic and police officer, especially because both Edwards and Shain had crossed those lines by switching careers, but this point of comparison did inform many of the possibilities for identity performance. Hughes and Vito viewed the police Discourse as insular, and that the "diffusion of ideas" from institutions (and Institutional identities) outside it was limited at best. This conception informed a great deal of their thinking about their students, including how they understood the reasoning for and desired outcomes of their writing assignments.

Reasons for Writing

In each of my instructor interviews, I tried to understand how they thought about their writing assignments and their goals by providing a form of a continuum between

two extremes used to understand academic writing. For some instructors, writing is seen as a way of representing the knowledge that students have acquired. From that approach, the goal is for students to convert the lectures and readings of the class into communication that demonstrates their mastery of the information they had received. For other instructors, writing itself is seen as a way of learning, a way for an individual to discover their own understanding of the material they had provided. Although these extremes represent, as I indicated, an oversimplification of the ways that different writing across the curriculum scholarship has considered writing, it provided a useful tool in the interviews when I asked them to place themselves in either camp. While the instructors did find themselves on one side or the other, one universal response was that they all viewed their writing assignments as a way of helping to work against the insular nature of police Discourse. Regardless of the meaning of the assignments in their classroom, they believed that the assignments would enable their graduated students to spread the ideas they had gained in the AOC with their profession.

Beyond that shared goal, however, two distinctly different views of the writing assignments appeared. While the consistency of these two different approaches may have come from the way I asked my question, it seemed that the instructors were comfortable with the ways it helped them think about their assignments. The first group (Edwards and Hughes) held to something close to what Hughes referred to as "a kind of utilitarian view" of writing. As Hughes explained:

> I want them to be able to take ideas to their organizations and explain them and
> use them. So I don't know where that fits in those two poles, but I want the ability
> for them to convey that information to others. I think they need to succeed in their

careers, to really succeed in their careers, to be able to change the face of their

profession they need to be able to have that ability. If they're going to be a chief,

they've got to be able to communicate in writing with folks. Inside and outside of

the organization.

While he "absolutely" believed that writing helped students to gain a better understanding

of the material, Hughes held to two main goals with the writing. First, it would assist

them in their careers, and second, it would help "change the face of their profession" by

enabling some level of diffusion of the ideas they had received during their time in the

AOC.

Edwards shared this second goal and hoped that his writing assignments would

enable communication between two populations that were sometimes in unnecessary

conflict: police and the lawyers who defended police from civil lawsuits. As mentioned in

chapter three, Edwards viewed at least one of his assignments, the legal services paper, as

an explicit attempt to force police officers to come in contact with another element of

their department that they may have avoided, and his writing assignments were largely

about preparing students to do just that. Beyond that, he explained that his goals for his

assignments were "two fold. It's both the content of the material which is law-related and

second the communication aspect of it, to be able to succinctly, tightly if you will,

communicate the law in written form" to other audiences. As Edwards explained:

I often use the term and tell them in class that I'm trying to train them to be a

translator . . . Unfortunately, most law is brought to the policing community by

lawyers. We don't understand what lawyers say. Lawyers can get up and speak

for an hour. And you get through, and you really have no idea what they said

because they spoke lawyer. What I'm trying to teach these folks is to go back

home and be able to talk to the boss, talk to the people who work for them, but not

talk law. Talk like a police officer. But yet convey the content that an attorney

would have brought to you. So you serve as a translator between those that know

the law and speak law and those who know the law and yet speak American.

Edwards clearly perceives that the Discourses of policing and those of civil law, though

highly related, are separate, held apart by the distinctions of language use that mark who

is a lawyer and who is not, an important distinction of social power. As a result, it would

seem that his understanding of his assignments as preparing students to be translators

from "lawyer" to "American" (the language of police) would implicitly invoke the

concepts of writing as a way of learning (in this case, a way of learning "lawyer" through

experience translating it). Despite this, Edwards was firm that his writing assignments

were "mostly about showing what they know" and not about providing them a way to

develop an understanding of the material through reflection.

In contrast, Vito landed on the opposite side of the continuum, seeing his writing

less about demonstrating what they know and/or translating that material for a different

audience and more about the students working their way through the ideas of the course.

When I asked him what he wanted from his writing assignments, he answered:

I've always thought that's the best way to learn. Multiple choice exams to me are

almost a waste of time. Unless you're just trying to see that the people have read

the material. But I mean, learning to develop an argument, defend it, reading your

sources - I mean, you learn so much more from doing a paper. There's just no

comparison. And it's - I know, it's much more difficult to grade, but we were

148

talking about this at the last meeting that we had - that <u>Academically Adrift</u> book

came out, I don't know if you've heard of that. It's saying that college students

are not learning to think critically.

Although he did not directly indicate that the use of other assessment methods was to

blame for students not learning critical thinking, implicit in his statement was the belief

that critical thinking and learning to work through ideas through idea went hand in hand.

As a result, his writing assignments were entirely meant to have students explore

the ideas of Kouzes and Posner's <u>The Leadership Challenge</u> through application, first to

their experiences with an important leader, then to a biography of a leader, and finally in

comparison to another framework for understanding leadership. Writing, for Vito, was

the method not only of evaluation, but the real method of instruction. Although he shared

Hughes' goal of having these ideas return with his students and diffuse into their police

departments, he measured success by how students transformed their ideas and actions as

a result of the writing. Each semester, Vito asked the class how many of them had chosen

to write about an AOC graduate. This occurred during one of my observations of his

class, and as he said, when asked for hands to be raised, "There were a lot. There's

always a lot. And that tells me that they got something out of the course as terms of

leadership. And the writing, I don't know. But a lot of them, they get promoted." For

Vito, rather than becoming translators or diffusors, becoming the types of leaders who

would inspire other students to write about them was the greatest success of his pedagogy

and the writing assignments that were so central to it.

Hughes and Edwards: Strategies for Conflict Expectations

Although the term "identity" was not a concept any of the instructors used in our interview sessions, the expectations of their assignments involved specific conceptions of identity performance and the transfer of knowledge. To be a translator is to be someone who can stand between two different Discourses and understand the epistemic and axiological norms valued by those Discourses, requiring that one not block out one of the Discourses as "wrong" in its values. To refine, through reflection on one's own experiences and representations of leadership, a sense of how one acts as a leader is to help learners better understand the identity they already perform and how others recognize it. As a result, when these instructors designed their assignments, they also brought with them, consciously or unconsciously, a series of expectations for how their students would attempt to transfer writing strategies and how these attempts would succeed or fail. These expectations were, no doubt, developed from experience and extremely representative of the actual experiences of the classroom. Moreover, my experiences with students like Powers, whose writing overly transferred the epistemic and axiological norms and approaches often valued in police writing, seemingly validated many of their expectations of conflict.

The first of these expectations was, as Hughes succinctly said, was that the students would "write like cops," an assessment echoed by both Edwards and Vito, though each developed this assessment in different ways. For Hughes, the conflict in this experience was primarily an epistemic conflict. As he commented, the approaches that many of the students, especially the undergraduates, took would:

function, but they write everything like a police report. They don't fully explain

concepts, they're naturally very smart. They understand what's going on. So they

can answer a question, but having them go from the question and fully and

completely explaining that answer is very difficult for them. They want to jump to

the conclusion, and so my goal is to try to get them to see that they need to

explain their logic all the way through in terms of their writing. That's an

academic exercise, but I think the world's getting more complex for police

organizations, and so part of the reason I want them to do that is so they can reach

out to other places and get ideas and then explain those ideas in their organization.

You just can't out and steal the idea and serve it up on a platter. You have to be

able to explain that thing completely . . . They just like to distill to the ultimate

core and just throw that at you. They don't like to fully explain the logic.

This quote once again demonstrates Hughes' perceptions of his assignments as helping

with diffusion, but more important is the expression that students' police writing

strategies would lead to epistemic conflicts.

For Hughes, students "writing everything like a police report" were ignoring the

necessary connections he wanted them to develop, which was the ability to unpack the

assumptions and reasoning behind an idea. Given that he believed that the police world

was so resistant to the diffusion of outside ideas, helping students to understand that the

need to unpack that reasoning was key to helping them take the ideas they received from

the AOC back to their departments. As such, the transfer of the epistemic "givens" that

needed no explanation in police writing became a moment of negative transfer for

Hughes because it not only failed to satisfy his expectations and needs as an instructor

but also became a potential roadblock to his students spreading the lessons of the AOC into the profession.

Hughes attempted to help his students with this issue by frequently asking them, in both their in class interactions and in their writing, to "flush that out," something that has become a bit of a joke with AOC students and graduates. As Hughes notes, "I keep saying flush that out for me. I must have said that a thousand times. Later, I get emails from [former students], and they'll put it in quotes, you know, razzing me. I'll make sure I'll flush this out for you." My participants did, indeed, reference "flushing it out" when we were working on the final paper for Hughes' class, both in a joking manner but also importantly as a tool to understand some of the comments I made on their writing. Both Shim and Ross specifically mentioned it during our conversations about their difficulties with this final assignment, especially when they were thinking about whether or not they had explained their ideas well enough. Thus, although Hughes may feel that some of his students resist the kind of help he's offering, this use of the concept by students indicates that he is getting through and helping to soothe points of negative transfer for at least some of his students.

Edwards shared much of this same view, explaining that when many of his students come into his class, the problem is that "ever since they've gone to the academy, we have beat on them as a profession, be short, succinct type. The old Dragnet 'just the facts, ma'am, just the facts.' Because of that, they're notorious for putting conclusions down without supporting that." He felt that his students had adapted to this consequence because it "was the nature of their job," a consequence of "their audience [being] by and large mid-level management. Sergeants and lieutenants have been about as far as their

152

writing has gone," and as a result, the closed loop of receiving writing from this mid-level tier and writing to the same people created a solidified sense of what counted as the appropriate way to write. However, Edwards was quick to point out that their attendance at the AOC marked a transition in their careers in which the students would have to learn different writing tactics. As he explained, the AOC students "are groomed to be command staff officers. Majors, lieutenant colonels. Chiefs if you will. Their audience now is no longer interested in that short, sweet, down and dirty. They're now writing for chiefs, for mayors. They're writing for civilians. They're writing for newspaper reporters or media. So they need to learn how to change that, to change the paradigm."

Interestingly, although Edwards indicates that the new audiences' needs are not satisfied by the "short, sweet, down and dirty" approach that results from police academy training, when I asked him what ability he wanted his writing assignments to help his students develop as they "change[d] the paradigm" of their writing, he responded, "To be able to analyze the information and convey a great deal of complex information in a very short document." While this may seem like a contradiction, as Edwards further explained, it became clear that although he recognized the same type of conflict of epistemic givens that Hughes was discussing (jumping to conclusions, leaving out important reasoning) in the problems of "writing like a cop," he wasn't bothered by the succinct aesthetic valued in police writing, although he desire that they explain their reasoning further than they would in most police reports or other typical writing. Beyond those conflicts, however, the primary conflict that Edwards had actually experienced with transfer related to the performance of identity was student desire to be recognized as performing an entirely different Discourse.

To understand that conflict, one needs to understand how Edwards approached instructing his students in their writing assignments. Where the other instructors left it to students to use their assignment sheets and their access to antecedent examples to guide them, Edwards provided a very specific template for most of his assignments, and he expected these to be followed without significant deviation. For example, the assignment for the third paper of his project series (the P3) was a "policies/procedures/practices evaluation" came with the following outline:

I. Introduction

(What are you going to say/do)

II. Summary of the Law

(What should you be doing)

III. Current Policy/Procedure/Practice

(What are you doing)

IV. Strengths/Weaknesses

(Good/bad or compliance/non-compliance)

V. Recommendations

(How, exactly, would risk be minimized)

VI. Conclusion

These outlines appeared to have been quite useful for his students. The participants in this study did not deviate from this provided outline, and in several of their papers, they

154

elected to include the outline segments as headings. It is likely that they did thus because they, like the participants in Jennie Nelson's 1990 study, "believed [the assignment] called for papers that clearly matched the steps outlined in their detailed assignment guidelines," but unlike the students in Nelson's study, the participants in my study were correct in taking this approach (p. 377-378).

