



---

## Chapter 1

---

# Who Are Developmental Immigrant Students?

### KEY POINTS

- Developmental immigrant students are entering undergraduate programs throughout the United States with the same hopes and dreams as most college students: to graduate, to find a good job, and to become successful citizens.
- Teachers have the opportunity and privilege to help these students reach their academic goals.

---

When I came to the country, I always thought that this country was ‘the land of opportunity’ or ‘the promised land.’ In order for me to be free, I have to cross over the gate [education], which I have not yet crossed over.

— *first-year developmental immigrant student*

---

Before we can define developmental immigrant (DI) students, it is important to distinguish these students from other first-year college students. Certainly, the majority of students entering colleges and universities in the United States are ready to do so: two-thirds of all students complete their education with varying degrees of success. It is the other one-third of first-year students who are academically underprepared and, therefore, more likely to drop out of college (Sladky, 2010). Often, these students are placed into remedial courses, but encounter difficulties in completing

these courses and, ultimately, their college education. However, it is also true that every year more than half a million academically underprepared college students do successfully complete their remedial courses, precisely because of the developmental approach when working with these students (Boylan, 2001), and go on to do as well in standard classes as those students who began their education fully prepared (McCabe, 2000).

In this book, we will address the underprepared “third” of entering college students (using the more optimistic statistic of the two cited in the introduction), who have traditionally been categorized as either developmental students or ESL students and placed into either mainstream developmental classes or ESL classes in the first year of college (and sometimes beyond). Certainly, many of these students are, in fact, (mainstream) developmental students or ESL students and belong in these classes. However, in the last twenty years, a new cohort of students, Generation 1.5, has emerged on college campuses across the nation, and for two decades, researchers and teachers have been defining and describing these students: some of them have been found to struggle in the mainstream developmental and ESL classes because they fall somewhere between the two groups (Roberge, 2003; Harklau, 2000). We too have researched and taught Generation 1.5 students at our campus, Penn State Brandywine (a Pennsylvania State University campus in the Philadelphia area). Originally, these students were also placed into ESL composition classes, but we soon realized that one or two composition classes were not enough to retain them; they could not cope in their General Education classes, so most dropped out or failed out of college. We also realized that within the Generation 1.5 cohort, there was a sub-group of learners, whom we have labeled developmental immigrant students (DI students), who seemed to need even more comprehensive and intrusive developmental work if they were to succeed in college.

The following section begins with a brief comment about our challenges in labeling DI students (let alone any group of students), and will be followed by definitions of ESL students, Generation 1.5 students, traditional developmental students (non-ESL), and DI students.

Labels in general are problematic because they are fraught with problems and dilemmas of their own; they stigmatize and marginalize, but labels have always been used as a tool for identification in education, especially in identifying students, because they help to provide a frame of reference. Therefore, we have identified (and labeled) a sub-group of Generation 1.5 students flooding college campuses today as developmental immigrant (DI) students.

Following are definitions of those students that have been identified, for the most part, as students needing remedial or developmental course work on many college campuses: mainstream developmental students, ESL students, Generation 1.5, and DI students.

## Mainstream Developmental Students

Developmental (remedial) education is a result of Open Admissions policies that began in the 1970s: students were suddenly being admitted into institutions of higher learning unprepared for the rigors of college, thus needing remedial support. Developmental programs in higher education approach students and their learning holistically: they are based on the belief that all learners possess innate abilities, which can be used to support growth in lesser developed areas (Mulvey, 2008). Rather than focusing solely on weak skill areas, a developmental approach assumes that everyone has talents and strengths. By acknowledging these strengths while building those areas that are underdeveloped, faculty encourage students to become more competent and confident learners (Casazza, 1999).

