



Western Washington University
Western CEDAR

WWU Graduate School Collection

WWU Graduate and Undergraduate Scholarship

Spring 2018

You Know?: Decoding 'Knowing' in the English Professor/Student Relationship

Chloe Allmand

Western Washington University, hardallmandy@comcast.net

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cedar.wwu.edu/wwuet>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Allmand, Chloe, "You Know?: Decoding 'Knowing' in the English Professor/Student Relationship" (2018).
WWU Graduate School Collection. 689.

<https://cedar.wwu.edu/wwuet/689>

This Masters Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the WWU Graduate and Undergraduate Scholarship at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in WWU Graduate School Collection by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

**You Know?: Decoding ‘Knowing’
in the English Professor/Student Relationship**

By

Chloe Allmand

Accepted in Partial Completion
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Donna Qualley, Chair

Dr. Jeremy Cushman

Dr. Dawn Dietrich

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dr. Gautam Pillay, Dean

Master's Thesis

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Western Washington University, I grant to Western Washington University the non-exclusive royalty-free right to archive, reproduce, distribute, and display the thesis in any and all forms, including electronic format, via any digital library mechanisms maintained by WWU.

I represent and warrant this is my original work, and does not infringe or violate any rights of others. I warrant that I have obtained written permissions from the owner of any third party copyrighted material included in these files.

I acknowledge that I retain ownership rights to the copyright of this work, including but not limited to the right to use all or part of this work in future works, such as articles or books.

Library users are granted permission for individual, research and non-commercial reproduction of this work for educational purposes only. Any further digital posting of this document requires specific permission from the author.

Any copying or publication of this thesis for commercial purposes, or for financial gain, is not allowed without my written permission.

Chloe Allmand

May 17, 2018

**You Know?: Decoding ‘Knowing’
in the English Professor/Student Relationship**

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of
Western Washington University

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Chloe Allmand
May 2018

Abstract

This project uses a grounded theory methodology to study what university professors mean when they talk about “getting to know students.” Eight tenure-track and tenured English professors participated in the study. To represent the various fields within this English department, the sample of eight professors includes creative writing, literature, and writing studies faculty. Data for this study consisted of individual interviews and class observations. After coding the data, four categories emerged: Determining the Degrees of Knowing, Building Class Rapport, Maintaining Class Rapport, and Leveling the Playing Field. I argue that “knowing students” is a multi-dimensional relationship I describe with “the distance-degree continuum.” In this continuum, distance, degree, roles, and rapport act on one another to offer a more complete picture of “knowing” than relying on any one element in isolation. In my discussion of how the distance-degree continuum operates, I point to the distinction between professors who “rule break” and those who “role break.” Rule breaking includes engaging in explicitly prohibited relationships with students, while role breaking is less black and white. Professors can role break either intentionally or accidentally by stepping out of the roles that are typically appropriate and productive in their relationships with students. I conclude that for “knowing” to be productive between professors and their students, it must serve a pedagogical purpose, and remain bounded by the intent of the relationship: to teach and to learn.

Acknowledgements

This project would not exist if it were not for the generosity of the professors who offered up their time, energy, and ideas in service of my study. From participating in interviews, allowing me to observe their classes, and answering more than one “Just One More Bit of Data Gathering” email, each of the participating professors supported me with genuine care and excitement for the project. I send them each my deepest gratitude.

I would like to thank my thesis committee members Dr. Dawn Dietrich and Dr. Jeremy Cushman, whose enthusiasm for the project helped to buoy me along through the weeks when I was unsure if I would ever finish writing. It’s not everyone who would meet being given 100+ pages after committing to 40-60 with nothing but excitement and encouragement. They make the academy a place I want to be.

I send my special thanks to my mom and dad, Ruth and Ron Allmand, the first pedagogues I ever had the luck to observe. Thanks also to Aaron, for letting me wake him up at 3 a.m. when I had a theory epiphany, and to Sophie and Herman, who sat by me through coding, drafting, and every revision.

Lastly, I want to thank the incomparable, unstoppable, and inspiring Dr. Donna Qualley. Donna served as my thesis committee chair, and she introduced me to the world of grounded theory. A student once told Donna that she is reminiscent of *The Incredibles*’ Edna Mode. I can see the comparison, except that beyond supporting others in their work, Donna is a superhero in her own right. In conducting interviews for this project, one professor mentioned the importance of being recognized when he was a student by a particular professor, and how this recognition boosted his self-confidence, and bolstered his excitement for academic work. In writing “you are indeed a researcher!” on my final project for her class, Donna gave me this recognition, and inspired me to pursue a methodology that I had never expected to fall so in love with. For never doubting I would get this thing done, for editing with truly superpower level precision, and for “getting to know” me, Donna has my thanks, as unending as the grounded theory process on which she got me hooked.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iv
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables and Figures.....	vii
“The Thing Worth Doing” – An Introduction	1
“The Mud and the Muck to Move Things Forward” - Methodology and Literature Review	6
Findings: Determining the Degrees of Knowing.....	23
Findings: Building Class Rapport.....	40
Findings: Maintaining Class Rapport	51
Findings: Leveling the Playing Field.....	59
“Can You Tell Me What You Mean by ‘Know?’”	77
But Wait, There’s More!.....	85
Works Cited	91
Appendix A.....	92
Appendix B.....	94
Appendix C	102
Appendix D.....	107

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Participation Breakdown	15
Table 2: Participants' Years Teaching.....	16
Table 3: Categories and Codes	23
Table 4: Categories and Codes	40
Table 5: Categories and Codes	51
Table 6: Categories and Codes	59
Table 7: Professors' Preferred Forms of Address from Undergraduate Students	66
Figure 1: The Distance-Degree Continuum.....	79

“The Thing Worth Doing” - An Introduction:

I’m first and foremost a human being. Part of my identity is teacher but it’s not the only thing, just like theirs. Part of their identity is the student, but the more I start to realize what else is going on for them the more depth I have to work with as their teacher. And I guess maybe I assume the same thing, know me as more than *that teacher*.

I was sitting in an office positively bursting with books at the comprehensive university I attend in the Pacific Northwest, a notebook perched on my knees, and my phone, serving as an adequate, if unprofessional, recorder was resting on the desk beside us. I had just asked the professor across from me about her teaching persona. I had heard my professors say they wanted to get to know my classmates and me, and I had said similar things to my own English 101 students. However, this interview sparked my curiosity about how “knowing students” actually takes shape for professors. I began to wonder how that “knowing” might inform pedagogy for English professors in particular.

The idea for this project had started as a glimmer in the back of my mind in the spring of 2017, when this encounter took place. I had enrolled in a graduate seminar titled “Research in the Teaching of English” that focused on grounded theory. I had no idea what grounded theory was. A theory expert, or even dabbler, I was not. I entered the class because I wanted to step beyond my comfortable zone of literature seminars, try something different, and explore new territory. In the course syllabus, my professor framed the work we were signing on for with Marge Piercy’s poem “To Be of Use” from her 1982 book *Circles of Water*. The poem begins with, “The people I love the best / jump into work head first / without dallying in the shallows” and goes onto celebrate “people who harness themselves, an ox to a heavy cart / who pull like water buffalo,

with massive patience, / who strain in the mud and the muck to move things forward” in pursuit of “the thing worth doing” (1-3, 8-10, 19).