As Edwards explained, he wanted his students to write using the outline and this approach to these writing assignments had developed because:

When I grade papers, I'm looking for certain things. I'm looking for keywords, key phrases. I'm looking for a certain organizational flow. Years ago, I did not use the templates. And what I found was a shotgun approach to writing. I may eventually find the six things I'm looking for, but my gosh, they're scattered all over the place. They were disorganized. They were not in a short and sweet, in-and-out format. I also did not have a page cap, based on whatever you wanted to do. So I was getting very long, very disorganized responses that were okay, but needed to be tightened up considerably. A boss is not going to read a twenty page paper.

Thus, the outline served to assist in evaluation of the assignment by making it easier to locate Edwards' "certain things," but as the concluding comment indicates, Edwards' frustration with the "scattered" academic-style papers was more than just because it made it difficult for him to grade. Like Hughes, Edwards saw his writing assignments are preparing his students to take ideas across Discursive borders, to be a "translator" of legal language for the students' bosses back in their departments. As such, these assignments are part of student apprenticeship in the "lawyer" Discourse that Edwards knew many of

155

his students avoided, and his frustration with these long papers was thus not only about them being difficult to grade but because students writing in that way were not acting as the translators he wanted them to become.

In this sense, this conflict would seem to be axiological, a moment where the aesthetic values for communication were clashing, but given that both Hughes and Edwards saw the primary problem with students' writing in the AOC was that they "wrote like cops," where was this conflict coming from? As noted Edwards himself, the aesthetic values of police writing are short, succinct, tight descriptions that can be quickly read and comprehended, providing the who, what, when, where, and how (and perhaps the why) of a situation in a "down and dirty" format. These approaches match up well with Edwards' desired values, the types of values "a boss" would want to see, so why were students producing papers that attempted to use such different axiological values?

Based on my experiences with Shim and her experiences with her first leadership paper (discussed in chapter three), I find myself concurring with Edwards' assessment that "what I was getting back from them was that they wanted to write academically. They wanted to impress me with they are here, they can master the rigors of a college course. They wanted to impress me with their academic writing." Students were choosing such a different approach because they wanted to be recognized as capable of performing as academic writers, so they were transferring the axiological values they felt were appropriate to their sense of the academic Discourse. Edwards said they were trying to "impress" him, but that would not be the word I would choose; rather, I would say they wanted to "be recognized" as performing a version of academic Discourse. As with Shim's decision to abandon and reject appropriate police writing strategies and instead

156

embrace the highly stylized language she used in the early drafts of her leadership paper, the students who produced these papers for Edwards rejected the stylistic approaches of police writing to be recognized as something else.

This conflict upset Edwards because by attempting to be recognized as academic writers, they were not achieving Edwards' primary goal of preparing students to be able to "translate" the legal Discourse ("talking lawyer") into something more compatible and comprehensible within the epistemic and axiological norms of police writing ("talking American"). As a result, these attempts became moments of significant negative transfer. After all, as Edwards noted, "They're going to write for me for thirteen weeks. That's it. After that, they're going to go back and write for someone that doesn't want to read twenty pages." To try to "force" students into not using the strategies of a Discourse he knew to be incompatible with police writing expectations, he started providing outlines like the one shown earlier and imposing a page limit. As Hughes' did with his constant repetition of "flush it out" to try to help students recognize epistemic conflicts, Edwards' structures became pedagogic support for minimizing Discourse conflict, but it took a very different form than Hughes' approach.

Although most of my participants expressed some level of frustration with the papers they Edward's for his course, the clear expectations he provided meant that none of them, with the exception of Powers, were frustrated with understanding his axiological or epistemic expectations. Even Shim, who seemed to want the most to be recognized as something other than a police writer, approached Edwards' papers with the provided outlines and the examples of antecedent papers in mind. Although all the students were being trained to be "translators" between legal and police Discourses, they seemed to be

completely comfortable with the restrictive forms these papers were to take. Only

Powers, who had problems with Edwards' epistemic expectations (Powers didn't want to

reveal problems with his department), demonstrated frustration with the type of

knowledge required for the papers. Their only real struggles with these papers was with

the legal databases they were expected to use. They found those databases confusing,

frustrating, and poorly designed. Still, once they overcame these difficulties, "writing like

cops" traditionally served them well as they focused on collecting and conveying

information, gathering the points that Edwards looked for when he graded.

I believe that students were primed not to resist this type of pedagogy because

much of police writing is about stable genres with specified structures. In addition, the

first phase of Edwards' assignment may have reminded them of the "stress training"

method described in chapter three. This first assignment was a proposal for their

semester-long project composed of multiple papers that would help students to become

an "expert" on a specific civil law issue that could affect their departments. In the first

paper, students would include an "identification of the topic [of the project], an

identification and discussion of the legal issues, a discussion of the relevance of the topic

to the agency, an explanation of why this topic was selected, a listing of the questions or

issues to be addressed, and an overview of the proposed methodology." All of this was to

be accomplished in two pages, and students were rated only as passed or unacceptable. If

the student did not receive the "big P" for pass, then he or she would rewrite the proposal

again, repeating the process as many times as needed. This experience is reminiscent of

the way that Powers, acting as a Field Training Officer (FTO), required his trainee to

keep writing drafts of the same police report until the trainee got it right. Many of

Edward' students get it right early on, but several would go through multiple rewrites until they had found a way to phrase their ideas in a way that was axiologically and epistemically acceptable to Edwards. In his words, the assignment asked students to "tell me what you're going to do. I don't care what you're going to do, just tell me what you're going to do. I will not give you a passing grade on that until you and I have reached a mutually acceptable contract. If you want to negotiate something, that's fine, but once we get the Big P [for Passing] on it, then that's our contract," and he would hold students to that outline for the rest of the semester. Assuming that Powers' description of his training process is not too different from that experienced by many police officers (and Parsons and Jesilow's (2001) description of the ubiquity of stress training would indicate that it is not), this experience with Edwards would prime many of the students for adjusting to his expectations just as they had once adapted to their FTOs. This congruence, in addition to the stability and structure of the papers likely helped smooth potential moments of identity conflict.

By understanding Edwards' and Hughes' expectations of conflict and how they attempted to address these through their pedagogy, two useful generalizations can be made. First, previous instructor experiences with students drawing from or performing versions of Discourses are likely to provide a useful framework for instructor to use to anticipate future conflicts. Returning to Bergmann and Zepernick's (2007) analysis of advanced engineering and science students rejecting the possibility of transferring from their FYC courses, the strategies and successes of Hughes and Edwards suggest that if the FYC instructors in Bergmann and Zepernick's study were better aware of how students perceived the courses, those instructors could potentially modify their pedagogy to ease

student rejection of its usefulness. In other words, if those instructors structured their pedagogy so that Discourse conflicts were soothed with better explanations and potentially assignment structures, then those students would have been more likely to perceive the overlaps and transfer more successfully from their FYC courses. However, AOC instructors have a luxury most FYC instructors do not in that they can be reasonably certain that all of AOC students share strong experiences in similar Discourses and thus draw from roughly the same type of performance of identity, so a FYC pedagogy that attempted to minimize potential conflicts would have to be cautious in its application of blanket assumptions. Second, as Edwards' experiences with his students attempting to perform academic-style prose indicate, even when we create pedagogies that are aware of and address issues of identity performance, students may attempt to resist in ways that we do not anticipate. This second generalization will be further developed in the section of this chapter that discusses of instructor performance of identity situated the possibilities for student performance of identity.

Vito: Welcoming Different Identities

If Edwards' approach helped bridge the tendency of students to "write like cops" by finding moments when many of the norms of police writing would be appropriate and useful to the writing assignments and thus discouraged attempts to be recognized as performing a different identity, Vito's writing series had very different expectations for students. As explained earlier, for Vito, these assignments were the primary moments of learning during the course. Although class periods were filled with discussions of textbook readings, with viewings and analysis of "leadership case studies" (popular films depicting important leaders and leadership moments), the real pedagogy of the course

160

was its writing and the opportunities it provided students to reflect and to apply the principles obtained from The Leadership Challenge.

As a result, Vito's experiences with what it meant for AOC students to "write like cops" was quite different than Hughes or Edwards. Where Hughes constantly worked against an epistemic conflict and Edwards worked against attempts by students to represent themselves as "academic writers," Vito experienced problems with students writing within the boundaries of being recognizable as "cops." While he rarely failed papers, the papers that were the least successful were those that "have a tendency to [be] about . . . people that they work with and how they're a good role model." In other words, by pointing to the leaders within their department and the way those leaders act as role models, writers who take this approach write to be recognizable as like these other police officers. They "write like cops" to be intelligible as a cop. In some ways, this tendency was an epistemic conflict, because what Vito really valued, and what earned Shim her prize after he evaluated the first essay, was "a personal story . . . [Those] students write about brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers and grandfathers. And you know, you can tell they really thought about it, and they expressed themselves well by telling a personal story." As a result, it was those students who did not restrict the strategies they used through the performance of "writing like a cop," who opened themselves to other ways of being recognized beyond a police officer that earned Vito's highest evaluations.

However, Vito did not believe he was training his students in writing academic papers or that his approach was specifically academic, although they were certainly school-based genres. Rather, he believed, as Edwards and Hughes did, that the students at

161

the AOC were at a point in their career where the type of writing they were going to do was about to change. While they were all well-practiced writers because "the entire system runs on reports," the writing they would do in management was no longer about "here's what happened in this incident." Instead, they were writing to supervise, writing to organize efforts, and writing to promote organizational change, and he believed his assignments helped with this because even if they were quite different from any of the genres used by police writers, they trained them in the right type of thinking "because [they've] got to assess and reason about why [they're] applying things a certain way. [They] have to make the case. Build an argument."

Although these may be overly generic criteria for "good" writing (academic or otherwise), I believe that Vito's goals were roughly parallel to those of Hughes and Edwards in that he wanted this evaluation of experience, this building of an argument for why someone fulfilled the criteria for this specific leadership framework, to help students prepare to translate and diffuse this approach of leadership into a way that other police would understand. By valuing the personal over the organizational, Vito was rewarding those students who seemed most willing to step outside the safety boundaries of "writing like a cop" and thus be more willing to make those connections upon leaving the AOC.

Unfortunately, where Hughes and Edwards had specific strategies to try to help students overcome the different problems with transferred strategies they anticipated, Vito, at least in my observation and interviews with him, did not. He was quite open to students taking a variety of approaches to their assignments and, unless a paper was a complete failure, he was very generous in his grading, considering an A- to be a low grade. Given how much the students of the AOC cared about grades, they generally

162

appreciated this supportive approach to their assignments. However, although the participants in my student also valued Vito's writing assignments (as well as his whole course, generally speaking very positively about their experience in it), I am uncertain if they ever perceived the elements of "writing like a cop" that Vito didn't value and perceived that he was willing to embrace representations of other, if still related, identities.

Rather than receiving feedback that may have encouraged them to take greater risks, to abandon the antecedent papers that were guiding them on many of their assignments, the only somewhat negative feedback that they received was on grammar and other mechanical concerns. As Vito explained, he's not "a grammarian. I always say it's like playing a piano by ear. I know how to write because I read, but if you tell me that's a comma splice or this or - you know, I don't know. I don't know. I mean, I know when it looks right and when it looks wrong. But [students] have got learn that from someone else." As a result, while I believe that Vito appreciated the signposting and transitional elements that Shim and I struggled to introduce into her paper, I cannot be certain because beyond a rubric used for all assignments, the main comments all participants received were grammatical.

One generalization that can be made from this discussion of Vito's experiences is that while FYC instructors may be welcoming of student attempts to try out different identities and the epistemic and axiological values that go along with them, by not openly addressing those differing expectations, students may be less willing to try them. While Shim seemed to sense that Vito would be willing to accept her use of very different approaches than police writers typically do, a student like Ross, who was very flexible in

163

his understanding of self and willing to embrace alternative approaches, chose to stick to what he understood to be the 'safer' path for writing because classroom discussions of writing, which were minimal, did not address Vito's preference for personal over professional stories. As I will further address in chapter five, apprenticeship in a different Discourse is risky not only for the instructor but also for the learner, so if composition instructors do not make it clear that apprenticeship is being offered at a lower risk, students are unlikely to take that risk.