Actually, a positive approach is what has enabled so many “at risk” students to realize their dream of a college degree since 1869, when Charles W. Eliot, the president of Harvard at the time, stated that “The American college is obliged to supplement the American school. Whatever elementary instruction the schools fail to give, the college must supply” (Spann, 2000, p. 2). Eliot’s words express the true American ideal of equality for all: we have a moral obligation to try to level the playing field when there is a way to do so. In other words, developmental education is about increasing students’ chances for success in order to “increase their social and economic well being, which, in turn, will increase the social and economic well being of our country” (Spann, 2000, p. 2). Spann, who authored the Education Commission of the United States’ Policy on post-secondary remediation, found that developmental education, combined with quality learning support systems—tutoring, counseling, etc.—can translate into long-term success for students.

## ESL Students

Through the years, the label English as a second language (ESL) has referred to any student whose native language is a language other than English; however, this term has always been problematic since, in many cases, English is not necessarily the second language of these students, but rather the third or fourth language. For this reason, other terms have been used to identify these students: language minority student, limited English–proficient student (LEP), English language learner (ELL), and so forth. However, regardless of the acronym used and regardless of the nuances that may distinguish one acronym from another in colleges and universities, most instructors at least have a sense that the student in question is an ESL student; they have a frame of reference that the student is a non-native English speaker.

For the most part, ESL students are more proficient in written English than in spoken English as many learned (formal) written English in language classes in their native countries; they are literate in their first language (they have usually had uninterrupted spoken and written L1 development); they have a meta-language for discussing aspects of language learning because of their background in L1 academic literacy; and they have little understanding of U.S. culture or its educational systems since most completed their PK–12 education in their home countries. Many ESL students are placed into ESL composition classes or into mainstream developmental classes in their first year of college.

## Generation 1.5 Students

When a relatively new population of immigrant students who seemed to embody different characteristics from the ESL students began entering U.S. colleges and universities in the last twenty years, a new term was coined to label them, Generation 1.5 (Rumbaut & Ima, 1988). And as these students began to be studied, the label seemed appropriate; it was a category that distinguished them from ESL students. However, the more that has been learned about Generation 1.5, the more the label is being questioned. (The term was coined as a sociological term, not a linguistic one, so it didn't take into consideration linguistic variation.) With that said, the term Generation 1.5 is still recognized by faculty in colleges and universities throughout the United States, and it is also still used in some journal articles and books, although much less so now.

Much has been written about Generation 1.5, and much has been learned about this population in the last twenty years. They come from non-English speaking backgrounds and have “traits and experiences [that] lie somewhere between those associated with the first and second generation” (Rumbaut & Ima, 1988, p. 103). They are U.S. residents through naturalization, green card, or birth; tend to “live” their native culture at home and their adopted culture at school; and are usually the first generation in their families to attend university in the United States.

It has been well documented (Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999; Roberge, 2003; Goldschmidt & Ziemba, 2003) that the education Generation 1.5 students receive prior to attending post-secondary institutions varies tremendously, so they usually enter higher education with diverse educational experiences, diverse English language proficiencies, and diverse academic literacies (Patton, 2006). For those Generation 1.5 students born outside of the United States, they have come to the U.S. either voluntarily or involuntarily; they may or may not have had an interrupted first language (L1) development; and they may have a presence or absence of L1 literacy and/or other language literacy (Harklau et al., 1999; Leki, 1992; Ogbu, 1991; Roberge, 2002; Rumbaut & Ima, 1988). Thus, they graduate from U.S. high schools with varying degrees of education and with “varying degrees of bilingualism, biculturalism, and academic literacy” (Danico, 2004; Skarin, 2001; Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999).

Because most of these students come to the United States at some point during their schooling period, they are at least partially U.S. educated; therefore, many do not identify themselves as English language learners nor do they fully recognize their problems with reading and writing because their oral fluency is usually strong. In high school these students are well behaved and conscientious, but the academic demands placed on them are often not sufficient for the rigors of college.

At Penn State Brandywine, most of our non-native English-speaking students embody the characteristics of Generation 1.5; however, in the last five years (since 2005) they have been more underprepared and more in need of support, both in and out of the classroom, than in previous years. Though they are English dominant at this point in their education, in reality they have a very limited formal knowledge of English (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009); therefore, we have identified these most at-risk students within Generation 1.5 as developmental immigrant students.