Grounded theory research is tedious. It is remarkably time-consuming, constantly recursive, and maddeningly meticulous. Despite grounded theory’s inherent rigor, Piercy’s poem rang in my head all quarter, alongside my professor’s encouragement. I found that while many of my classmates were succumbing to frustration and fatigue, I was a voracious, if sometimes exhausted, “ox.” I was not only happy pulling my cart, but constantly challenging myself to see if I could pull it even farther, even faster. My professor wrote on my final project “You are indeed a researcher! No dallying in the shallows for you.” And thus began my love affair with data.

In this seminar, my classmates and I each chose a professor in the department to interview and observe in class visits. We then pooled our data as a class. Pooling data was essential, because even though we were each working with professors individually, the goal was to explore the question “What kinds of *theories* about teaching and learning can we construct by examining the reading, writing, thinking, and classroom *practices* in Literature, Theory, Creative Writing, or Rhetoric and Composition Studies courses?” The class collaborated on questions for semi-structured interviews, and we each conducted, recorded, transcribed, and coded two interviews with our chosen professor. We also, on two occasions, observed a class our professor was teaching and kept detailed field notes. All of this with the goal of surfacing patterns between the varying professors, who taught courses across the discipline: introduction to fiction writing, fiction writing seminar, introduction to poetry writing, trash cinema, young adult literature in film, rhetoric of comic books, queer of color critique, teaching literature in secondary schools, and editing and publishing.

While most grounded theory studies take years of gathering and immersing in data, on the quarter system, we had only ten weeks to dunk ourselves as deeply in our study as we could. While we certainly gathered a trove of fascinating and complicated data, we were left with more questions than emerging theoretical concepts. I was still curious about “knowing students,” and I wanted to understand more of what professors mean when they use the phrase. Perhaps I should not call my newfound love of data collection and analysis an affair, because at the end of that quarter I was not satisfied with letting my relationship to the study be a ten-week fling. I knew my curiosity would continue to nag at me, so I decided I wanted something long-term. I was ready for a commitment.

In expressing my desire to keep working, or perhaps more truthfully through whining about the limited time to my professor, it became obvious to us both that I needed to continue this work by writing a thesis. A thesis would allow me not only to keep the work going we had begun that quarter, but also afford me the opportunity to focus the study on questions I had not had time to explore. Simultaneously fun and infuriating, grounded theory yields constant cascades of new questions to grapple with. Once I had decided to take this project on as a graduate thesis, one question surfaced as most worth pursuing. This questions had stuck in my mind, nagging at me to address it, but I had not had adequate time to explore it. I wanted to examine what English professors mean when they talk about getting to know students, and how the concept of knowing students may or may not affect pedagogy.

Ideally, in true grounded theory fashion, I would take years to interview and observe hundreds of informants, and years to grapple with my data. With less than a year to complete my thesis, I had to let go of the ideal, and focus on the possible.

Through my study of professors teaching literature, creative writing, and writing studies courses at different levels, I hope my research begins to unpack how English professors get to know their students and to what extent that action may affect teaching and learning. However, this study is by no means conclusive. I attend a comprehensive university with an English Department of just over fifty faculty. English Department class sizes at the university I attend are relatively small, and meet face to face, not online. I worked with a small sample size of eight informants, and interviewed and observed only professors, not students. As of fall 2017, the university reported 25.6% minority students, and the majority of the English Department faculty are white. About two thirds of the faculty, both overall and tenured or tenure-track professors, are women. All of these factors affect the data I was able to collect, and limit the possibilities and scope of my study.

While I acknowledge my study is not conclusive, it is fairly representative of this English department's tenure and tenure-track faculty. I recruited participants who teach a wide variety of courses. Some of my informants are in their fifth year of teaching here, while others are approaching their thirtieth. I interviewed and observed six women and two men, though I did not focus my study on what role professors' genders may play in knowing students. Despite this study's limitations, I hope my research will nevertheless provide a look at how getting to know students may function in other universities with departments and programs similar to English at the university where this study took place.

Research Questions:

When teachers and students talk about professors "knowing" their students, it seems teachers and students understand that "good" professors make efforts to get to know their

students. But, there is no clear definition of what it means for a professor to “know” his or her students. Does “knowing” imply personal details? Or does it mean professors recognize and respond to students’ habits of mind? Getting to know students would seem to entail more than learning a “fun fact” about them on the first day of class. Based on these thoughts, four research questions emerged:

- What does it mean to English professors at this university to “know” their students?
- Is “knowing students” always a good thing, as we seem to understand it to be?
- How might knowing students affect professors’ teaching?
- To what extent do professors find the concept of “knowing students” important to their teaching, or to themselves as teachers?

“The Mud and the Muck to Move Things Forward” – Methodology and Literature Review:

Why Grounded Theory?:

Grounded theory is a qualitative research methodology. It was originally developed in sociology by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss in the late 1960s, coming to fruition in their 1967 book *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Grounded theory researchers work through data to conceive new theories and/or theoretical concepts, rather than simply applying or replicating existing theories in a given field. The grounded theory process involves qualitative research in the form of intensive interviews, observation or field work, coding, and constant recursive comparison of data, all of which I will later explain in more detail. In this type of research, interviews are primary, and field work is secondary. In other forms of qualitative inquiry, ethnography for example, field work is the primary form of data gathering. In her book *Constructing Grounded Theory*, Kathy Charmaz explains “Stated simply, grounded theory methods consist of systematic, yet flexible guidelines for collecting and analyzing qualitative data to construct theories from the data themselves. Thus researchers construct a theory ‘grounded’ in their data” (1). Grounded theory allows the researcher to build a theory grounded in original data, rather than pulling from established theories and working from the top down.

Although Glaser and Strauss developed grounded theory together, their difference in research training and their divided vision of how best to practice grounded theory led to several schools within the methodology. Glaser’s background in quantitative research made his approach more structured and focused on the resulting theory, while Strauss’s approach “encouraged more free-wheeling flights of imagination, ‘blue skying’ he called it” (Charmaz 10). In this project, I am using Charmaz’s method, Constructivist grounded theory. As Charmaz explains, her method

“adopts the inductive, comparative, emergent and open-ended approach of Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) original statement... Constructivist grounded theory highlights the flexibility of the method and resists mechanical applications of it” (13). Charmaz argues that Objectivists Glaser, Strauss, and Juliet M. Corbin (Strauss’ partner following his split from Glaser) “treated their analyses as accurate renderings of these worlds rather than as constructions of them. Nor did they take into account *their* processes of construction of the research and the structural and situational encroachments upon it” (14). In Constructivist grounded theory, rather than denying one’s subjectivity, the researcher acknowledges it, thereby becoming reflexive rather than merely reflective (14). As a student and teacher, I do have ideas about what I, at least, mean when I talk about “knowing” my students; however, being a student and teacher also means that I carry particular subjectivities as a researcher in this study.