Support Services

The previous section discussed the problems related to transfer that the instructors of the AOC anticipated and their strategies for limiting them. However, the support that AOC students receive goes beyond the classroom. In addition to the social support they receive from classmates and the antecedent examples they use as guides, the AOC's students can make use of the University of Louisville's writing center. Over the years, AOC students have become a familiar presence in the writing center, and, as noted in chapter two, Hughes asked me to speak about its services when I recruited participants.

However, as Stephen North's classic 1984 "Idea of a Writing Center" made clear, the instructors who send their students to the writing center often have vastly different ideas about what the writing center is and does. While writing center consultants often visit classes to inform students about the writing center and explain its holistic approach towards writing assistance, many students and instructors continue to believe that its primary service is to be that "someone else" that Vito indicated grammar instruction should come from. It shouldn't be a surprise, then, that when I asked the AOC's instructors about the writing center and how they believed it might help their students,

they were uncertain about what the writing center did and what it might offer the students in terms of finding ways to bridge between their successful writing skills as police and the writing they were doing for their AOC courses. For instance, Vito seemed to view it primarily as a proofreading service, explaining that when grammatical concerns do "pop up, I'll tell them, take this draft, now I've graded it, take that one over there and let them go through it with you because you write run on sentences and you don't have good paragraph structure."

Edwards explained that although he was aware of the writing center and believed that it "seems to be well received" by students who use it, he didn't "know exactly what goes on in terms of percentage of students that use it. Do they take rough drafts, are they polishing the dream or are they mining the gold? I'm not sure what they're doing over there, but the students seem pleased with it." Despite this generally positive evaluation, he also advised me, "I think sometimes there's a reluctance to go over there. You know, they feel, I have reached this level in my life, I write a lot, and I don't need anybody else to tell me how to write, which is sad." Since he was uncertain about the writing center's pedagogy or how it might fit into his own efforts to help them bridge between the writing they do (the brevity and succinct styles of "writing like a cop") and the writing he wanted, he was unable to address student concerns that being told the writing center might help them was denying the identity of being successful police writers that many of them have developed.

Hughes, however, seemed to see the writing center and its potential help with not only grammatical issues but also his concerns about students not seeing where they were leaving out information because of the epistemic conflict he anticipated. Because the

primary development he wanted to see in his students was to "have the ability to fully explain something in a real way," and he believed that "many of them just don't have that" ability, his main hope for the writing center experiences was to help them address that epistemic conflict he expected to be transferred from "writing like a cop". In his words:

> The students are not used to writing in academic. They're used to writing in a much shorter fashion. And they're used to writing to get just enough down to be done. It's part of the job. Because you put too much in, it might come back to haunt you. You don't put enough in, that might come back to haunt you. Right? So an outside system of support that helps them see what 'good' looks like or how to improve what they have, I think it is really important for them. And to be honest with you, I don't just have the time to or really the skill base to do that.

For Hughes, the writing center might help students overcome epistemic conflicts by having another person more comfortable with academic writing address moments of epistemic conflict. Although he also mentioned the importance of the writing center helping students with grammar, his concern about how the writing center might help address the transfer of writing tendencies appropriate to police writing but inappropriate to his assignments was unique among the AOC instructors.

In general, these findings suggest that the instructors, because of their uncertainty about the services or pedagogy offered via the writing center, did not in general perceive the writing center as a place to help ease the transition between the identities associated with police writing and the identities appropriate to their academic writing.

Situating Identity in the Classroom

In the previous sections, I discussed how instructors anticipated problems related to transfer, discussed how they provided or did not provide support to help students overcome those problems, and discussed how the instructors perceived or did not perceive how support services might help with those issues. While these discussions provide a good sense of instructor expectations and strategies, writing assignments do not exist in a vacuum, especially when it comes to the performance of identity. Rather, students understand at least a significant portion of the types of identities that they believe instructors l value via classroom interactions. When students seem to ignore written instructions and to approach assignments in inappropriate ways, their choice to do so may have come from classroom interactions and their sense of their instructors' performances of identity.

Hughes attempted to ease any potential conflicts with his students' expectations by speaking in a fashion that he felt was appropriate for the officers, one that mimicked his understanding of police Discourse. This was quite effective, so much so that during my initial observations of the AOC, many of the students were discussing whether or not Hughes had ever been an officer. Although the conversation never led to a resolution, Shim spoke for many of the students when she commented, "I could just imagine him as one of my old sergeants, couldn't you?" In fact, as noted in chapter two, Hughes had never worked in policing, although he had been the leader of an amusement park's security department, with more than 180 people under his supervision. Many of those individuals had gone onto law enforcement as a result of their experiences there, so Hughes believed that while he had never actually been a police officer, he "gravitated to

it in some way" because he had "affiliated with folks who" maintained becoming a police officer as their career goal.

As a result of that experience, Hughes became quite comfortable with a way of speaking to his class using a version of police Discourse. It mirrored a great deal of how I heard the AOC's students speaking to each other, including police jargon, a certain kind of bravado, and a casual inclusion of "swear" or "curse" words. When I asked him about my observation of this behavior, he was surprised at first and momentarily looked perplexed. He then explained that he was "kind of embarrassed that [I saw] that," but when I affirmed my belief that students responded extremely positively to it, he went on to explain that he does it because:

> I think it's effective. But I've got no, it's one of those kinds of things where you . . . analyzing it now, you know, it gets kind of awkward for me. But I do think it's important to them because while all students, but particularly them, are at risk more than most students. And so they need to kind of be made to feel comfortable some times. Sometimes a way you can do that is to . . . I don't know, to lighten it somehow, to alter it somehow. That technique works to do that sometimes.

Speaking in a version of recognizable police Discourse helped to soothe potential conflicts by creating a space where the AOC's students felt more aligned, which thus prevented one element of identity performance, the exclusion of voices not like one's one, from barring transfer. Hughes' performance of that Discourse did indeed make students feel more involved with the course, giving them 'permission' to speak during the large chunks of class he left open for student discussion because they knew their type of speech, their Discourse, was welcomed. Although most of my participants referred to

Hughes' class as probably the most difficult they encountered and spoke frequently about the legendary difficulty of his tests, I never saw any sense of student resentment or resistance to his ideas. Students were so engaged that classes were dominated by student discussion of the topic at hand, and Hughes had to work to keep it under control more than to find ways to get students to talk.

However, that sense of congruence between Hughes's Discourse, as represented in class discussions and lectures, also led to potential negative transfer. Earlier, I indicated that Hughes' expectations of transfer conflict were mostly epistemic, but he experienced axiological conflict. In his words, "The other thing [my students] will do is they will write exactly as they speak. And so they haven't found their written voice. They use their vocal voice as their written voice." However, while this is a moment of potentially negative transfer, the ways in which he uses a version of "talking like a cop" when speaking may be being read by his students as welcoming their use of this same Discourse, this same performance of identity. While improved in-class interactions may have been a significant benefit of Hughes' choice to speak more "like a cop" in class, I believe that it also led to the students' choice to think that there would be no need to switch Discourses when writing formal assignments. Thus, although Hughes believed that "[in] the world we live in today, to be effective in terms of vocal communication as well as written communication, you just have to be able to write a lot differently than you speak," by creating a space that was extremely welcoming of "the way cops speak," he achieved greater discussion in the classroom as the cost of not signaling that a switch of identity would be required in writing. As a result, it lead to some moments of transfer that became perceived as negative by Hughes as the evaluator.

Edwards' experience was in many ways very similar to that of Hughes, but as a former police officer and police lawyer, he didn't have to overcome the perception of being an outsider that Hughes worked against through his type of language. If anything, Edwards was very comfortable performing elements of being a Kentucky State Trooper. While he never left room to doubt his academic qualifications, he, like Hughes, spoke in a police Discourse fashion, casually dropping jargon and cursing into his lectures. Moreover, beyond these axiological efforts, he demonstrated his epistemic qualifications by frequently mentioning his experiences during class sessions, and he also highlighted the current Trooper in the AOC session, asking him questions that demonstrated Edwards' knowledge of the inner workings of that agency. Even in his interviews with me, as the section quoted earlier indicated, he sometimes would begin referencing police as "we," marking himself as one and speaking from the shared experience of being a police officer. As such, Edwards seemingly never experienced any of the need to switch Discourses that Hughes (or Vito, to be discussed next) did. Since he was always performing a certain type of police identity, he was always situating the possibilities for identity in the classroom in relation to that police identity. Students knew they were with another cop, and so they felt the pressures discussed earlier to always be recognizable as police themselves.

Thus, Powers' reaction to Edwards, which was almost always negative and which led to his unwillingness to adapt to specific expectations in his writing for Edwards, is especially complicated. Given that I believe that Powers was the most "cop's cop" of my participants, why did he have such a reaction to Edwards' strong performance of his cop identity? In Hughes' class, Powers felt challenged by the material and often struggled

with the challenging tests, but he felt that Hughes, while he had never been a cop, clearly knew a lot about the profession and "had a lot of great ideas" about how it might improve. Vito, who had also never been a cop and didn't perform a cop-like Discourse (and who, as I shall shortly discuss, experienced the most conflict because of this), was rated by Powers as "just a good dude who can teach you a lot about life." However, when it came to his experiences with Edwards, he was frustrated by the constant referencing Edwards did to his experiences as a Trooper. After all, as Powers said, "There's only one Trooper in this class, but [Edwards] talks about being a Trooper all the time, like Troopers are the best type of cops."

Moreover, it seemed as if Powers never felt that his own experiences and developed competency as a police officer were recognized and valued by Edwards, and he commented that he thought Edwards believed "he was a better cop than anyone in that room" because of his strong ongoing performance of police Discourse. My observation of Edwards doesn't confirm Powers' evaluation in that he seemed open to all of his students' experiences, but Powers' reaction was, I believe, at the root of the performance of identity that closed down his willingness to expand his papers to achieve Edwards' epistemic requirements. Given how much he was willing to adapt his writing for the other courses and the amount of growth demonstrated in his final paper for Vito (see chapter three), this ultimately negative transfer of strategies to his papers for Edwards demonstrates how powerful the performance of identity can be as shaping a learner's perception of where and when affordances for different strategies exist. If the learner locks down his or her own performance of identity due to a sensed oppositional performance of identity, then little room for growth is afforded.

Also interesting, then, is Edwards' own comments that the writing series he used had developed largely because students had been trying to write "academic style" papers that were too long, too unfocused, and too difficult to skim, which he understood as the students attempting to show him that they could achieve academic standards. Although these changes occurred long before I observed Edwards' course or talked to students going through the writing series, I believe that it is unlikely that Edwards performed less of a police identity in those earlier classes. Given the frequency with which his experiences appeared in lecture and the decorations of his office, which included badges from the state troopers of all fifty American states, I believe that he has long held his police identity close and kept it highly visible. If I am correct in that assessment, then the decision of previous students to try to show their academic capabilities, to be recognized as academic writers, is truly interesting. As I explained above, I believe one of the effects of Hughes' decision to speak "like a cop" during his course lectures is that students feel that they can use the same type of language when writing for him because it will be valued by him. However, in Edwards' class, where being a cop is performed so centrally, students chose to try to demonstrate their ability in a very different Discursive style. Why?

I can only conjecture in response, but I believe that Powers' reaction to Edwards may point a potential direction. If other students reacted as Powers did, feeling that their own understanding of self as a police officer was not being recognized and might, to some degree, be challenged by Edwards' constant reference to his own Trooper experience, then they may have attempted to challenge Edwards' academic identity by showing, through attempting academic styles, that they could be recognized as just as

172

academically capable as Edwards himself. Although their actual successes may have been

mixed, the desire to perform that element of identity led them to attempt to transfer

strategies from their own academic experiences, including the type of elongated sentence

structures, expansive vocabulary, and extended argument structures that are sometimes

believed to be hallmarks of academic-style writing. However, as noted earlier, none of

my participants attempted this approach, including Shim. While they may have had

mixed feelings about Edwards, only Powers chose to resist the provided outlines by not

including some of the required information.