## Developmental Immigrant Students

Though DI students share many of the same characteristics as Generation 1.5, they tend to face greater academic, social, and emotional challenges in their pursuit of higher education. Also, because DI students have not been specifically described in the literature, we wanted to shed greater light on them to fill a gaping hole in the ongoing discussion on Generation 1.5: it is not our intention to separate developmental immigrant students from Generation 1.5 but rather to include this group in the dialogue as a subset of Generation 1.5. We coined the term *developmental immigrant student* because this student is a first or second generation immigrant student who needs (extensive) developmental course work.

Usually, when DI students enter post-secondary education, they are placed into one of two (usually non-credit) English classes: an ESL class, where many of the students can read and write English but have trouble speaking English, or a developmental class, which is mostly comprised of traditional students (who lack academic literacy skills) and which is usually taught by an instructor who does not have an ESL background. Developmental immigrant students' needs fall somewhere in between: They tend to have weak reading and writing English skills but strong oral skills, and they need developmental and academic literacy skills (taught by a teacher with an ESL background) to be able to compete at the college level. In other words, within the broad spectrum of Generation 1.5, developmental immigrant students tend to have the greatest number of challenges and the least amount of self-sufficiency. In addition to literacy issues, these students often have to support themselves and/or finance their own education, sometimes have few family members to turn to in the United States, and usually have no frame of reference for the system of U.S. higher education.

It is important to understand that developmental placement, especially in the first year, is not unusual in undergraduate programs. As stated in the introduction, about

one-third of freshmen in four-year colleges (Bettinger & Long, 2009) and universities and 41 percent of freshmen in community colleges in 2007–2008 required remedial education (Sladky, 2010), despite the fact that 4 out of 5 developmental or remedial students graduated from high school with a GPA of 3.0 or higher. For immigrant students, especially, being placed into developmental classes often confuses them: they don't understand the ramifications of what they did or did not receive academically until they transition into college. In college, they begin their process into becoming "educated" people (Levinson & Holland, 1996), a process which usually clarifies, sometimes painfully so, the extent of their preparedness, or lack thereof, from their previous academic training. Roberge (2003) puts it bluntly when he says that this lack of preparedness is often the result of their pre-college based acquisition processes, where they experience a merry-go-round of placements, pedagogies, and teaching practices resulting in inconsistent instruction. Thus, it is the student who needs a solid academic literacy foundation, along with a strong system of academic support, that we refer to as a developmental immigrant student.

A few years ago, a student was admitted to our campus because of her impressive high school GPA (3.7). She had come to the United States at the age of 16, was placed in the 11th grade in high school, and graduated near the top of her class. However, her admission to university brought with it new challenges and realities. The student's combined SAT score was 400 (200 Verbal; 200 Math). Also, because she came from a war-torn country, her previous educational experience was sporadic, at best, causing her to have limited foundational knowledge. Much to her amazement and dismay, she was placed in developmental courses at our university, several of which she had to repeat. For this student and others like her, the first year of college turned into a series of frustrations and disappointments. For us, understanding these students' frustrations and disappointments led us to take steps to provide meaningful course work. In fact, this student would come to represent the new immigrant student on our campus.

Perhaps the best way to exemplify DI students is through another student's words sent to his professor in an email a few weeks into the first semester:

---

I'm total failing in school i'm ready to do for my schoolwork before, but I think I just want to quit my school now i do everything so hard i don't know what can i do? i really want to someone support me. someone help me. but i'm to shy to ask. i don't know i need help.