In the graduate course, we read Alan Peshkin’s “In Search of Subjectivity—One’s Own.” Peshkin encourages researchers to acknowledge their “Subjective I’s,” the potentially subjective parts of themselves that may affect their ability to approach research objectively. I made a list of some of my own Subjective I’s: “Teacher I,” “Student I,” and “Teacher’s Kid I.” As a teacher, student and child of two teachers, I am no stranger to pedagogy. However, to truly understand how the concept of “knowing” may show up within this English department, I could not rely on “data” from my own experiences or what I have seen other professors do in the past. I needed to constantly acknowledge and account for my own subjectivities as I constructed theoretical concepts. My professor had told us “We want to go in with an open mind, not an empty head.”

Although I employed grounded theory practices in this study partially because that was how I had begun to work with these concepts in the graduate class I had taken, other factors affected my decision to employ this research methodology. The problem with working from

existing theories about professors “knowing” their students is that few studies really delve into this topic, and I am aware of none that deal with these questions within an English department specifically. There are the obvious downfalls to too much “knowing,” such as inappropriate and or harmful levels of intimacy, including sexual or romantic relationships between teachers and their students. The obvious answer to any questions I may have asked regarding these types of relationships would be “don’t have sex with your students,” so I was not interested in pursuing that line of inquiry. I was curious to know what might be the right degree of “knowing,” because teachers and students seem to understand “getting to know each other” as a positive factor in the teacher/student relationship.

What Do We Know About “Knowing”:

If you Google search “Getting to Know Your Students,” you will find 150,000,000 results in a crisp 0.43 seconds (at the time of my search in May 2018). Many of the articles are broken down into handy lists of four, five, or ten strategies teachers can use to get to know their students. Not only are these strategies teachers *can* use, but it is implied or argued outright that teachers *should* use these strategies. In one of the first hits, “A 4-Part System for Getting to Know Your Students” from *Cult of Pedagogy*, seventh-grade teacher Jennifer Gonzalez says “Building solid relationships with your students is arguably the most important thing you can do to be an effective teacher. It helps you build trust so students take academic risks, allows you to better differentiate for individual needs, and prevents the kinds of power struggles often found in poorly managed classrooms” (par. 4). She offers four strategies for getting to know one’s students: facilitating ice breakers on the first day of class, distributing get-to-know-you questionnaires, storing the collected data in a spread sheet, and regularly checking in with students through surveys or direct questions about how the class is going. Importantly,

Gonzalez's article, and the many others similar to it, implies that getting to know students is inherently positive, but not the end goal. Rather, getting to know students is a means to an end in relationship building between teachers and their students. In Gonzalez's view, the benefits of these relationships all relate to teaching and learning: students feeling they can take risks, teachers understanding students' needs, and avoiding "power struggles" between students and teachers. "Knowing" does not appear to mean "knowing" on a level of intimacy beyond what is necessary to serve the teachers' pedagogy and the students' learning. Notably, these strategy list articles are geared toward elementary, middle, and high school teachers, which suggests that relationship building is essential for primary and secondary school pedagogy. But is knowing as relationship building as essential in the college classroom?

According to Jeff Grabill, Associate Provost for Teaching, Learning and Technology at Michigan State University, the answer is yes. Grabill argues that "caring matters," and points out that most university faculty have little or no training in teaching. Rather, their expertise is in their field of study, and their teaching is often rooted in their experiences as students. He says "the most common notion of what it means to teach is to 'deliver content.' Yet today, more than ever, students can find content on their own. What they cannot find online is someone who can listen and offer feedback. They can't readily find someone who will care about them as learners" (3). That teachers should care about their students seems obvious, but what caring about students looks like in practice is less clear, especially in the college classroom. Grabill describes caring for his students as having "the time, space, and energy to get to know my students, to listen to their stories, to share my joy about what we were learning, and to change my approach to teaching to meet their needs" (3). Like so many educators, Grabill tosses in the phrase "get to know my students" without stopping to explain exactly what he means. Get to know what about

them? Their needs as students, as Gonzalez mentioned? What they want to do for a career? Their favorite coffee places?

If we are to consider the role of “caring” in education, it is impossible to do so without considering Nel Noddings’ work. In her article “Caring in Education,” Noddings says “I do not mean to suggest that the establishment of caring relations will accomplish everything that must be done in education, but these relations provide the foundation for successful pedagogical activity” (4). Noddings distinguishes between teachers caring that students meet educational requirements, and teachers caring for students as individuals with various needs and capabilities. She calls this second kind of caring “the relational sense of caring,” meaning that caring is about relationships between educators and students (1). Her argument rests on the belief that caring about students is essential not only to being a “good” teacher, but also to teaching students, not just content, effectively. Gonzalez and Grabill seem to agree, and from my brief experience as a teacher, I find I want to agree with them as well. It seems that there can be no “successful pedagogy” without care from the teacher, not necessarily care that students master the curriculum, but care for the students as people with varying needs and capabilities. However, I am curious how the need for care from teachers may be different depending not only on whether it is focused on elementary, middle school, high school or college, but also depending on who the students are as individuals with varying needs, capabilities and personalities. While Noddings’ work is certainly useful as I consider “knowing,” it would be an egregious error to conflate professors caring about students with professors knowing students. We can certainly know a person without caring for them. It is clear that professors can care about their students in the relational sense Noddings points to without knowing their students particularly well, especially on a personal level. I care about my students’ needs as learners, but that does not mean

I know them in any role but “student.” I have heard professors express their anxiety when they see a student struggling, but that does not mean the professor *knows* that student. Though caring and knowing both seem to play a role in “successful pedagogy,” it is important also to interrogate what “successful” means, and for whom. From what I have read, seen, and heard, successful pedagogy seems to be based in part on relationship building between teachers and students, but I am curious about the boundaries those relationships may need in order to remain “successful.”

In her article for *The Dartmouth*, “Level Footing: The Professor -Student Dynamic” Eliza Jane Schaeffer examines what makes for a “successful” relationship between professors and students. Schaeffer points out that “Any Dartmouth — or to be frank, any collegiate — tour guide will tell you that their school is characterized by close student-professor relationships that often develop into research opportunities and job references” (2). Here, it seems that a “successful relationship” between a college professor and his or her students is one that leads to professional success for the student post-graduation. Schaeffer provides several anecdotes of students who say they felt most engaged in classes where professors “got to know them,” but again, what “knowing” means is not clear. Is checking in with students at the start of class, as Schaeffer and many others seem to emphasize, really “getting to know students”? From asking “How’s it going?” at the start of class, I seem to learn which of my students are comfortable responding, and which of my students still have their earbuds in. I don’t know that “checking in” means “getting to know.” Schaeffer concludes her piece by saying “A professor can and should be a teacher and a friend” (3). I have heard this sentiment before, which is why I find Schaeffer’s article worth mentioning. One of my own 101 students did a project on teacher-student relationships, particularly about a teacher he had in eighth grade who he considered a friend. I

am not convinced, however, that “knowing” implies friendship, or that friendship serves pedagogy in the way Schaeffer and others have suggested. If one person is the teacher, and one person is the student, are the two ever really on “level footing”? Can a relationship so informed by power dynamics ever really be considered friendship? And is friendship between a teacher and a student really a positive relationship for either party?