In addition to students sometimes not feeling as of their performance of identity

as police was being undervalued in the shadow of Edwards' strong performance of police

identity, another possible reason for this conflict appeared when Edwards shifted a bit

more towards his identity as a police lawyer. As Edwards explained, police and the legal

services that protect them in the case of civil lawsuits are not always communicative, and

police often believe that lawyers are speaking a different language with a very different

set of values. This conflict appeared in the moment briefly discussed in chapter three on

the day that the legal services paper was assigned. At the time, Edwards was talking

about the practice of legal services reaching a settlement with those filing lawsuits

against the department instead of going to trial to defend the police officer's behavior. As

noted in chapter three, honor is a strong axiological value in police Discourse, so when

Edwards began discussing this, several students bristled in response. They repeatedly

expressed how they felt betrayed by legal services in these cases, even if the settlements

often didn't involve admitting wrong doing or harm the police officers' careers. When

Edwards responded with, "What would rather have, a trial that you can't guarantee you'll

win and a chance at losing your job?," it did little to soothe the axiological conflict they felt. Thus, one of the reasons students, including Powers, may have chosen to resist Edwards was rooted in the sense that despite his strong police performance, he wasn't really on their side, wasn't really "one of them."

If Edwards' performances sometimes led to students sensing conflict and resisting him and Hughes' mimicry of police Discourse led to a productive, inclusive atmosphere but also issues of axiological conflict, then Vito's performance of a decidedly non-police identity lead to a complicated space of uncertain boundaries for both him and his students. Vito experienced the most conflict between his status as a lifelong academic who had never worked as a police officer and an instructor who was attempting to teach police how to be better leaders. Part of this conflict was no doubt rooted in the type of "insular" quality of police that Hughes referenced, but I will argue in this section that a great deal of the conflict Vito experienced during my observation was also rooted in the gendered status of the police institution (see my discussion in chapter three) and the relationship it created with the popular culture texts ("cases," in his terms) he used as instructional material.

Vito was well regarded by all of my participants, including Powers, who demonstrated more growth as a student in his papers for Vito than he did elsewhere, but Vito reported that such had not always been the case. Although he believed that such instances had decreased as the ratio of undergraduates and graduate students had shifted, he reported that:

Sometimes with cops, sometimes it's like, hey, you're not a cop. That's what they'll always hit you with. You've never been a cop . . . It even came up in

174

graduation once. In one class, the president said that. You know, because we have the president of the class deliver the address, and he said, "Well, Vito's class was pretty good even though he wasn't a cop."

However, Vito believes that in general he has "gotten used to it" and has learned to respond to students who raise that the concern with, "Look, you're not here to learn how to be cops. You're here to learn how to be a manager, and I know about that."

Although the voiced opposition to Vito's status as a non-police officer teaching about principles of leadership has decreased over time, other signs of student resistance still appear. As Vito explained:

I can tell when they really don't buy into what I'm talking about. In other words, some people come here with their minds made up about the way things are and the way they should be. The way organizations should run. And we challenge a lot of that. And they don't always take it well. But because they're in a kind of militaristic, quasi-militaristic authoritarian mostly organization, they usually won't say so. But their body language does.

As Vito explained and Hughes advocated, because part of the AOC's purpose is not only to help police officers develop leadership abilities but to help transform the policing profession by helping the spread of ideas from outside the world of policing, they challenge many of the older, more established ways of thinking about policing and leadership.

One of the main ways that Vito's course attempts this challenge is, as chapter two described, by centering the class on viewing popular films used as case studies of

leadership. The primary purpose of such an approach was to provide examples on which

to use the framework provided by The Leadership Challenge, but when considering

identity as the recognizable performance of specific elements of a Discourse (Gee 2011),

these popular texts become more than just demonstrations of specific types of leadership.

As Powers noted in his support of Vito's approach (believing that one could learn about

how to be a good police officer through Andy Griffith), much of popular understanding

about acts of leadership come through media representation. The most popular of these

texts are shared across multiple Discourses, offering a series of recognizable moments

that help a great number of people conceptualize what leadership means. Thus, as much

as writing papers that applied Kouzes and Posner's model to their own experiences

helped students to understand the framework, the viewing and discussion of the films

provided a shared forum where students could publically discuss shared texts and

recognize the elements of identity they saw as leadership, providing students with some

sense of what types of identity were appropriate for the class and the writing they were

doing.

Because they are working with these popular films as a way of discussing the

framework but also understanding their cultural representation of leadership, Vito has

attempted to choose the films he uses to provide a wide spectrum of leadership:

> The first tendency we had, I noticed, with all of us was war. We're using Crimson
>
> Tide, we're using Twelve O'Clock High, and The Hunt for Red October. I said,
>
> "Well, what the hell is this, a military college?" No. You've got to have diversity.
>
> You got to have different races, you've got to have men, you've got to have

women. You can't just throw white men up there as God's gift to leadership.

Okay, so I try to I emphasize that. I try to be diverse.

During my observations of his course, Vito attempted to represent diversity in his films by including films like <u>Remember the Titans</u> and <u>Secretariat</u>, but as I will shortly explain, the ways in which this diversity was discussed and accepted by the students was mixed, leading to a limited sense of what type of identity performance would be accepted by Vito (and their classmates) as appropriate.

Drawing from the history of policing as a gendered organization (see chapter three), I would argue that the "first tendency" that Vito and others felt in choosing to represent leadership by using representations of militaristic white men in moments of crisis was not an accident of coincidence, but rather an expression of that history and the existing cultural representations of police. Those students who, as Vito explained, came to the AOC "with their minds already made up" about what leadership looked like would likely be highly receptive of films in this vein because they confirmed much of that understanding. In terms of the performance of identity, they would recognize themselves or their desired understanding of themselves within the films, finding within the representation of hegemonic masculinity confirmation of their understanding of themselves. However, with those films that represented models of leadership other than those associated with hegemonic masculinity, those individuals would demonstrate resistance that could affect their perception of what performance of identity would or would not be accepted by the instructor who showed those films.

During my observation of Vito's classroom, these expectations were seemingly confirmed, although in complicated ways. On the surface, because <u>Remember the Titans</u>

(2000) stars Denzel Washington and is historically situated during the period of school integration by busing, the film should be a good way to discuss questions of race and its relationship to leadership. However, throughout the film, although questions of racism abound, Denzel Washington's Herman Boone, the head high school football coach, works to subsume any of the questions of race by pushing the normative values of masculinity that football represents as a way to bypass questions of race. During the first act of the film, the potential players for the new football team elect to board the buses that will transport them to the site of their camp by race, leaving one bus for black students and one for white students. Boone, seeing the players have placed their Discursive racial identities above the Institutional identities of his team, forces them to get off the busses and reload based on their team unit, offense or defense, beginning a process of dissolving other identities and replacing it with an Institutional one. The first act's resolution comes when two players, Wood Harris's Julius Campbell and Ryan Hurst's Gerry Bertier, willingly subsume themselves into their Institutional identities as members of the team's defense, providing the moment that allows the rest of the time to do likewise. For the remainder of the film, as the team's members experience forces of racial struggle, they turn on their Institutional sense of themselves as members of something greater, the football team called the Titans, to soothe that conflict.

Ultimately, then, the model of leadership presented in <u>Remember the Titans</u> is not about the racial struggles of the film's time period but about a hegemonic masculinity, a specific way of being masculine that can provide social harmony across an organization. In this reading, <u>Remember the Titans</u> is not all that distinct from the militaristic films that Vito mentioned earlier, and thus, it isn't surprising that it was well received during my

observation of the AOC. The discussion after the film ignored questions of race (or sexuality, briefly evoked in the film through the Kip Pardue's Ronnie 'Sunshine' Bass, who is potentially gay but also commits to this Institutional identity over any other) in favor of discussions of specific Boones' speeches to his team about how to win, the players' efforts to bring the team together despite the community's greater struggle, and, at times, remembrances of students' own football experiences.

The 2010 film Secretariat, about Penny Chenery Tweedy and her famous Triple Crown-winning horse, was received in quite a different way. Throughout the film, Diane Lane's Chenery Tweedy is continually working against the assumed knowledge of an institution, the world of horse racing. Like policing, that world is also gendered masculine in its history and dominant ways of achieving recognition and social power. While the film is about Secretariat's amazing performance during his races, it is mostly a representation of Chenery Tweedy's efforts to resist the accepted way of doing things and to redefine the business of horse racing, much of which requires her to overcome assumptions about her gender's intrinsic lack of understanding both horses and business. The horse's ultimate triumph is not just a triumph for the horse, but for Chenery Tweedy in the face of a structure of hegemonic masculinity to which she never conforms. Although she masters a Discursive identity that achieves recognition in the world of horse racing, she never accepts the Institutional role that would have been assigned to her by that Discourse. Her leadership, unlike that of Boone in Remember the Titans, isn't about placing the Institutional identity or organization role above a different Discursive or other identity, but about bending the organization, challenging the role an Institution would provide when it is unjust and denying of opportunities. The film's Chenery

Tweedy is undoubtedly a leader who builds a team that challenges and, through Secretariat's victory on the tracks, upsets the established order, but she is not one who does so by reaching for some higher order that transcends her gender as Boone's greater Institutional masculinity bypasses questions of race for glory and unity through the game of football.

As a result, the student reaction to Secretariat was quite a bit different than the reaction to Remember the Titans. At first, much of the discussion was about the horse itself and the amazing qualities of its victories, but as Vito tried to shape the conversation more onto the representation of Chenery Tweedy's leadership and how it fit the Kouzes and Posner model, members of the class pushed back. While some praised her using the terminology of the model, one student in particular simply said, "I think she was insane. Like completely crazy," and murmurs of agreement came from around the room. Oddly, no one attempted to challenge that evaluation of her leadership, and it remained unchallenged as the class ended that day. When I later asked Vito why he thought Secretariat had received such feedback from the students, he frowned slightly and said, "Probably because it was about a woman." In a similar vein, in previous years he had shown the film Elizabeth and received even stronger negative feedback, leading to his decision to stop using the film.

Although this discussion of these two films and the student reaction to them may seem to have veered far from the subject of transfer and the performance of identity, these two moments demonstrate key ways in which the Discursive elements of classroom interaction allowed or forbid different performances of identity, going beyond the efforts and instructor makes to facilitate one. As mentioned in chapter one, police feel

tremendous pressure not only to be recognizable to the public that they serve, but to each other, and the ways in which popular culture objects are understood, parsed, discussed, accepted, and rejected by other police is a powerful force for defining who is and who is not recognizable as part of a Discursive identity (Gee, 2011). Although, as Vito intended, both films served as valid "cases" to which the Kouzes and Posner model of leadership could be applied productively, the Discursive rejection of the representation of Chenery Tweedy's leadership made it impossible for it to be considered by at least the most vocal segment of the class as a model for leadership within policing.

Where this social pressure became most evident was in the topics selected for Vito's assignment in which students were asked to read a biography of a famous leader and analyze it using the Kouzes and Posner leadership model. Many students, including my participants, reached for military models, including General Omar Bradley and Alaric the Visigoth. Even when not a military choice, and despite Vito's attempt not to hold up "white males as God's gift to leadership," such individuals were often the choice, including Al Gore and Steve Jobs by my other participants. Very rare were the students who, like Shim, choose a different model. Susan B. Anthony may not seem like a radical choice for such a paper, but when Thornton and Ross mentioned talking with her about her topic and drafting process, they repeatedly commented on how surprising it was that she had chosen a woman as her example leader. Despite the efforts by Vito to open the Discursive model of leadership through representations that went beyond its norms, even supportive, flexible individuals were surprised when one of their colleagues went outside their expected representations, indicating how potent the limits related to the performance of identity can be.

Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed the following points:

1. In my discussion of how the instructors understood student expectations for the AOC program, I revealed their anticipation of **student pressure to succeed in the program and how their understanding of that pressure led instructors to adapt strategies to try to soothe conflicts and support successful transition via elements of their pedagogies.**

2. In my discussion of teacher expectations of conflict, **I explained how previous experiences with students had led the teachers to anticipate significant conflicts tied to the performance of identity.** The first of these conflicts was **epistemic, in which the instructors felt that police would jump to conclusions without supporting those conclusions or revealing the thought process they used to get there**. The second of these conflicts was **axiological, in which students would sometimes attempt to write using stylistic choices that were negatively evaluated by their instructors**, although sometimes this meant that **the axiological conflict could be rooted in a student trying to perform an academic identity.** The third of these conflicts was a kind of **authenticity challenge rooted in student perceptions of a conflict of identity**, in which students felt that those instructors who had "not been cops" would not be able to share valid information with them.