—*first-year developmental immigrant student*

---

While many may see this student as an anomaly, the fact remains that he and thousands of others like him are entering colleges and universities and are struggling to make their way through. But the journey for them is more complex than for most students: This student's words suggest that DI students are not just in need of aca-

ademic support; they are also in need of emotional and social support. These are students who, despite being admitted into an undergraduate program (again, based primarily on strong high school GPAs), will likely not complete the program without extensive and intrusive support. We believe that DI students' academic literacy needs (along with their emotional and social needs) extend beyond what can realistically be addressed in many undergraduate ESL composition and mainstream developmental classes, yet most undergraduate programs only offer these two options for first-year immigrant students. Table 1.1 provides an overview of the academic literacy practices of developmental L1 students, ESL students, and DI students, framing the similarities and differences among them.

It is important to note that though this chart is used for purposes of comparison/contrast, there is overlap between categories. However, it is clear that DI students fall somewhere between developmental L1 and ESL students. Like developmental L1 students, DI students need to be taught to distinguish between formal and informal language, need to learn study skills and strategies for reading and writing, and to an even greater extent than developmental L1 students, need to develop academic vocabulary. DI students also need instructors and support staff that understand their needs as students who learned English orally and may have had varied educational experiences. For these students, special attention to grammatical errors (especially word endings and similar-sounding words), idioms and expressions that should and should not be used in academic writing, cultural and historical information about the United States, and academic expectations in higher education are critical to DI students' academic growth.

An overview of some of the challenges facing undergraduate DI students and the faculty who teach them follows. (Please note that in this book, the terms *instructors*, *faculty*, and *professors* are used interchangeably.)

## Challenges Faced by DI Students

### 1. Identity

It has widely been viewed that the college experience offers students opportunities to develop their personal and professional identity (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002). Muuss (1996) reinforces this view by saying that the late adolescent years (18–22) are a “crucial time for identity formation” (p. 62) and the overwhelming majority (98 percent) of first-year students fall into this age group (Cooperative Institutional Research Program, 2005). However, it is also true that many of today's first-year college students are more focused on daily life management (Clydesdale, 2007) than they are on identity formation because of family or other circumstances.

Perhaps James M. Lang (2008) puts it best by saying, “It's time to figure out how to work with the freshmen we have, rather than the ones in our admissions brochures”

**TABLE 1.1**  
**Academic Literacy Practices of Developmental L1, ESL,**  
**and Developmental Immigrant Students (adapted from Crosby, 2007)**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Developmental L1 Students</b>	<b>ESL Students</b>	<b>Developmental Immigrant Students</b>
<b>Language Proficiency</b>	Speak and write English as an L1	Speak and write another language as an L1, also possibly speak other languages, also possibly write other languages	May speak another language as an L1 (sometimes limited or not at all), also possibly speak other languages (not necessarily fluently), sometimes write another language as an L1, also possibly write other languages
<b>L1 Proficiency</b>	Uninterrupted spoken and written L1 development	Uninterrupted spoken and written L1 development	Sometimes interrupted or no written L1 development; sometimes interrupted spoken L1 development
<b>English Language Learning</b>	Acquired spoken and written English	Learned mostly written English in formal language classes	Learned mostly spoken English by exposure to it
<b>English Proficiency</b>	Tend to use only informal English in speaking and writing	More proficient in written English than spoken English; more familiar with formal than informal English	More proficient in informal spoken English (BICS — Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills) (Cummins, 1981) than formal written English; more familiar with other varieties of English than standard American English
<b>Educational Background</b>	Complete PK12 schooling in U.S.	Complete PK12 schooling in home country	Usually complete part of PK12 schooling in home country; complete other part of PK12 schooling in U.S.
<b>Understanding of U.S. Culture</b>	Understanding of U.S. culture, educational school systems	Little understanding of U.S. culture, educational school systems	Some understanding of U.S. culture, educational school systems
<b>Academic Literacies Proficiency</b>	Weak background in academic literacies in English	Background in academic literacies in L1; some to no background in academic literacies in English	Some background in academic literacies in English; some to no background in academic literacies in L1
<b>BICS and CALP Proficiency (Cummins, 1997)</b>	Strong BICS, developing CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) (Cummins, 1981)—academic English learner	Developing BICS and CALP — learning academic as well as other types of English	Strong BICS, developing CALP — academic English learner (further behind developmental L1 learners)
<b>Difficulties with Academic Literacies</b>	Difficulties with fluency in academic writing from lack of academic writing experience, difficulties with comprehending academic readings from lack of practice and exposure	Difficulties with fluency in academic writing, interference from L1, misuse and misunderstanding of idiomatic expressions, difficulties with comprehending academic readings from lack of practice and exposure	Difficulties with fluency in academic writing, phonetic quality to writing — inclusion of idiomatic and non-standard English expressions, difficulties with comprehending academic readings from lack of practice and exposure
<b>Meta-Language Proficiency</b>	Meta-language for discussing language, but only if learners had foreign language learning experience	Meta-language for discussing aspects of language learning	Very little or no meta-language for discussing aspects of language learning
<b>Grammatical Proficiency</b>	Grammatical errors include subject-verb agreement, noun/pronoun-reference, possessive form	Grammatical errors include subject-verb agreement, noun-pronouns, articles, prepositions, verb tense	Grammatical errors include verb endings, noun endings, verb tense, subject-verb agreement, articles, prepositions