On one of my English 101 course evaluations from Fall 2017, a student wrote “Chloe is more like a friend than a teacher.” I cringed reading it, and cringe whenever I think of it. Considering the rest of the comments in the evaluation, I believe the student meant calling me a friend as a compliment. I imagine she meant that I was personable, or even fun to talk to in the classroom and in my office. This particular student had asked me for poetry recommendations, and I lent her several books. However, I consider being viewed as a “friend” as a hindrance to my pedagogy. Can a teacher really be a student’s “friend” in a way that serves pedagogy? It seems a large part of defining what professors mean by “knowing” students rests in defining what “knowing” is not. To understand “knowing,” understanding the degree to which professors find knowing their students useful to their pedagogy seems essential.

No “Dallying in the Shallows”:

Without a body of existing research to use as a launch pad, I needed to build my own theoretical concepts from the ground up if I wanted to explore how “knowing” really shows up, or does not, in this English department. I do not mean to sound flippant when I say that I believe the best way to learn what professors mean when they say they get to know their students is to ask the professors what they mean. Rather, grounded theory methodology is rooted in just that - asking people to define exactly what they mean by what they say and do. I needed to ask multiple professors my questions, and see what patterns might emerge from their responses. The

research is not as simple as observing if what people say and what they do seem to match. Grounded theorists joke that they “sleep with their data,” which is genuinely not an exaggeration. If I had not employed grounded theory practices in this study, I would not have engaged with the data so recursively. I did not simply interview a professor then observe their teaching. Rather, I interviewed a pool of professors, observed some of their teaching, conducted more interviews, reread the first interviews, sent follow up emails, and so on and so forth. If I had used another methodology, I also would not have been able to see patterns across the data from my various participants as clearly as I could by working the data into categories, rather than focusing on one professor at a time. Because I wanted to see how the concept of knowing shows up within an English department, not just for individual professors, the comparison work of grounded theory was essential to my purpose for pursuing this study. I will provide more detail of each portion of the grounded theory process and how I employed its strategies as I explain my exact research process for this study.

Gathering Participants:

If I had had five or six years, instead of less than one, to conduct and write this study, I would have recruited perhaps one hundred participants from several universities. Given the time constraints, I decided to choose eight informants from within the English department of which I am a part. I selected participants based on several factors. With over 50 faculty members in the English department, to help narrow the pool, I reached out only to tenured or tenure track professors. I wanted to reflect the fields within the department and the majors offered, so I selected professors who teach creative writing, literature, and writing studies. Importantly, the majority of my informants needed to be teaching at least one class during either fall quarter of 2017 or winter of 2018, so I could observe their teaching. Also, I could not choose informants

whose classes were scheduled at the same time as the graduate courses I was enrolled in, or the section of English 101 I was teaching. To protect my participants' privacy, I assigned each informant a pseudonym, and intentionally omitted the titles of the classes they teach, and other details that would make their identities immediately obvious.

I began with a list of eleven professors whom I initially contacted through an email. I explained my project, and what their participation could entail. One professor politely declined immediately, saying she was stretched too thinly that fall to add anything else to her schedule. Another said he would be happy to talk through the ideas I was grappling with, but would prefer not to be recorded or included in my writing. A third professor never responded, and I chose not to follow up with her when I secured eight of the original eleven professors. Via email, eight professors had agreed to meet with me for an initial interview. I presented them with an IRB approved consent form and answered any questions they had about my study. With only nine months to gather data and write, I capped the study at eight informants, and was on my way.

In acknowledging that each professor might not have the time or desire to engage in each part of my study, I crafted my consent forms with options. When the professors signed their consent to participate, they had the choice of signing up for only the initial interview, multiple interviews, or multiple interviews and class observations, with a last additional option of allowing me access to course materials including syllabi and assignments. Only one professor signed up for the initial interview only - the other seven were game for participating throughout the entire study. Whether or not I observed their class depended on scheduling, and whether or not I interviewed them a second time depended on whether I had observed their class. I conducted initial interviews with all eight informants, and second interviews with six. I observed those six professors all once, and two of them I observed a second time. To see each informants'

participation in my study, and their years teaching overall and at this university, please reference Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: Participation Breakdown

Initial Interview	Second Interview	Class Observations (Fall)	Class Observations (First Day Winter)
Jocelyn Simons (literature)	Jocelyn Simons	Jocelyn Simons (twice)	Anna Neal
Max Turner (writing studies)	Max Turner	Dan Lock	Max Turner
Dan Lock (literature)	Dan Lock	Anna Neal	
Anna Neal (literature)	Anna Neal	Miranda Boone	
Miranda Boone (creative writing)	Miranda Boone	Amy Allen	
Amy Allen (queer studies and creative writing)	Amy Allen		
Mary Williams (literature)			
Carrie Peters (literature)			

Table 2: Participants' Years Teaching

	Years Teaching Total	Years Teaching at this University
Jocelyn Simons	21.5	14
Max Turner	13	5
Dan Lock	15	5
Anna Neal	20	12
Miranda Boone	21	19
Amy Allen	27	20
Mary Williams	38	27
Carrie Peters	34	26

Conducting Interviews:

There are several kinds of interviews, including structured, semi-structured, and free form. I conducted semi-structured interviews, which start from a prepared list of questions, but allow for follow up questions and tangential thinking. I chose this method of interviewing because although I wanted to ask the professors many of the same questions, I did not want to limit myself or the professor to my prepared list alone. Depending on how a professor responded, I wanted the option of deviating from my list to ask them to clarify, elaborate, or possibly go on a different line of inquiry altogether. I also tailored some questions depending on the informant. Because I had taken classes from four of the eight participants, I prefaced some of the questions I asked them with “I remember how this happened in our class, but...” In the initial interviews, I asked professors to define what they mean when they say they “know” a student. I also asked about their office hours, and communicating with students through email and the university’s chosen learning management system, Canvas. I conducted these initial interviews before I had

observed any classes, so the second round of interviews was with only those professors whom I had observed. I conducted the first initial interview on September 28, and the last on November 16.

In the second round of interviews, class observations informed my questions, many of which dealt with classroom rapport, physical layout of classrooms, and asking professors to reflect on their own experiences as students. What I had observed in each professors' class also led me to tailor some questions, or ask specific follow up questions of some professors. I conducted the first of the second round of interviews on December 6, the last on January 18. The first interviews were slightly shorter on average than the second round, ranging from 12 to 50 minutes for an average of 22 minutes per interview. The longest interview in the first round was with the professor I have spent the most time with as a graduate student, and the lengths of the interviews depended on my ability to ask follow up questions, and participants' length of answers and thoughts beyond my planned questions. The second interviews ranged from 14 to 34 minutes yielding an average of 25 minutes per interview. For lists of the questions I asked at the first and second interviews, please see appendix A.