3. In my discussion of teacher attempts to ease conflicts, I detailed how different instructors attempted to **ease epistemic conflicts through repeating a core**

phrase to stress the type of approach they wanted to see, attempted to **ease**

axiological conflicts by providing specific structures for students to use,

and how **instructors had mixed understandings of how support services,**

such as the campus writing center, could be used to address these

conflicts.

4. In my discussion of how instructors situated student identity in the classroom,

I revealed how **instructor performance of identity led students to**

perceptions of what types of identity would be appropriate for their

writing assignments, sometimes leading to **axiological conflict when**

instructor expectations for appropriate language and style were

undermined by students' sense that approaches would be welcomed

because of classroom interactions. In addition, I detailed how conflicts of

identity performance **might lead to students attempting to challenge an**

instructor through the performance of identity, either by refusing to

comply or by attempting to perform a Discourse opposite of teacher

expectations. I also discussed how the **gendered history of organizations**

and the Discourses associated with them can lead students resisting

pedagogies they see as threatening that sense of their identity.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I discussed how the instructors of the AOC anticipated issues with transfer and how they attempted to work (or didn't work) against those expected problems. In addition, I discussed how they understood external support services in assisting their students, including with any elements of aligning identity, and then concluded with a discussion of how classroom interactions situated the possibilities for student identity performance.

In this concluding chapter, I begin by summarizing my findings represented in chapters three and chapter four, and then present some of the implications of these findings. I conclude by discussing a method for avoiding potential issues with the performance of identity and transfer, a method that is sometimes called "the performance of neutrality" (Kopelson 2003), and then suggest some additional elements that need to be considered when thinking about student performance of identity.

Summary of Findings

In the previous chapters, I found that the performance of identity does seem to have a strong effect on the possibilities for learners to perceive and act upon affordances for transfer and for instructors to support and make those affordances possible.

Chapter three focused on the experiences of my student participants and their writing processes. Much of my analysis in this chapter developed from my interviews

with them, but I also included a significant section of their writing to illustrate my analysis and incorporated anecdotal evidence from my experiences providing support. To better understand their experiences, I drew from histories of gender in policing, specifically Parsons and Jesilow's 2001 study of women officers. In this study, Parsons and Jesilow found that the growing inclusion of women into law enforcement had not led to significant changes in the culture or language of policing because the history of law enforcement had left the organization strongly gendered towards hegemonic masculine ways of knowing and acting. Women who had joined the force had not changed this gendered culture because they had to be intelligible within it in order to advance, leading to both male and female police officers speaking "in the same voice" and only presenting one type of professional identity.

The long-lasting effects of this gendered legacy were evident in my discussion of how the performance of identity may sometimes lead learners to make inappropriate transfers or resist transferring appropriate strategies. Although Katy Shim's experiences as a police writer had provided her with strong textual organization and formatting strategies that were appropriate to the AOC's assignments, she resisted using those approaches in one of her earlier papers. The historic gendered legacies of police Discourse may have led her to attempt to represent a different identity, possibly causing her to reject the transfer of those strategies. Instead, she favored a more expressionistic approach that reflected writing practices she had been praised for in very different writing situations. In the conclusion of that section, I explained the process by which I was able to help her perceive a bridge between the two different performances of identity and write a paper that was highly successful.

Another aspect of how this gendered legacy affected participants demonstrates how the performance of identity can sometimes lead learners to not want to leave old strategies behind and to resist seeking assistance with a new Discourse. Unlike Shim, who existed in a complicated relationship with the restrictions of police Discourse and the hegemonic masculine epistemic and axiological limits that came with it, Powers and Danube were both extremely recognizable as performing within the expectations of hegemonic masculinity. Powers was reluctant to abandon approaches he used as a police writer, ultimately leading to negative transfer, and Danube was unwilling to receive support for his writing. These experiences illustrate how being successfully recognized as a member of a Discourse and perceiving some kind of conflict between that Discourse and the one(s) valued in a specific writing situations might cause learners to block adapting even when strategies are unsuccessful. From this analysis, I suggest that when we are working to minimize negative transfer by helping students to decrease their reliance on previously successful strategies, we need to consider the cost learners experience in doing so. Because those strategies are often bound up in their successful performances of identity elsewhere, not recognizing these costs may cause learners to resist adapting or dropping them.

However, I also found that not all learners find that performances of identity serve as a barrier to transfer or adaptation. Some are better prepared to drop or adapt previously used strategies that are part of their existing performance of identity when they encounter new Discourses and the writing situations they represent. From my discussion of Ross's and Thornton's experiences, I show how learners who have experienced less successful recognition within a Discourse or who have previously experienced crossing multiple

Discourses may not feel that switching their performance is a great cost to them. Such learners might simply be seen as "good students," but their "good"ness comes not from an intrinsic superiority to other students but in their willingness to transfer, adapt, and relinquish classroom and writing strategies without seeing such as a threat to their "selves" or the identities they perform. Although I believe that my experiences with Shim, Powers, and Danube illustrate many of the potential problems that can arise with transfer related to the performance of identity, the experiences I describe with Ross and Thornton show how identity performance may place certain students in an optimal position to transition between different Discourses and their related identities.

In the final section of chapter three, I found that the performance of identity affects not only what students transfer, positively or negatively, or fail to transfer into a classroom experience but also what they believe they will be able transfer from that experience. In my discussion of what Shim, Powers, and Ross felt they could transfer from their writing strategies that they developed during their time in the AOC, I highlighted how student expectations of what epistemic and axiological approaches would be appropriate to their 'home' Discourse can shut down the possibility for successful transfer before it can happen. Although all of the instructors believed that the students of the AOC, in the process of transferring into police leadership, would need to become more flexible writers who would use some of the strategies they would gain from completing the writing assignments they were given, only Shim believed that she would be able to take any of those strategies 'back home'. Even a student as flexible as Ross believed that he would unable to use any of the writing approaches he had used in his classes because no one in his department would find them appropriate or useful. While

those favoring a stronger form of activity theory will feel that such transfer might be impossible because, as Patrick Dias, Aviva Freedman, Peter Medway, and Anthony Par (1999) argue, these activities are "worlds apart," my experiences with these learners suggested that such separation may be tied not just to the activity but to the identities bound up in those activities and the larger Discourses of which they are part.

In some ways, these findings of chapter three may remind readers of the findings of Mary Jo Reiff and Anis Bawarshi's (2011) study of how students transferred their previous experience with different writing genres into FYC, especially their finding that some learners act as "boundary guarders" and hold onto their existing genre knowledge even when it is inappropriate. In addition, they found that some learners act as "boundary crossers" and were more capable of repurposing and reimagining their writing strategies for very new contexts (p. 324-325). In many ways, my findings support Reiff and Bawarshi's framework of "guarders" and "crossers." The ways in which Powers, in particular, relied on police writing strategies as well as police writing epistemic and axiological norms could be described as "boundary guarding," and the flexibility and adaptation of Ross and Thornton could be described as "boundary crossing." However, the findings of my research build upon Reiff and Bawarshi's request for researchers to consider prior genre knowledge "while also attending to the dynamic sociohistorical, culture, and personal conditions that show how and why students relate to and make use of their discursive resources" (p. 333-334).

The performance of identity, as analyzed through Gee's Discourse theory and NIDA frameworks, helps contextualize those conditions and reveal how individuals construct their motivations for acting as boundary crosses and guarders. Understanding

the ways in which Powers gains social power and self-recognition through his high level of congruence with Discourse expectations helps explain why he would be reluctant to not guard his boarders. As with Reiff and Bawarshi's findings, which linked student confidence in their abilities to their tendency to guard, a person like Powers with a higher level of recognition and comfort in his performance of identity would be likely to be understood as highly confident. Moreover, because of that success, such individuals would likely be less willing to pay the social cost in lowering their recognizability within that Discourse when asked to take up another. Individuals like Ross and Thornton, however, who have been in an ambiguous relationship with their Institutional and Discursive identities for significant portions of their careers and lives, can be crossers without seeing a tremendous cost involved. Finally, individuals like Shim may seem to be something like a boundary guarder (albeit of a very different sort than Powers), but her experiences demonstrate how the complicated social nature of the performance of identity may require significant pedagogical effort to help a highly capable learner perceive why crossing may not come at a the cost of social or self-recognition.

Chapter four shifts the focus of my findings from the experiences of my student participants to those of their teachers because, as Nowacek (2011) argues, all attempts to transfer only become positive or negative through an agent of evaluation. In the case of the AOC and most classroom environments, this evaluator is the instructor, so chapter four works to understand how instructors thought about student expectations for the coursework, what kinds of transfer-related conflicts those instructors expected, how those instructors thought about academic support services and their role in helping ease any of

those conflicts, and how those instructors situated the possibilities for student performance of identity through their classroom interactions.

The first of these discussions was about how the instructors understood student expectations for the AOC program. From my discussion with the instructors, they were keenly aware that the AOC students face specific unique pressures. On one hand, because receiving an assignment to attend the AOC is meant to help candidates groom themselves for further development as a police leader and potential promotion, the students are under tremendous professional pressure to succeed. If they do not pass, then they will not be considered for promotion, and they will effectively have put a limit on their potential career. On the other hand, beyond these professional pressures, students are also under strong social pressure from their peers both inside and outside of their current of the AOC. Because generations of police leaders have attended the program, expectations for performance are quite high. Because the instructors of the AOC understand that their students are at both significant professional and social risk if they do not succeed in the program, they are highly considerate of how they might ease the difficulties without losing the academic rigor they strive to maintain.

One of the ways in which they attempted to ease those problems is by expecting certain types of conflict as a result of students transferring strategies from police writing. The first of these conflicts was epistemic, in which the instructors felt that police would jump to conclusions without supporting those conclusions or revealing the thought process they used to get there. The second of these conflicts was axiological, in which students would sometimes attempt to write using stylistic choices that were negatively evaluated by their instructors, although sometimes this meant that the axiological conflict

190

could be rooted in a student trying to perform an academic identity. The third of these conflicts was a kind of authenticity challenge rooted in student perceptions of a conflict of identity, in which students felt that those instructors who had "not been cops" would not have valid information.

To overcome these conflicts, the different instructors attempted different strategies. One, Hughes, attempted to ease epistemic conflicts by repeating a core phrase ("flush it out") to stress the type of approach that he wanted to see. Edwards, who was more concerned with axiological conflicts, attempted to ease these problems by providing specific structures for students to use, and Vito, who wanted to see students break further away from the limits of their police identities, managed only to provide some level of support through classroom interactions that students did not always comprehend. In general, despite the potential for support services like the writing center to help students better understand the nature of the conflicts and experience apprenticeship in a different Discourses, the instructors in general had mixed understandings of how support services worked or how they might fit into their pedagogical goals.

These efforts were complicated by how the teachers, in their own performances of identity, situated the possibilities for student identity. In Hughes' experiences, he attempted to ease student transition into his classrooms by using language that mirrored that of the students. However, this performance of identity led students to sometimes believe that such approaches would be appropriate for their writing assignments, leading to an axiological conflict because they would avoid using the type of academic language that Hughes expected and wanted. Edwards faced a similar problem, in that his performance of police identity was so strong that in some ways it may have created

conflicts, causing students to believe that their own experiences and identities were not being validated and recognized by him. As a result, those learners attempted to challenge Edwards through the performance of identity, either by refusing to comply or by attempting to perform a Discourse opposite of Edwards' expectations. In my analysis of Vito's classroom interactions after viewing two cases (films), I discussed how the gendered history of organizations and the Discourses associated with them can lead to students resisting pedagogies they see as threatening that sense of identity, ultimately leading them to narrowing the possibilities for growth and exploration of their ideas.

The Implications of These Findings

Based on these findings, I would argue that performance of identity does have a strong effect on how learners perceive and select affordances for transferring between different Discourses or situations. In addition, it seems that the ways that instructors situate their identity in classrooms strongly affects how learners perceive what identities will be valid for assignment purposes. Since the SPI and its AOC exists to serve a specific institutional function (advancing police careers), the population of learners and instructors in this study have more stable understandings of their identities and relationships than most students and teachers in general education courses (like FYC). If a population with such significant pressures to be intelligible to each other as part of the same or similar Discourses experiences the type of issues related to the performance of identity I described, then those students and teachers connected in the shared activity of courses without such pressure to be intelligible likely face even stronger conflicts. The wider range of identities seeking recognition will push against each other with different epistemic and axiological norms. Unless an effort is made, as I discuss later in this

chapter, to create a space where these conflicts are met with pedagogical effort, the performance of identity, by both students and teachers, may close off the potential for productive transfer.