(C1, *Chronicle of Higher Education*). Lang clarifies this statement by explaining that first-year students spend most of their time and intellectual energy figuring out how to handle life: dealing with money, negotiating newfound freedoms with sex, drugs, and alcohol, and determining how much time to devote to studying, working, and playing, rather than figuring out who they are, as they actively resist efforts “to examine their self-understandings through classes or to engage their humanity through institutional efforts such as public lectures, the arts, or social activism” (C1).

The college experience is a crucial time for both identity formation and time management, but it is also a time of role confusion (Erikson, 1950). Because college-aged DI students share cultural characteristics of both the first and second generation, they are even more confused in some ways, continually reassessing who they are in relation to their families and friends and school; sometimes they are just not sure who they are. Their life experiences are such that they experience dual cultures, languages, traditions, and identifications, fluctuating back and forth between them. This experience exacerbates college confusion because they are not only learning about the culture of higher education, they are also learning about their own culture and identity within the wider culture. For the most part, these students stop learning about native cultural knowledge when they leave their native lands, knowledge that is critical in identity formation. No matter when the students leave their native country, identity formation is in various stages of completeness. If students are born in the United States, in contrast, native identity formation is more often gleaned rather than actively learned or experienced. Also, depending on when DI students arrive in this country, their education begins at the same point as their classmates in terms of age, but not at the same point as their classmates in terms of academic literacy.

## 2. Language and Background Knowledge

Language-wise, many DI students’ first language development was “interrupted,” so they tend to be somewhere between the learning of one language and the learning of another as well as somewhere between their acquired (mostly spoken) English and their academic (mostly written) English. Also, because most of them are ear learners, learning English through listening (Reid, 1997), they usually speak English fluently, often as fluently as native speakers because of their strong social skills (Harklau, 2003).

Though English skills continually improve in college, DI students still tend to lag behind native speakers in reading and writing: their reading and writing is usually English-dominant, but they lack a basis of comparison in a fully developed L1 language system (Thonus, 2003). In addition, although some have read novels in high school (remarkably, some have not), they are not necessarily familiar with the content-specific language of academic texts.

Finally, many DI students lack background knowledge in the content subjects they are studying and therefore struggle in these classes, especially in comprehend-

ing lectures and taking notes (Kiang, 1992) and reading and studying from textbooks (Spack, 1997). This struggle further exacerbates their frustration as they pursue higher education.

### 3. Navigating Higher Education

The fact that DI students graduated from U.S. high schools and are somewhat familiar with contemporary American culture is deceiving because they are often challenged by the American higher education system (Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999; Harklau, 2000). In this respect, DI students are usually caught between expectations and reality in their undergraduate education.