I conducted interviews in the participants' offices, and scheduled interviews at participants' convenience, often within their regular office hours. I recorded each interview, the first interviews using an app on my phone, then the second interviews with a higher quality field recorder my advisor loaned me. Although transcription services are available and several professors suggested I could seek them out, it was important to me to transcribe each interview myself. While paying someone to transcribe or applying for a grant for transcription services could have saved me time initially, overall I think it would have distanced me from my data. To see patterns across the interviews and class observations as they emerged, I had to remain in

constant contact with my data. I had to “sleep” (and spend seemingly every waking hour) with my data. The transcription process allowed me to hear my participants’ responses a second time, more slowly, so I could highlight particular moments that jumped out to me as integral to my study.

Observing Classes:

During fall quarter, I observed five instructors. I observed Dr. Simons’ class twice, in two different rooms. During winter quarter, I observed Dr. Turner for the first time and Dr. Neal for the second time, both on the first day of winter quarter classes. Of course, this meant that I observed Dr. Neal teaching two different classes. I did not conduct any class observations until I had completed six of the eight first interviews, so I began observing classes at the end of October 2017. I requested professors’ permission to visit their classes beforehand, so they were aware of which class I planned to observe and which day I would arrive. Although I have omitted the titles of classes to protect my participants’ privacy, I observed one 200 level class, two 300 level classes, and four 400 level classes. Dr. Simons’ class, which I observed twice, was a 400 level. One class was in writing studies, one was in creative writing, and the remaining five were in literature.

In all eight observations, I was a non-participant observer. I attempted to be as inconspicuous as possible, so that students and the professor would not be overly influenced by my presence. I sat in the backs and side corners of classrooms. I took notes by hand, attempting to get down as much dialogue as I could, then transcribed my notes as quickly after the class as possible.

Coding and Categorizing Data:

While there is plenty to be learned from gathering data, to truly uncover emerging patterns and glimmers of theoretical concepts, coding and categorizing data is essential to grounded theory. After I had transcribed an interview or class observation, I printed the document with a wide column on the right hand side to write out the initial codes I might use to describe what I saw happening in the interview dialogue or within the class I had observed. Coding, put simply, is the process of describing data with verbs, rather than describing with adjectives alone. For example, when professors talked to me about noticing students struggling with anxiety or depression, and offering the students resources such as our campus Counseling Center, I would describe that data with the code “Watching for and Responding to Troubled Behavior.”

After coding an interview or class observation, I made a list of all the codes that had come up in that interview, whether they were intriguing or perhaps not of interest for this particular project. When I had completed that process, I began to look for the codes that were showing up in multiple interviews and in multiple class observations. I wrote, revised, and rewrote my codes a seemingly endless amount of times to best capture the data in a way that was genuinely descriptive of what I was observing, rather than what I thought I *might* see or what the data *could* mean. Charmaz advises grounded theory researchers to “Make your codes fit the data you have rather than forcing the data to fit them” (120). A code that seems interesting is not enough; each code must represent the data that is actually surfacing from the study, not the data a researcher might hope to see.

When I had a list of codes that all seemed to have significant data attached to them, I began the exciting and agonizing process of putting together a code book. A code book is a

document in which a researcher defines all the pertinent codes that have surfaced in the study. She then sorts those codes into categories. When the codes are defined, researchers can revisit their data, in my case interviews and class observations, and begin to pull data points and place them under their corresponding codes in the code book. Occasionally, the process is that simple, but the agony of codes is that sometimes it becomes clear that a code is actually too broad and encompassing data that is not all exactly related. In those cases, the code needs to become a category that encompasses other codes. Sometimes, a code needs to split, because the code is describing two or three kinds of data that may be related, but are not so similar they can fall under the same code. For example, I originally had written a code I was calling “Building Class Rapport.” The more data I revisited though, it became obvious that “Building Class Rapport” was too broad to be a code of its own, so it became a category encompassing other codes that are still related to building rapport, but are more specific, like “Laughing with Students,” and “Sharing Personal Stories.” As I kept working with the data, it occurred to me that there was so much data falling under the “Building Class Rapport” category because some of the data was about building rapport, but some of the codes were actually about maintaining rapport. So, “Maintaining Class Rapport” became its own category. The category “Building Class Rapport” came to hold four codes: “Getting Laughs,” “Sharing Personal Stories,” “Getting Students to Know Each Other and Work Together,” and “Valuing Knowing Students’ Names.” The category “Maintaining Class Rapport” holds four codes as well: “Running Jokes,” “Laughing with Students,” “Checking In,” and “Teasing Students.” While the data points under “Laughing with Students” and “Checking In,” for example, all relate to “Maintaining Class Rapport,” the data within each code is different enough to need to be described with two codes. I will describe each

of these codes in detail as I discuss my findings. For definitions of each code as well as examples of each code's corresponding data points, please see Appendix B.

The process of codes splitting in two or growing to become categories meant that my code book was constantly expanding and changing. In the original version I wrote in early January 2018, I had just three categories: "Building Class Rapport," "Knowing Contextually," and "Attempting Availability Structure." I completely revised both "Knowing Contextually" and "Attempting Availability Structure," because neither category was accurately or precisely describing the data. The final version of my code book includes four categories, three of which are deeply related in that they all have to do with rapport between teachers and students. Those three categories are "Building Class Rapport," "Maintaining Class Rapport," and "Leveling the Playing Field." The other category is "Determining the Degrees of Knowing," which was originally "Knowing Contextually." Originally, my code book contained two more categories: "Grappling with Availability" and "Offering Availability Beyond the Classroom." To keep the focus of this project more sharply on the concept of knowing students, I have not included those categories or discussions of their codes in this project; however, I have included those categories as a separate code book in Appendix C. Of course, I could have continued endlessly adding and moving codes, and even potentially adding more categories, but at some point, the coding has to stop, and the writing must begin.

Visual Aids and Memos:

To keep track of categories, codes and their relationships to each other, I created a document with movable parts. Those "movable parts" were sticky notes, on a "document" of 11' by 17' card stock. I realized it was too difficult for me to keep track of how codes were growing and changing when they were listed just within my code book, so I created the sticky note

document as a way of visualizing how all of the data I collected was really taking shape. I wrote the names of my categories on pink sticky notes, then wrote the names of my codes on green sticky notes, and placed them under their corresponding categories. I chose sticky notes specifically because codes have a tendency to travel between categories, and I can move a sticky note more easily than I can copy and paste text in a long document. I had to go in and revise my code book eventually anyway, but the sticky notes helped me visualize how the codes traveled.