As a result, it seems that unless we take performances of identity at both the student and teacher level into consideration, we are likely to experience at least two significant negative consequences. The first of these negative consequences would be a kind of "lockdown" of the potential for transfer due to the performance of identity, one that would look like Powers' experience in Edwards' course and the experience described in Bergmann and Zepernick's 2007 study, in which engineering and science students in upper-level courses looked back on their experiences in freshman composition course and felt that they were taught writing approaches that were useless to their current coursework and could transfer nothing from them. These students, in describing the types of writing they did as "flowery" and "personal," were using the performance of identity to reject the possibility of transfer on both axiological (flowery) and epistemic (drawing on personal/subjective experience) grounds. Although the pedagogies used in FYC within Bergmann and Zepernick's study were varied due to a lack of specific expectations other than expected page lengths and some of the pedagogies used were based on the types of writing appropriate to literary studies, the consistency with which students rejected the possibility of any of the pedagogies of FYC being more than "how to B.S. your way through an English paper with a lot of flowery adjectives and other fluff" speaks more towards their support of an element of Discursive truth tied to their identities as students in "fact-based" disciplines (p. 125).

In other words, like the pressure the SPI students feel to be recognized as police by other police officers, I believe that the students in Bergmann and Zepernick's study were taking such a consistent line not simply because of the actual experiences of these courses, though the activities were certainly different. However, the consistency of their responses while talking in groups about their experiences suggests they wanted to be recognized by each other as performing an identity rooted in a Discourse that they believed was oppositional to the axiological and epistemic norms that their comments showed they thought dominated FYC. Through this ongoing effort in negative definition, the students solidified their recognition of themselves and each other as performing the "right" epistemic and axiological norms for their target Discourse (engineering or related disciplines) through the act of pushing away at the "wrong" epistemic and axiological norms they thought drove FYC.

This negative consequence of the performance of identity creates significant problems for many of FYC's desired outcomes, especially the belief that at least some significant elements of the course will transfer into useful strategies and approaches for future courses and writing situations. As Bergmann and Zepernick (2007) explain, students operating from the preconceived belief that their first year composition course uses "wrong" epistemic and axiological frameworks:

> prevents them from engaging with the composition course, except on their own terms: that is, as a course in creative, expressive writing, designed to teach them mechanical skills and the MLA citation system, and in which their highest priority should be to achieve the required page length without boring the reader too much.

These terms severely limit their ability to recognize, understand, or internalize

most of the skills that composition teachers are trying to teach. (p. 138)

Understanding that such engagement "on their own terms" is a function of performing an

identity and a desire to be recognized as performing such an identity helps clarify the

nature of the conflict. Without addressing how that performance of identity is affecting

students, then Bergmann and Zepernick's evaluation that student comments indicate that

"the primary obstacle to such transfer is not that students are unable to recognize

situations outside FYC in which those skills can be used, but that students do not look for

such situations because they believe that skills learned in FYC have no value" outside of

the Discourse they believe FYC represents, a Discourse oppositional to the one they want

to be recognized as performing within (p. 139).

In addition, students in general education with a strong sense of "who they want

to be" (and thus a sense of the performance of identity recognized as that type of person)

may use their anticipation of opposition between that desired Discursive identity and their

perception of FYC's epistemic and axiological norms as a reason to resist engaging in

FYC as a meaningful educational experience. As a result, students may be like those

described in Bergmann and Zepernick's study who reported feeling that the comments

they received from their FYC instructors were "intrusive" and inappropriate to writing

they saw as an expression only of their personal experience and knowledge (p. 132).

Although the students in my study believed in the values and purpose of the AOC, their

perception that the types of writing they were using there had no use in their professional

lives kept them from seeing the connections that their instructors believed were there.

Also, students like Danube, who chose not to use the support service he once sought,

demonstrate that in some cases, this strong performance of identity may lead students to perceive feedback as assaults rather than as opportunities to improve their writing and perhaps draw from and transfer approaches that would better support the information provided or make a more coherent analysis, the performance of identity in the perceived opposition to the values of FYC may prevent learners from transferring appropriate strategies to a composition task.

The second consequence of not recognizing the role of the performance of identity may be an undertheorized and undeveloped comprehension of how the ways in which instructors' performances of identity situates student understanding of what types of identity are appropriate. Understanding this effect is important because, as described above, if a learner begins to recognize a teacher's performance of identity as associated with Discursive norms held in opposition to the ones the learner wants to be recognized as holding, that learner may lock down and refuse to engage in a meaningful way with the goals of the class. Powers' experience with Edwards' legal services paper, in which he refused to adapt to Edwards' epistemic requirements, illustrates such a moment of identity lockdown, as do the ways in which students resisted Vito's attempts to show models of leadership other than the military model associated with hegemonic masculinity. This finding suggests that even if we redesign general education courses to better promote transfer by recognizing how student performance of identity affects the possibility of transfer, if we do not come to understand how our own performances are received by students, then we may unintentionally create the blockades to transfer we want to avoid.

Although I have stressed how the implications of my findings apply to FYC, in most senses, they are applicable to most situations of writing instruction, and are especially applicable in situations with adult and returning students. Like the students of the AOC, these students have likely experienced a strong sense of competence in a professional or other capacity, and that sense of competence informs how they perform their identity. As with more traditional students who have a strong sense of "who they want to be" and may apriori position themselves against values they think are opposite to that desired identity, those students who have experienced long-lasting recognition as competent members of a specific way of being and use of language may enter a classroom prepared to guard boundaries against other epistemic and axiological values. In a time in which many of our students are returning veterans with strong senses of their own abilities and often their identities, the two consequences of not considering how the performance of identity is affecting the possibilities for productive and negative transfer are quite significant and could lead to underserving this population.

In addition, the experiences of the three instructors I discussed in chapter four provide specific implications for how instructors' approaches to addressing expected transfer conflicts affect student outcomes. All three instructors were aware of expected conflicts of transfer based on their previous experiences, and as a result, each of them believed that they needed to address those conflicts in one way or other, but the different approaches they used led to markedly different results.

Vito, who approached the problem by attempting to create a more inclusive curriculum through expanding the diversity his cases presented and through evaluating student papers generously, demonstrates how a too hands-off approach may not make

significant changes in student awareness of conflicts or how they might address conflicts. Because he did not directly speak to students about what he valued and make his expectations of conflict between those values and the norms of police writing and identity clear, most students chose to play it safe and not engage as much as they could have with the assignments. Although he rewarded those students who did in a very public way, it wasn't always clear to students why the reward was being given. As a result, although students absolutely gained Vito's goal of a thorough and comprehensive understanding of the leadership framework developed in Kouzes and Posner and as a result gained communication ability with others who were familiar with that widely read and cited text, they gained little new comprehension of writing approaches that could be used in other circumstances. Even Shim, who had the most positive experience with Vito's writing assignments because of the Discourse crossing it afforded her, did not perceive the writing she had done in that class as one that would inform her future writing situations.

In contrast, while Edwards clearly had the strongest desire to use his writing assignments to help students become translators between the Discourse of civil lawyers and the Discourse of police, the experiences of his students may demonstrate the consequence of being too directive. Because he believed that students would not provide sufficient information, the outlines for each assignment contained a list of expected information, and because he was afraid that they would use an academic-style writing approach that would not be succinct enough to be effective for police audiences, he imposed a page limit and expected the outlines he provided to be followed. However, while the students did use the provided guides and antecedent examples to succeed in their assignments, the guidelines may have too easily fit within the expectations of police

writing. With the specific instructions, the assignments may have been perceived as similar to the type of standardized genres they already used as police writers. As with the students in Nelson's (1990) study, the participants in my study were successful at producing the papers but gained a limited understanding of the epistemic and axiological values that drove those outlines. If they became better translators between legal Discourse and police Discourse, they did so in much the same way that a person using a Spanish-to-English dictionary becomes a better translator of language. The translated construct may look right, but it carries with it none of the deeper social comprehension of the lived language and, more importantly, the Discursive values of specific social groups.

Hughes' approach suggests a potential productive middle ground. Although both Vito and Edwards were successful in pushing students to comprehension of the course materials, neither provided the same type of open discussion of expected transfer conflict that Hughes did. Although his repeated core phrase ("flush it out") may seem like a minor element, its constant situated use in classroom discussions and in discussions of his expectations for writing assignments led to a more open discussion of the major conflict he expected between police writing approaches and his expectations. While he did not directly speak about this as a conflict, by integrating this phrase and its deeper significance into so many sections of his class, he did promote student comprehension of a conflict and of a need to adapt to a different set of Discursive values. From my analysis of Hughes' experience, it seems that among the most productive strategies we may use to address conflicts related to the performance of identity is by openly addressing the conflicts we perceive and providing extended practice with overcoming those conflicts.

Addressing Identity Performance

How might instructors apply this awareness of identity performance into their classrooms so that the transfer of knowledge from general writing instruction is more consistently possible? Although education scholars with strong understandings of transfer such as David Perkins (2010) have offered guidelines for general approaches that can be used to make transfer more frequent, these frameworks have not fully addressed how student performance of identity can interfere with such pedagogies. As my study indicates, the ways in which the performance of identity affects student learners is not always as negative as the confrontational and oppositional rhetoric used by the students in Bergmann and Zepernick's (2007) study. However, the negative relationship those students perform does offer a useful framework: the idea of resistance.

Resistance is a complicated term and one that has been discussed at length in composition. As Karen Kopelson (2003) argues, "Discussions about student resistance to writing instruction have helped to define and shape composition's disciplinary conversation since its inception" (p. 116), and we have long, as Richard Boyd (1999) writes, attempted "to document the seemingly inevitable struggles between instructors and students and to render visible the agonistic relations played out in the classroom" with an eye towards how we can prevent those struggles from stopping our pedagogical goals (p. 589). In general, much of this discussion has focused on critical pedagogy and has asked how teachers can minimize student resistance to its use in the classroom.

At first, questions of resistance and critical pedagogy may not seem like the same type of concepts usually raised in transfer discussions. However, seen from the lens of Gee's Discourse framework, since all "skills" and concepts become meaningful and

epistemically and axiologically appropriate through their use by certain Discourses, then all questions of the performance of identity, including resistance, become intrinsically bound up in the charged identity questions of what is "the right" way to do things and the "right" way to think so as to be socially recognized by others who have the social power/authority to judge them as such. Thus, questions of critical pedagogy and student resistance to it are very much about transfer and the performance of identity, especially when it comes to thinking about the way the classroom is a "contact zone" for different axiological and epistemic "right" answers from different Discourses.

Moreover, even if a class is not explicitly drawing from critical pedagogy, student resistance related to the performance of identity still casts a long shadow over the possibility of transfer. In Bergmann and Zepernick's study, the students rejected not only what they perceived as the axiological and epistemic values of the type of writing they were doing in their FYC classrooms, but they also rejected teacher attempts to help them further develop their writing, seeing their "writing teachers' suggestions as meddling rather than teaching or coaching" (p. 132). Since they perceived the writing in FYC as "personal," "creative," and drawn only from their own experiences and knowledge, they saw their teachers as attempting to interject their own ways of understanding into their writing (p. 131-133). Understood from the framework of Discourse theory, the students believed that the Discourse of the classroom matched up to their transferred Discourse and identity, so they resisted having the epistemic and axiological norms of that Discourse challenged by their FYC instructors. Part of this experience is because the students in this study did not perceive that FYC instructors had any specific disciplinary knowledge or membership (p. 132), so they did not see the instructors' comments as

drawing on a different set of axiological and epistemic answers from a different Discourse and resisted these other answers as intrusions on their identities.