The problem usually begins at the pre-college level where DI students may be placed in classes that are academically and socially “discontinuous with the norms for literate expression they encounter upon entering college” (Oakes, Gamoran, & Page 1992), perilously decreasing their chances of success in college. In these basic classes, students have little contact with academic texts, limiting their experience with academic reading and writing, but they tend to do well and get high grades because they show up and work hard. Despite the good grades and hard work, however, most are placed into developmental classes when they enter college, placement that causes them much anger and frustration. In college, this frustration is usually grounded in the fact that developmental classes put them behind where they think that they should be, making their education more expensive and taking much longer since many of these classes don’t count for college credit.

What further complicates the problem for them is that they hold a U.S. high school diploma. Administrators and faculty *expect* these students to do well precisely because they have graduated from U.S. high schools and because they often show evidence of stereotypes (committed, hard working, serious) associated with international students (Harklau, 1998). Likewise, these students *expect* to do well because they have gone through (at least in part) the U.S. school system and have graduated, usually with a high grade point average, from this system. The discrepancy in expectations is largely responsible for the confusion, frustration, and, sometimes, failure that developmental immigrant students face in higher education.

Another complication for the students is that they and their families sometimes have misconceived notions of what attending college means. For parents who have never attended college, especially college in the United States, there are few expectations of college other than that their children will get a good education to ensure that they have a good life. Neither parents nor students have a realistic frame of reference regarding the rigorous commitment required in higher education. Also, many parents do not see a problem with their children working full time (40+ hours a week) or with taking care of siblings full time while going to school. Some of these parents are, themselves, working long hours in low-paying jobs in their quest to survive and to provide for their families. It is not unusual for students to help the family at work or at home, perilously overloading an already full academic schedule.

Like their parents, DI students are not sure what to expect from higher education. Most see college as an extension of high school. They know that they have to work hard, and they equate hard work with success, which, at this level and for this population, may not be enough.

The expectations by teachers and administrators about immigrant students can also be incongruent with the expectations by these students and their families about the U.S. educational system. Students who enter university lacking what Bourdieu (1998) refers to as “academic culture capital,” the processes or the valued practices of education (those practices and activities that are part of higher education, such as advocating for oneself, understanding the language and vocabulary, etc.), will usually have difficulty identifying and interpreting these practices and the expectations inherent within them, thus diminishing their chances of completing higher education. Ironically, the educational opportunity available to these students is precisely the reason why many of them came to the United States in the first place, equating success with a college degree.

This lack of academic culture capital among students creates tremendous gaps in understanding (Harklau, 1998) between college educators and the students themselves concerning the academic preparedness of these students. Because these gaps are usually at the subconscious level on the part of students and teachers, neither group recognizes them as a problem. Zamel (1991) explains that “not only do students need to learn how language form and language function are interrelated, how discourse and context are interdependent, and how language and culture are intertwined, but ESL students [as well as DI students] also need to learn how higher education operates in terms of its expectations, assumptions, and conventions.”

## Challenges Faced by Faculty of DI Students

One of the greatest challenges faced by faculty in undergraduate programs is what to do with underprepared students sitting in their classes: these are the students that are struggling to stay in school; these are the one-third of first-year students that will fail or quit one or more of their classes (Chute, 2008). And certainly, some of these students are DI students who face even more obstacles because of language and literacy.

Some faculty may question how these DI students (as well as mainstream developmental students) get admitted to college (usually because of strong high school GPAs) considering their underpreparedness, but the fact remains that they are in our colleges and universities. Though college admission processes are outside the scope of this book, the questions that faculty really need to ask is how can they best serve these students that have been admitted, and how can they give them the opportunity to thrive. At the very least, instructors in undergraduate programs should assess the immigrant students sitting in their classrooms and respond to them accordingly: understanding who these students are and how they learn, which, ultimately, will help in answering how they can best be served.

Complicating the problem of how to best serve DI students is the fact that less than 13 percent of teachers have had any professional development on teaching any English language learners (NCTE, 2008), let alone those most at-risk. Many instructors honestly don't know what to do with students with relatively undeveloped language and literacy skills (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009). Certainly a strong support system helps (learning center, writing center, etc.), but is that enough to ensure student success?