Along with my handy sticky note document, I also wrote memos throughout my study to keep track of emerging thoughts, whether those thoughts were questions I wanted to ask my participants in their next interviews, codes I felt needed to get into the code book, or connections I noticed between one participant's response to a question and another's. Charmaz dedicates an entire chapter of *Constructing Grounded Theory* to memo writing, and describes the process as "provid[ing] a space to become actively engaged in your materials, to develop your ideas, to fine-tune your subsequent data-gathering, and to engage in critical reflexivity" (162). For many researchers, memos are somewhat formal documents, kept consistently, and written so that another human would be able to read them. My memos were rarely like that. For me, memos were sometimes tidy paragraphs typed and saved into my research folder on my laptop - at other times, memos were quick notes jotted on a notepad in my kitchen because a thought came to me as I was brushing my teeth, or typed into my phone while I was taking a walk through the woods. Those examples may sound silly, but the truth of grounded theory research is the data never leaves the researcher, and that included when I was brushing my teeth, riding the bus home from school, or even sleeping. Yes, I have dreamt about my data many times, and am wondering now if I will ever stop.

Findings: Determining the Degrees of Knowing

Table 3: Categories and Codes

Determining the Degrees of Knowing	Building Class Rapport	Maintaining Class Rapport	Leveling the Playing Field
Collecting Student Information	Valuing Knowing Students' Names	Checking In	Allowing a First Name Basis
Distinguishing Roles as Professors	Getting Students to Know Each Other and Work Together	Laughing with Students	Getting Student Voices into the Classroom
Knowing Students as Students	Sharing Personal Stories	Running Jokes	Valuing Student Input
Knowing Students as People	Getting Laughs	Teasing Students	Breaking Classroom Spatial Boundaries
Building Productive Boundaries			Sharing Own Working Practices
Asking to Be Called by Title			

Me: So thinking about any class after ten weeks, do you feel like you know your students? And then also to answer that question, if you feel like you know a student, what does that mean, or look like for you?

Max Turner: Woah. Can you tell me what you mean by know?

Me: I'm asking you to tell me what you mean by know [MT laughs]. So if you have a student in a class, and you are thinking of that student in a way, like, 'I feel like I know Susie,' what does that mean?

MT: I'm not religious but I have a religious perspective on everything I look at. It's the only way I can describe it. I don't think I can answer... No I don't know Susie. I know my wife, I know Scott, my dear friend. After ten weeks, I'm

building a particular boundary. Because I need them to figure out there's a place I'm not gonna step. I know Susie as a student. Sometimes.

Dr. Turner's response to my question, "What does it mean for you to know a student?" illustrates well the types of responses I received from all the professors in this study. I asked the eight professors about how they would define "knowing" their students and how they do or do not make themselves available to students. I learned that professors think of knowing and availability in terms of boundaries with a "good" side that is productive for teaching and learning and a "bad" side that leads to potentially damaging relationships and negative experiences for teachers and for students. On the positive side of "knowing," there is role modeling, mentoring, and "good" teaching. On the negative side, there is friendship, "therapy sessions," and a breakdown of the boundaries between the teacher and the student.

For the professors in this study, "knowing" their students is appropriate when it serves a pedagogical purpose, meaning the "knowing" aids the professor in their role as teacher or role model, and aids the student in their learning and development. "Getting to know students" is appropriate as long as it does not break down the boundaries professors put in place between themselves and their students to maintain relationships that are rooted in teaching and learning - nothing else.

I named this category of data "Determining the Degrees of Knowing" because the professors in this study do not "get to know their students" at random. In situations outside the classroom, "knowing" can happen in less controlled ways: the way we may or may not get to know people we work with, take a class with, or see every morning in line for coffee. In contrast, the professors described "knowing" students with great care and meticulous attention to how

they determine the degrees of “knowing” that they allow between themselves and their students, and how they are constantly building and maintaining boundaries.

Collecting Student Information:

Collecting student information is one way professors express to students what they need and want to know about them. Dr. Carrie Peters, Dr. Amy Allen, and Dr. Miranda Boone all specifically mentioned intentionally collecting information from their students on the first day of class. In regards to one of her film classes, Dr. Peters said “I like to gather some information from them and ask them some questions to get them to open up and start talking. A lot of times it can be things like: what’s your relationship to film? Are you completely new to this? Or what kind of films do you like to watch? Something easy where everyone will have an answer.” In her Queer Studies classes in particular, Dr. Allen asks students for their preferred name and preferred pronouns, a common practice at our university. In her creative writing classes, she also asks for “other little bits of information about themselves,” and uses those details to help her remember students’ names: “It’s harder in the big class, but if someone likes to play the banjo it helps me remember their name. If somebody is from a small town and really excited to be [here], it helps me remember their name. So I have them write a personal narrative, some kind of statement about what matters to them, and I give them a lot of freedom in that.” Dr. Boone gave me a copy of what she calls an “intro sheet” or “check in sheet” that she hands out to students on the first day of class. She said she started this practice four or five years ago, originally as a way to help students get to know each other, but a positive “side effect” was that she got to know more about them, too:

I always have them fill it out before we even start talking about the class, and then they get in groups and share with each other what they've written... they can reveal, as they feel comfortable, their gender preference, their pronoun preference. You know, anything else that might be very personal and that they wouldn't necessarily want to reveal in front of the whole class while I'm taking roll.

I observed two professors' first day of class during winter quarter 2018. Dr. Peters, Dr. Allen, and Dr. Boone had told me about their first day information gathering in the first round of interviews, but I was able to observe how Dr. Turner and Dr. Anna Neal practice these strategies with their classes on the first day of a new quarter. Instead of calling roll at the beginning of class, Dr. Turner asked students to introduce themselves to the class with their name, where they're from, and why they signed up for the class. He would then comment a bit to each student, and repeat their name. Dr. Neal gave each student a notecard, and asked them to write their name, preferred nickname, preferred pronouns, and what, if anything, they knew about the major author they would be studying. She then asked the students to share what they had written with someone next to them, and introduce their partner to the class. Dr. Neal collected the notecards at the end of class.

It seems that collecting these details from students, or "getting to know students" in this way is a purposeful, pedagogical strategy. It allows professors to start to get a sense of who their students are enough to be able to remember their names, but not so much that they are forming a friendship or a relationship outside of the class. In collecting this information, professors are demonstrating to students that they care about them in the relational sense Noddings' outlined. The professors care about the students in terms of who they are as individuals, not just how well they are mastering the course curriculum. The professors are also making space for student

voices in the classroom and encouraging students to get to know each other, two concepts I will further explore in my discussion of rapport between professors and students.

Distinguishing Roles as Professors:

In our discussions about “knowing students,” professors consistently distinguished between roles that they deem appropriate to embody in their relationships with students, and roles they categorize as inappropriate. In my first interview with Dr. Boone, she said “The challenge with teaching a class like this where you are dealing with personal material is not to cross any of those boundaries between teacher and counselor, or teacher and friend... So, being able to show interest and empathy, but without going overboard and losing my own sense of boundaries with them.” Dr. Allen echoed Dr. Boone by saying,

I feel like I need to know them as people, I just have always felt that. At the same time, I think that there is a level of understanding who they are that I don't want to know, so one of the things I say (that I'm really proud of saying, and it's in my syllabus) is: Do not friend me on Facebook because I am not your friend. And I say it exactly like that because I want to model for them the difference between being a role model, being a teacher, being a mentor, and being a friend. They're different. So I don't want to know them as if they're friends, because that's not my role, and it would be bad role modeling. I want to know them well enough to be able to guide them toward particular interests and show some level of compassion and excitement for whatever brought them to the university.