Thus, thinking about ways that composition has posited avoiding student resistance is a productive way to begin thinking about how we might better prevent student performance of identity from becoming a barrier to productive transfer. A potentially useful framework to consider is the performance of neutrality, an approach suggested by Karen Kopelson (2003). Neutrality, an intellectual middle stance in which political positions are not openly taken, is what many college students come to their courses expecting, anticipating that they will learn skills that are true and useful regardless of their political context. Of course, composition has long recognized that neutrality is not an actuality; in the absence of speaking political positions, that which is "normal" and hegemonic, the dominant politics of a situation, are always there as ideology, already dominating the classroom as the "right" values for at least a significant segment of the population. Moreover, as Kopelson (2003) well notes, all instructors are marked by their body, their physical presence, with the axiological values of certain Discourses. These include not only clothing choices and other somewhat controllable aspects of appearance but those seemingly inalterable qualities such as race, sex, age, weight, height, etc. However, as the NIDA framework introduced in chapter one demonstrates, while these qualities can be discussed on a Natural level, these attributes carry most of their potential for the performance of identity when they are used on the Discourse level as signifying a certain way of being, a certain performance of identity.

Thus, as Kopelson notes, neutrality is not an actual quality but a performance, a way of positioning oneself through appearance and action. It is a kind of performance of

identity in which one works against being recognized as performing a Discourse, or at least not performing a Discourse marginalized by the more dominant Discourses that provide the hegemonic norms that many students draw from. By performing such neutrality, Kopelson argues, an instructor desiring to use critical pedagogy prevents students from immediately performing resistance by performing elements of identity that shut down meaningful exchange in the classroom and prevent the possibility of transfer from the classroom experience, and practitioners of critical pedagogy do want transfer to occur since their hope is that the destabilizing work their pedagogy does will lead into other aspects of their students' lives, putting them on a path towards changing the social order. As a result, although Kopelson's purpose is discussing how instructor performance of neutrality can serve as a way for that instructor to cunningly undermine student expectations and engage them in critical pedagogy and not about student performance of identity, she is directly concerned with preventing students from doing what the students in Bergmann and Zepernick do when they reject the FYC experience as "fluff." In terms of the AOC, neutrality may be a way to temporarily undermine the tremendous pressure the learners place on themselves to be recognized as police, to help create a space where, by temporarily suspending the "right" epistemic and axiological norms, Hughes may be able to achieve more of the diffusion he desires because students will not automatically reject it as "outside."

Performing neutrality thus might not only be a cunning way to prevent students from locking down against critical pedagogies, but it may also be a way to address the two consequences of not considering the performance of identity I discussed earlier. The first consequence, in which students can lock down and either refuse to transfer or

transfer inappropriately, can be prevented by performing neutrality because it can help to undermine student expectation of FYC's axiological and epistemic norms. If an instructor constantly challenges the "rightness" of how a student thinks the Discourse of FYC (and potentially all of the English discipline) by taking a stance of uncommitted neutrality, then the students' beliefs that FYC's writing skills are a collection of ways "to B.S. through an English paper" can be undermined. When a student thinks that sentences laden in "flowery" adjectives are the "best" way to succeed in FYC because of their oppositional stance, a teacher performing Discourse neutrality can ask students to explain why those approaches are the "right" ones. Doing so pushes the learner to support their linguistic choices with more attention to important concepts such as audience awareness and stylistic choice, ways of talking about the use of language that may unpack the learner's Discourse performance and promote transfer. If a student resists certain knowledge approaches because they are "subjective," a teacher performing Discourse neutrality can work to help the student to understand how understandings of what counts for 'truth' and firm evidence shift depending on the discipline and Discourse. Although neutrality is not outside Discourses (it itself is a type of Discourse, one that holds epistemic and axiological values), performing it can, in the same way that Kopelson describes, potentially undermine the expectations that drive students to perform identities that disable productive transfer. By questioning every assumed Discursive value, teachers place learners into situations where they must address their often unspoken assumptions about different Discourses, potentially creating more moments where more affordances for transfer can be perceived and the inappropriateness of certain approaches can be recognized.

Performing neutrality also addresses the second concern I explained, in which the instructors' performance of identity may be unintentionally leading students into conflicts as they attempt to work out what types of identity will be accepted as valid or invalid for the classroom. Just as students are mostly unaware of the Discourses and their epistemic and axiological norms that they use in most of their lives, instructors, even those more attuned to the complexities of everyday language and rhetoric, also are often so immersed in the Discourses of their lives that they do not see how they create oppositional relationships. Where Kopelson (2003) sees the performance of neutrality as a way to disarm student recognition of instructors marked by difference from hegemonic norms and enable critical pedagogy, it is also a way to help instructors disarm student recognition of the "expected" norms of instructors' Discourses. Bergmann and Zepernick (2007) showed that student expectations of FYC and English-discipline Discourses are often counterproductive to their ability to see the rhetorical, textual, and compositional strategies they are taught in those courses as more than just the "b.s." they expect and thus refused to see any of it as transferrable. Through the challenge of performing neutrality, instructors are forced to evaluate how their own performances of identity are supporting these student beliefs and thus be better prepared to use their performed stance to disarm those unproductive assumptions students make about FYC and the English discipline.

Of the AOC instructors, Hughes came closest to achieving this concept of neutrality in his classroom performance, and I believe this success was one of the reasons why his attempts to address epistemic conflict were quite successful and picked up by students. Edwards may have so strongly performed his police identity that it either

repelled students or made them assume that the values they held as police writers were sufficient to complete the structured assignments. Vito, due to his past experiences with students rejecting his teaching and the course's concepts because he "wasn't a cop," was more aware of student potential to reject him based on his identity performance, but he still, through his choice to include representations of diverse leadership models and to thus challenge the dominance of the military model of leadership, did not attempt to minimize students' reading of him as "not a cop." Hughes, however, because of his ability to perform a police-like Discourse, was often seen by his students as like them, the differences in his education and knowledge temporarily disappearing in classroom discussions under the cloak of neutrality. Just when it would seem that a dominant value of policing would be confirmed, Hughes would raise a question that challenged it, performing as a Socratic gadfly to cause students to reconsider and move beyond the general consensus of the value being "right" because of its dominance. As a result, Hughes was able to shift between different kinds of intelligibility that enabled him, along with his specific pedagogical efforts, to promote awareness of Discursive conflict and move students towards new solutions to those conflicts.

Problems of Neutrality

While neutrality should address many of the concerns instructors have with transfer and the performance of identity, at least one significant issue can be identified with it. While neutrality is itself a kind of Discourse, performing it does not necessarily address the social cost involved in a student changing the "right way" to do things in their own Discourses. As Gee (2012) notes, becoming capable in a Discourse such as police writing or various forms of academic writing isn't a simple collection of skills or a

concrete list of "dos and don'ts" for each Discourse. Rather, the epistemic and axiological norms of a Discourse are learned through social practice, through an apprenticeship with those who are already recognized as knowing "how we do things" in each different situation. As a result, the process of acquiring a Discourse is long, difficult, and often full of social cost as a learner moves from an outsider to a novice and slowly into full recognition by those already in the target Discourse.

Recognizing the cost of acquiring a Discourse is very important when considering how the performance of identity affects transfer. When Gee (1989) first introduced the idea of Discourses, he was heavily criticized for part of his idea of primary Discourses (those acquired first in a learner's life, usually based on home structure) and secondary Discourses (those acquired through later experience, specifically as learners passed into different institutions like school, work, and other social organizations). Those individuals who acquired a primary Discourse with less conflict with the epistemic and axiological values of a secondary Discourse acquired it with less difficulty, and those who acquired a primary Discourse at greater conflict with that secondary Discourse struggled to a far greater degree to acquire it. Specifically, what upset individuals like Lisa Delpit (1992) was Gee's implication that since apprenticeship was required to learn a Discourse, no one could be "taught" another Discourse and would be cut off from the social goods associated with that Discourse. The end result that Delpit saw was a kind of social determinism in which learners not fortunate enough to be socialized well into a socially dominant Discourse early on would forever be cut off from the social goods of that Discourse, an obviously unacceptable conclusion.

While Gee has since diminished the importance of primary and secondary Discourse in his own writing, I believe that when considering how the performance of identity affects learner perception of the possibilities for transfer, the idea of primary and secondary Discourses reveals an important consideration. Because, as I noted in chapter one, the key to performing a Discourse is being recognized by others already performing that Discourse, acquiring any Discourse is about assuming a social identity, becoming a certain type of person. Thus, the cost of acquiring a secondary Discourse is not only about not being recognized by others already in that Discourse; it is about dropping, even momentarily, the sense of self-recognition that comes with being a member of a Discourse. Asking a learner to drop his or her self-recognition through that Discourse performance is thus a social cost.

Explained another way, in Gee's original theory, a primary Discourse is learned early in life, during childhood, a period in which the social cost of mistakes is quite low. Most people, including children themselves, believe that they will make mistakes with language use, with knowing the "right" way to speak and behave in different circumstances, and with understanding why certain ways of knowing are "right" and others are socially "wrong." American culture has demarcated youth as the era of education, and these early learners are given nearly infinite apprenticeship as they acquire their first Discourses both by their social peers and by themselves. However, the social cost of apprenticeship increases as people age, as they gain (or fail to gain) more and more experience with Discourses associated with social institutions. People around those learners begin to become less tolerant of mistakes related to inexperience and to judge those mistakes as failures or demonstrations of character flaws. Learners themselves,

reacting to the increased social cost of apprenticeship, often begin to hold more strongly

to their own demonstrated abilities in specific Discourses. The learner begins to place a

social cost on his or her own "deviations" from the Discourses they have already

acquired. Seeking to avoid being perceived as foolish, as inexperienced, and as ignorant,

those experiencing conflicts with secondary Discourses strive to avoid those conflicts. No

one wants to give up being recognized as competent in the areas they have succeeded.

Thus, the barriers to successful apprenticeship in a new Discourse come not only from

without but from within.

While performing neutrality may be a way to help undermine student expectations

and push them into a more complicated and critical relationship with the "right" way to

use language in different Discourses, it may also not do enough to address the social cost

from within. In some ways, the performance of Discourse neutrality shares characteristics

with Socratic dialogic style in that it always asks for justification of values and pushes a

learner to explain his or her choices without accepting social conventions for why they

are simply "right." This stylistic tendency may create, as students feel the recognition of

their performance of identity undermined, a sense of frustration with the experience

related to their desire not to lose recognition of their own performance of identity. After

all, these students will have typically reached college because of successfully performing

Discourses compatible with their teachers' expectations in high school and/or other

professional experiences, so a pedagogy that pushes against the "rightness" of those

Discourses could be perceived as a steep social cost. In the case of non-traditional

students with large amounts of experience and often long periods of being successfully

recognized as capable professionals, the performance of neutrality may seem like more than a social cost; it may seem like an assault on their perception of competence.

However, I do not believe that this potential risk should prevent instructors seeking to use the performance of neutrality in the way that I have suggested in this chapter from doing so. Rather, by better understanding how social cost and the desire to be recognized may be affecting students and their experiences, instructors performing neutrality may be in a better situation to apply the three principles I introduced in chapter three in my discussion of Katy Shim's biography paper. First, by understanding how strong the desire to be recognized is, teachers can better understand the potential risks and costs students are experiencing in questioning the keys to that recognition. Second, by understanding how their own performance of identity affects student perceptions of the social cost of changing Discourses, teachers can better understand how they can provide recognition when needed to soothe the process of apprenticeship. Finally, through performing neutrality, a teacher must accept that the infinite multiplicity of Discourses provides for multiple social ways to make and organize arguments, and that the goal of a composition course is not to teach students the one "right" way to write but to help students develop the complicated rhetorical awareness necessary to enter into different Discourses. By pushing at learners "right" answers, whether they derive from success in schooling or success in the vast world outside of school, the performance of neutrality can potentially provide students and instructors a new framework for recognizing each other, their ways of doing things, and both their productive and costly intersections.

Future Research

The relatively small sample size of this study produced a great depth of information, and the amount of time I spent with my participants was instrumental, I believe, to getting them to be as honest with me as they were. However, by its very nature, such close ethnographic approaches make generalization difficult, and my suggestion here for instructors to consider the performance of neutrality as part of a pedagogy to help ease conflicts that lead to blocks in transfer is limited by that lack of generalizability. Thus, researchers on this topic may want to consider these research questions:

1. **How does the performance of identity affect transfer in more generalized education courses? T**his study was fortunate enough to be conducted at a research site where all of the participants were under social pressure to be recognized by each other as performing a similar Discourse, but most sites of writing instruction are not so homogenous. FYC courses, in particular, collect students who want to be recognized as performing a wide variety of identities, many of which shift during their initial experiences in college. However, in order to better understand how the performance of identity affects the possibilities for transfer both into and out of these initial instructional periods in writing, future research will need to explore those courses. This study highlighted a potential approach to such research by showing how Gee's NIDA framework can help analyze students' performance of identity. Using this framework, future researchers could code standardized interviews with

participants in more generalized courses in order to understand patterns of identity performance that can reveal shared Discourses.