Following are some of the challenges that faculty face in the classroom, challenges that, in some ways, are mirrored by the students' own challenges.

### 1. Student Underpreparedness

What surprises some instructors are the writing errors: DI students speak well and "sound" American; therefore, the assumption is that they can write well in English too. The underlying assumption here is that the students' spoken English proficiency equals that of their written proficiency. Thus, DI students may be in classes for weeks before instructors notice problems (e.g., when the first big paper is due); therefore, it might be helpful for instructors to give students a writing assignment early in the semester to try to identify those students needing extra writing support.

Perhaps the most problematic issue is a tendency by some faculty to look at immigrant students through a deficit lens (Davies, Safarik, & Banning, 2003), seeing weak writing skills or a lack of preparedness rather than the rich diversity they bring to the classroom and college or university. Roberge (2003) reinforces this by stating that when teachers compare English language learners with monolingual learners, they tend to focus on deficiencies rather than strengths.

Adding to the problem of student underpreparedness is the fact that some faculty are not sure how to teach them other than to "apply monolingual standards to immigrants' bilingual performance" (Ward, 1997, B8). Students for whom English is not the native language should not necessarily be held to the same standards, especially in writing, as students whose only language is English.

### 2. Non-Academic Issues of DI Students

Faculty should be sensitive to the many non-academic issues that DI students bring to college with them. As with mainstream students, many of them have demanding home or family responsibilities, grinding job commitments, and/or troubling financial burdens, but DI students are often the translator for the entire family, which means going to medical appointments with all family members, dealing with younger siblings' school forms, and reading all sorts of bills and/or government forms. Many DI students are also the (primary) caregivers to younger siblings in the family and some are responsible for providing food and clothing for them. Most of the students are too embarrassed to tell instructors about any problems they may have, problems that are not academic ones, but which are enough to cause them to drop out of college.

### 3. Instructors Unfamiliar with and Untrained in Teaching DI Students

Some instructors lack an understanding of the students' differing expectations of schooling, their differing reading and writing experiences, and their differing learning styles: all of these impact the students' classroom learning experience. Specifically, some instructors are unfamiliar with how DI students process a language, how they learn a language, and how they are motivated to learn. For the most part, they learn differently from the way that most American students have been taught in that they haven't done much reading in English. Also, because many DI students have had various sources of academic input throughout their schooling years, there are gaps in academic development. Some students attended school in their native country while others did not; some have been taught by ESL teachers and some by non-ESL teachers; and some have attended a variety of schools in different states or countries. Finally, because of their varied learning experiences, DI students are unfamiliar with differences in language use: formal (written) language vs. informal (spoken) language, a fact that many college faculty are not aware of. Instructors need to know what on-campus support exists and/or where to refer DI students should problems arise.

### 4. Student Advising and Placement

Finally, in their role as academic advisors, discipline instructors should be aware of DI students' reading and writing proficiency levels, information that is usually found in the admissions office. Sometimes, based solely on the students' high school grades or the strength of their oral proficiency, faculty place them into courses that they cannot handle, or they tell the students that they don't need developmental courses because they speak so well. DI students would be better served if faculty had more realistic information about the students' academic literacy skills. Admissions personnel or ESL faculty should be able to provide advisors with this type of information.

The misconceived notions and misinterpretations among DI students are largely responsible for their confusion and frustration in undergraduate programs, and the misunderstandings about these students by faculty are largely responsible for their confusion and frustration regarding these students' ability and performance in the classroom. Though some institutions of higher learning have recognized the special needs of DI students and offer writing programs (Frodesen, 2001; Goen et. al, 2001) or developmental programs (Murie, 2001; Murie & Fitzpatrick, 2009; Goldschmidt & Ziemba, 2003), little research has been done regarding these students' expectations regarding higher education. What is known, however, is that there seems to be a discrepancy in expectations on the part of both the students and the faculty: both expect immigrant students to do well and both are bewildered when they don't.