Dr. Jocelyn Simons also said she is not her students' friend, nor is she their “partner in learning,” at least not always. Dr. Simons said some of her classes are discussion based, and she encourages

her students to drive the conversation. At other times, there are concepts she has to lead the students through. Dr. Simons explained that when she has knowledge that the students do not have, the “knowing” between them cannot be a partnership. By consistently distinguishing between positive and negative roles, the professors helped me understand that one way they determine what degree they “get to know students” is through the roles the professors’ actively choose to embody or avoid.

Knowing Students as Students vs. Knowing Students as People:

Along with distinguishing between appropriate and inappropriate roles for themselves, professors also distinguished between “knowing students as students” and “knowing students as people.” I asked professors what it means to “know” students, and they seemed to break “knowing” down into these two categories. Unlike distinguishing between productive roles or potentially damaging roles for themselves, knowing students as students and knowing students as people is not a binary with simple “good” and “bad” or “right” and “wrong” sides. Rather, the professors indicated that “knowing students as students” is important to their work as teachers because they can’t effectively teach students without knowing something of who the students are and how they act within a particular class. Professors described “knowing students as people” as less essential to pedagogy, but that this kind of knowing can be rewarding and fun. “Knowing students as people” seems to happen for professors depending on two main factors. First, how forthcoming each individual students is, and what they may need or want in terms of “being known.” Second, the type and size of the class is important.

In the first round of interviews I asked professors on a scale of one to ten, ten being essential and one being unnecessary, to what extent “knowing their students” is important to

their work as teachers. Dr. Mary Williams said she would rank the importance somewhere near an eight out of ten:

I've had students who are very good students, who've done extremely well in the class, performed at a high level, been fully engaged, and yet I don't know that I necessarily know them better than other students in the class. So I suppose if I'm being very honest... it's certainly not essential to their performance. Because some students are simply more reserved. I don't mean that they don't participate in class, but they don't necessarily reveal to you and the other students a lot about themselves... You know something about their thought, but not necessarily their non-academic interests. Other students will come by the office and they'll talk about things other than their academic interests. If there's no one waiting at the door, they'll just chat. Some students just volunteer that information and others don't. So I guess, to be perfectly honest, I feel I need to know something. On a scale of one to ten I wouldn't say ten. I wouldn't say it's essential that I know them well, even intellectually, at least for them to have a rewarding experience and to perform well. I always like knowing who they are, but I wouldn't argue that they can't have a great experience. I wouldn't say that [knowing] is a requirement for them to have a great experience from the class.

While Dr. Williams ultimately landed on an eight in consideration of how her students may want to be "known," she added that for herself personally, she would always like it to be at a ten: "I think for myself it's far more rewarding if I get a sense of who they are as individuals... Because, then there's that wonderful feeling that you're connecting... that wonderful sense when students smile and you connect. There's a sense of a rapport and that's so rewarding..."

The other professors' responses were all fairly similar to Dr. Williams' response. Dr. Turner also said somewhere around an eight on the scale of importance, but qualified that he means an eight for importance of knowing them as students, not as people. Dr. Anna Neal said, "[knowing is] very important if by know we mean where they are academically and what their interests are, like that kind of context. What their aspirations are, what their strengths and weaknesses are as writers. So, ten for that and maybe like three for the interpersonal know." Dr. Dan Lock gave the lowest ranking overall, saying "somewhere in the middle...probably in the five or six range." However, it's important to note that when professors do not all rank the importance of knowing students as a ten out of ten, it does not mean that they only "care" about their students with 80 or 60 percent enthusiasm. Rather, Dr. Lock echoed Dr. Williams, saying that the importance of "knowing" depends in part on how students want or need to be known or recognized by their professors. Dr. Lock told me:

I have great teaching experiences where... I kind of have a feel of what the students are like in the classroom and the exchange of ideas is really interesting, and class is going great, but I don't necessarily have that strong connection or knowledge of the students in that kind of quasi-intimate way, and I have other classes where I have that, you know that kind of connection with one or two students but the class itself if not a trainwreck at least is not really one of my favorites... It's a pleasurable thing to have that kind of connection, I like it, but as far as its importance for how I experience a class, what makes it fun, or how I interpret it as facilitating the educational goals of the class, it can be useful but it doesn't seem... essential.

The professors consistently acknowledged that some students simply do not want or need to be “known” by their professors on a level beyond the professor understanding the student’s contributions to the class. When I asked professors about their experiences with “feeling known” by their professors during their undergraduate years, Dr. Lock and Dr. Simons both mentioned that they did not particularly want any kind of personal relationship with their professors. Dr. Lock said as a first-generation college student he didn’t have any strong connections with faculty in his first few years of undergraduate education because he “was terrified of the faculty and... of the TA. I didn’t really understand the distinctions between the TA and the faculty member. I knew one was younger and one was older, but they all seemed very scary.” Dr. Simons told me that some students want to remain anonymous to their professors, and that she was that way as an undergraduate student: “I wanted to engage with the material. I didn’t want to engage with people. So I respect that, I want to give space for that. But, for the students who want to have a relationship with the material that also allows them to cultivate a relationship with faculty, I’d like to be that person.” Considering that both Dr. Lock and Dr. Simons have gone on to earn PhDs and tenured positions at a comprehensive university, not being “known as people” by all of their professors during their undergraduate study does not appear to have been a hindrance to their academic careers.

If professors describe “knowing” as either knowing students as students or knowing students as people, then what are the distinctions that separate these two degrees of knowing? When the professors talked about “knowing students as students” they mentioned students’ “habits of thought,” their reactions to coursework, their academic interests, and their capabilities and behavior in the class. For Dr. Peters, knowing students as students serves her pedagogy because this kind of “knowing” allows her to acknowledge and manage power dynamics within

her classroom. She told me, “I kind of have to be attentive to how people are participating with each other. And you can’t intervene in that or help support that if you don’t know your students. You have to see how they interact with each other, and that says a lot about their learning, and if there are impediments to their learning.” Dr. Turner said he has to “know” his students, because if he doesn’t “know” them, he can’t recognize when they’ve had what he calls a “schema shattering moment”:

...In order for my teaching to work, that always means, at some level, every student has a schema shattering moment. Where they get super confused, and get to put themselves back together in a way that’s different. That’s always the ideal. Rarely happens, probably, but that’s the ideal... I have to be able to watch Susie’s response paper be a disaster. It means I have to know it’s a disaster because she’s really struggling. And I’m able to go ‘Okay, cool.’ And then I start responding in a way that’s like ‘What about this?’ and ‘Think through this’ and it encourages her to kind of move forward, not just stay in this confused spot.