2. **What methods can support services like writing centers use to assist students with relieving conflict?** Although the students in this study were given their own one-on-one tutoring in return for participation, my experiences, especially with Shim, suggest that such support could be instrumental in helping students to adapt and move away from the types of lockdowns that can occur from identity performance. This could be approached in combination with research on generalized writing programs or, to better understand the experiences of adult and returning students, researchers could reach out to support services and organizations designed to serve those populations, including those programs designed to assist returning veterans. If such an approach is taken, researchers may want to look not only at the experiences of students, but as this research suggests, researchers may want to build upon these organizations' understandings of their clients and the research they have already performed to help them understand them.

3. **How do instructors perceive their own performance of identity and how would they respond to programs designed to assist them with minimizing potential conflicts?** In the case of Edwards, at least one of the participants in this study felt that his performance of identity was counter-productive, creating a conflict of Discourses between the student and instructor that led to refusal to adapt and to inappropriate transfer. However, because the importance of instructor performance of identity was not yet clear to me, I did

not explore Edwards' own understanding of his performance of identity or how he understood its effect on students. Future researchers may want to spend time investigating instructor perceptions of their identity performance and, should a program designed to help minimize conflict through a performance of neutrality be advocated, to determine how instructors respond to such a pedagogical method.

REFERENCES

Bergmann, L. & Zepernick, J. (2007). Disciplinarity and transfer: Students' perceptions of learning to write. *WPA: Writing Program Administration,* 31, 124-49.

Beaufort, A. (2007). *College writing and beyond*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP.

---. (1999). *Writing in the real world: Making the transition from school to work*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Boyd, R. Reading student resistance: The case of the missing other. *JAC,* 19(4). 589-605.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge/Routledge Classics.

Carroll, L.A. (2002). *Rehearsing new roles: How college students develop as writers*. Urbana, Il: Southern Illinois University Press.

Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, N.J. : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*. Stanford: Stanford UP.

---. (2002). *Gender*. Cambridge, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.

---. (1995). *Masculinities: Knowledge, power, and social change*. Berkeley: University of California UP.

Connell, R.W. & Messerschmidt, J.W. (2005). "Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept." *Gender and Society* 19.6: 829-859.

Curtis, M. & Herrington, A.. (2003) Writing development in the college years: By whose definition? *College Composition and Communication* 55: 69-90.

Dias, P., Freedman, A., Medway, P., & Pare, A. (1999). *Worlds apart: Acting and writing in academic and workplace contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dodge, M., Valcore, L., & Klinger, D. A. (2010). Maintaining separate spheres in policing: women on SWAT teams. *Women & Criminal Justice*, *20*(3), 218-238.

Drisscoll, D. L. & Wells, J. (2012). Beyond knowledge and skills: Writing transfer and the role of student dispositions. *Composition Forum,* 26.

Franklin, C. A. (2007). Male peer support and the police culture: understanding the resistance and opposition of women in policing. *Women & Criminal Justice*,*16*(3), 1-25.

Herrington, A. J. & Curtis, M. (2000). *Persons in process: Four stories of writing and personal development in college*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2000.

Gee, J.P. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education* 25: 99-125.

---. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. New York: Routledge.

---. (2011). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideologies in Discourses.* Fourth Edition. New York: Routledge.

---. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice*. New York : Bergin & Garvey.

---. (2007). *What video games have to teach us about literacy and learning*. Second Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke UP.

Ivaniĉ, R.. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of self in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kimmel, M. S. (2006). *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: Oxford UP, 2006.

---. (2007). *The Gendered Society.* New York: Oxford UP.

Kopelson, K. (2003). Rhetoric on the edge of cunning; or, the performance of neutrality (re) considered as a composition pedagogy for student resistance. *College Composition and Communication*, 51(1), 115-146.

Lave, J. (1998). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics, and culture in everyday life.* New York: Cambridge UP.

Lave, J. &Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

McCandless, D. A. (1951). Southern Police Institute at the University of Louisville. *J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci.*, *42*, 105.

McCarthy, L.P. (1987). A stranger in strange lands: A college student writing across the curriculum. *Research in the Teaching of English* 21: 233-65.

McKay, T. (2013). Chris Dorner manifesto: Full text. *PolicyMic*. Retrieved from http://www.policymic.com/articles/26194/chris-dorner-manifesto-full-text-read-the-full-christopher-dorner-manifesto

Nelson, J. (1990). This was an easy assignment: Examining how students interpret academic writing tasks. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 24(4), 362-396.

Nowacek, R. S. (2011). *Agents of integration: Understanding transfer as a rhetorical act*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Parsons, D. & Jesilow, P. (2001). *In the same voice: Women and men in law enforcement.* Santa Ana, CA: Seven Locks Press.

Petraglia, J. ed. (1995). *Reconceiving writing, rethinking writing instruction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Perkins, D. N. (2008). *Making learning whole: How seven principles of teaching can transform education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Salomon, G. & Perkins, D. N. (1989). Rocky roads to transfer: Rethinking mechanisms of a neglected phenomenon. *Educational Psychologist* 24.2: 113-142.

Smit, D. (2004). *The end of composition studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Sternglass, M. (1998). *Time to know them: A longitudinal study of writing and learning at the college level*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. (2011). Tracing discursive resources: How students use prior genre knowledge to negotiate new writing contexts in first-year composition. *Written Communication*, *28*(3), 312-337.

Russell, D. R. (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society: An activity theory analysis. *Written Communication* 14.4: 504-554.

Wardle, E. (2009). 'Mutt genres' and the goal of FYC: Can we help students write the genres of the university? *College Composition and Communication* 60:4 765-780.

---. (2007). Understanding 'transfer' from FYC." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 31: 65-85.

Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Robert Terry
robert.terry@gmail.com

Armstrong Atlantic State University
Languages, Literature, and Philosophy
Gamble Hall 141
Savannah, GA 31419
912.344.3606

Education

University of Louisville, Louisville, KY. PhD, Rhetoric and Composition. Requirements completed August 2013 (To be awarded December, 2013).

Dissertation: "Discursive Affordances: Police, Transfer, and the Performance of Identity."

Committee: Joanna Wolfe (Director), Mary Rosner, Beth Boehm, Paul Griner, and Thomas Hughes.

Abstract: This study examines the approaches to writing academic papers used by five mid-level police officers enrolled in the Southern Police Institute in order to understand how the performance of identities affects the ways in which students select and reject opportunities for the transfer of knowledge from previous writing situations. I draw from James Paul Gee's methods of discourse analysis and the approaches of ethnographic writing studies, with the goal of identifying moments in which both the performance of identities and the anticipation of performance of identities lead to conflicting moments that sometimes prevent the transfer of knowledge and the recognition of that transfer.

University of Louisville, Louisville KY. M.A. English. May 2008.

Culminating Project: "Unmuting Urania: Literary Theory in the Creative Writing Classroom."

Director: Paul Griner

University of Texas at Dallas, Dallas, TX. B.A. Literary Studies. Summa Cum Laude. December 2005.

Honors Project: "Minimal Evolution: The Line of Lish, from Carver to Palahniuk."

Academic Positions

Assistant Professor

Armstrong Atlantic State University, Department of Languages, Literature, and Philosophy. 2013-current.

Graduate Teaching Assistant.

University of Louisville, English Department. 2006 – 2013.

Assistant Director of Composition, Business Writing.

University of Louisville, English Department. College of Business. 2011-2012.

218

Assistant Director of Virtual Writing Center.
University of Louisville, English Department. 2009-2010.

Assistant Director of Creative Writing (Axton Assistant).
University of Louisville, English Department. 2007-2008.

<u>**Honors and Awards**</u>
- University Fellowship, University of Louisville, 2008-2009, 2010-2011.
- Faculty Favorite Award Nominee (student selected). University of Louisville, 2008.
- Scholarship, New York State Summer Writer's Institute, 2007.
- Runner-Up, Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley Award, 2005.
- Best Fiction Submission, <u>Sojourn Magazine</u>, 2005.

<u>**Teaching Experience**</u>
Assistant Professor
Armstrong Atlantic State University. Department of Languages, Literature, and Philosophy.
2013-present.
- English 1101: Introduction to College Composition
- English 3720: Business and Technical Writing
- English 7100: Professional Communication Strategies

Graduate Teaching Assistant.
University of Louisville. Composition Program. English Department. 2006 – 2013.
- English 101: Introduction to College Composition
- English 102: Intermediate College Composition
- English 202: Introduction to Creative Writing
- English 306: Business Writing

Writing Center Consultant (GTA).
University of Louisville, University Writing Center. 2006-2007.

CRLA Certified Tutor (Level II).
Brookhaven College. 2003-2005.

<u>**Conference Presentations**</u>

"Beyond Gold Stars: Making Gamification Meaningful for Students." (Accepted)
Conference on College Composition and Communication 2014, Indianapolis, IN.

"Public Leadership and Academic Police Writing."
Conference on College Composition and Communication 2013. Las Vegas, NV.

"Positioning the Power of Police Leaders."
Thomas R. Watson Conference, 2012. Louisville, KY.

"Transfer Might Be Nothing But Terms Recognized."
Conference on College Composition and Communication 2011. Atlanta, GA.

"Remixing the Divide: Reconsidering the Narrative Level Used to Transfer Knowledge in Gaming."
Conference on College Composition and Communication 2010. Louisville, KY.

"'The Tupac of Porn': Haley Paige, <u>Videobox</u>, and the Sin of Desire."
   Louisiana Conference on Literature, Language, and Culture 2009. Lafayette, LA.

"The Legitimate w00t: Bourdieu's Market of Language in the <u>World of Warcraft</u>."
   Kentucky Philological Association 2008. Louisville, KY.

Publications (Fiction)
"Chucko the Clown." <u>Rosebud</u> 35 (April 2006). Short story. 6 pages.

"The Good Provider." <u>Sojourn</u> 18 (Fall 2005). Short story. 7 pages.

Service
Committee Membership
- Professional Communication evaluation committee
- Search Committee membership, 2013-2014
- Faculty Reading Group (Reacting to the Past evaluation), 2013-2014.

Teaching Workshops. University of Louisville, Composition Department. 2010, 2012.
- "Using the IMRAD for Productive Transfer," Fall 2010.
- "Meaningful Gamification." Fall 2012.

English Graduate Organization (EGO). University Of Louisville. 2006-2012.
- Executive Committee PhD Member, 2009-2010.
- Booksale Coordinator, 2009-2010.

Member, Tech Committee. Watson Conference. University of Louisville. 2008, 2010.

New PhD Student Mentor. University Of Louisville, 2009-2011.

Event Facilitator, PhD Recruitment Events, 2011-2012.

Participant, Graduate Teaching Academy, 2010-2011.

Relevant Coursework

Pedagogy:
- Teaching College Composition. Bronwyn Williams.
- Composition Theory and Practice. Min-Zhan Lu.
- Writing, Cognition, and Culture in Curriculum Design: Histories, Theories, and Practices. Bruce Horner.
- Teaching of English as a Second Language. Karen Mullen.
- Teaching Professional Writing. Geoffrey Cross.
- Teaching Literature: Theory and Practice. Beth Boehm.
- Teaching Creative Writing. Lauren Groff.
- Writing Center: Theory and Practice. Mary Rosner.

Methodology:
- Human Computer Interaction. Joanna Wolfe.
- Research Methods in Rhetoric and Composition. Joanna Wolfe.

- Qualitative Research Methodology. Geoffrey Cross.

Rhetoric:
- History of Rhetoric I. Mary Rosner.
- History of Rhetoric II. Carol Mattingly.
- Narrative Theory and Composition. Debra Journet.

Linguistic, Literary, and Cultural Theory:
- Queer Theory. Karen Kopelson.
- 20th Century Theories of Language. Karen Hadley.
- Popular Culture and Literacy. Bronwyn Williams.

Non-Academic Experience
Systems Administrator, Single User Issues
  Verizon.net. 2005-2006.
Systems Engineer, Information Security.
  Excel Communications. 1997-2002.