From these conversations, it became clear to me that “knowing students as students” is important to all the professors’ pedagogy, if in different ways. “Knowing students as people,” though, is more complicated to define in terms of its “usefulness” for teacher/student relationships. “Knowing students as students” seems to be a foundation on which “knowing students as people” can be built; though how much “knowing” is possible or helpful depends on the professor, the individual students, and the size and type of class. As I mentioned earlier, the professors pointed out that not every student wants to be “known” on a personal level, which the professors accept as no hindrance to a successful relationship and experience for the both the student and the professor. It’s also important to note that the professors who teach the largest

class sizes of 75 students said that while they try, and sometimes succeed, in learning each student's name, they can't "know" each of the 75 students as people. Dr. Lock told me, "I would find knowing them all with that level of quasi-intimacy completely exhausting. Right, as an introvert, I'm just not really calibrated for that kind of thing." Furthermore, professors who teach creative writing classes mentioned that because of the genres students are writing in, more personal details surface than they might in a literature course. Dr. Boone teaches creative writing courses and told me she typically feels she knows about half her students "as people." She said "a lot of students are not shy about going into some really intense stuff from their childhoods, so we learn a lot about each other." By contrast, Dr. Lock, who teaches courses in literature, said he's had many classes where he feels a sense of "quasi-intimacy" with just a handful of students.

Dr. Peters told me she always tries to remember that her students aren't just students, they're whole people. She said, "The funnest thing about teaching is getting to know them as people. So as much as I can with the large numbers we teach, I always try to interact with them and be present in my interactions with them to want to learn about them as people." For Dr. Simons, the degree to which professors choose to "know" their students depends on the professors' goals for the class and their relationships with students. For her, "knowing students as students" is not enough:

...if all I'm trying to do is deliver content, if all I'm trying to do is teach skills, if all I'm trying to do is lead exercises to help students practice their writing ability, if all I'm trying to do with these students is impart a certain kind of wisdom or cultivate a certain kind of skill set, or a certain kind of understanding about their world, if all it is is just about that, then I don't know that I need to know them all that well. But that is a deeply unsatisfying teaching relationship from my point of

view. So, if what I want to do is cultivate lifelong learning, if what I want to do is cultivate a lifelong connection with the amazing work that we do here...if that's what I'm going for, which I am, then yeah all of a sudden it becomes incredibly important that they know who I am, that they have that kind of anchor...

Not only does Dr. Simons want to know her students as people to meet her pedagogical goals, but it's also important to her that her students know her, too, at least enough to feel comfortable reaching out to her. Notably, neither Dr. Peters nor Dr. Simons describes "knowing students as people" as simply fun for fun's sake. While "knowing students as people" can be fun, and yield more rewarding relationships than knowing the bare minimum about one's students, the "knowing" each professor described still serves a purpose for the teaching/learning relationship. Dr. Peters told me, "I do think it's important to know your students because that impacts their learning one hundred percent." Here again, the students' learning is the ultimate goal.

Building Productive Boundaries:

As became clear to me when I asked professors how important "knowing students" is to their teaching, part of "knowing" between professors and students depends on how much students want to be known. While sometimes that means professors have students succeed in their classes without knowing them particularly well, it can also mean that some students seek more familiarity with professors than the professors in this study were comfortable with. To keep "knowing" within the appropriate roles for teachers and students, the professors build productive boundaries to protect both themselves and their students. I said earlier that the professors in this study expressed that any "knowing" between themselves and a student has to serve a pedagogical purpose to be appropriate. While each professor expressed that idea in one way or

another, it originally emerged from my first interview with Dr. Turner. When I pushed him to define “know” in terms of knowing his students, he mentioned it has to do with where he “puts his boundary”:

So there’s the boundary. Like everything, I do my best, but this sometimes breaks down and then that’s when I’m at my worst. But everything I’m doing with or for a student has a pedagogical purpose. Even if we’re drinking coffee and looking out the window, and they’re telling me about their other classes. That has to be pedagogical for me or I’m breaking my own boundary, and to what end? If I can’t answer that, I’m wrong.

For “knowing” to feel purposeful, appropriate, and just “right” between professors and students, the professor must have a pedagogical reason for the degree of “knowing” they allow. The professors in this study determine the degrees of “knowing” through building productive boundaries. These boundaries help the professors avoid forming “friendships,” set clear guidelines for interaction through email and Canvas messenger, and protect both students and professors from potentially harmful interactions or relationships.

Like Dr. Allen, who firmly tells her undergraduate students not to friend her on Facebook because she is “not their friend,” Dr. Williams also said she doesn’t socialize with students:

I don’t want to ever convey a sense of partiality where a student might say, ‘well she’s going to treat this student differently because they went to a movie together, or they went out for a cup of tea together.’ Along the same line, I want to be able to preserve my professionalism... I really can’t give a student as candid of a response because she’s become a friend, or he’s become a friend, and so on. So I feel I owe it to the student to give them my best professional response to their

work, and I don't want anything to interfere with that. And also, I think that for some students it could create a sense of discomfort and they might not feel free. It could be perfectly innocent to say 'Would you like to meet for a cup of tea?' But it could leave them feeling like they don't have the option of saying no, and it could create discomfort.

Obviously professors work to build and maintain boundaries during face to face interactions with students, but I was also curious about the professors' potential boundaries for communicating with students through technology. I asked the professors to what extent technology, particularly email and Canvas, affects their communication with students, and if the professors have any boundaries in place for when they check and answer emails. The consensus seemed to be that most of the professors would like to have firmer boundaries than they actually do. In our first interview, Dr. Turner told me he tries to get off screens by 6 p.m., and stay away from all screens on Saturdays. When I observed his class, Dr. Turner told his students "Do use me. I wanna be super available to you." He told them he stops checking email at about 7:30 p.m. It could be that Dr. Turner loosened his time boundary on email between fall and winter quarter, or it's possible that he is willing to respond to emails later in the day from students in upper division classes. Dr. Williams, Dr. Simons, Dr. Neal, Dr. Allen and Dr. Lock all told me that students can email them at any time of day or night, but they make students aware that they will not always respond immediately. Dr. Lock told me he wishes he had firmer boundaries, but "there's always this voice tickling at the back of my head that says 'you might have an email' so no, I try not to. I don't respond to students anymore after 9 o'clock at night unless it's really really necessary, more because I do kind of want to put some limits... Sometimes I want students to know less about my personal habits than that might reveal."

Dr. Peters said that she is “super available” to students, especially when a major assignment deadline is approaching. She told me she tries to be available over email all weekend, and will read and respond to drafts if students choose to send them. She added that:

When there’s not an assignment due I may set some boundaries for myself just to have down time so that when I do come back on Monday I can be present and energized and available again. So I struggle a little bit with having those boundaries because usually I don’t have any. But that’s not good for personal health in the long term either. It’s nice when you know that your job is not on for a period of time.

The only professor who told me that she doesn’t respond to students’ emails on the weekend was Dr. Boone, and her reason for doing so was in line with Dr. Peters’ mention of personal health and reenergizing. I asked Dr. Boone what logging off for the weekend gives her.

Oh boy it gives me so much. I’m able to do my own writing, you know which is critical for me. I’m able to just kind of let down. I do volunteer work... you know just being a person right? Because if I don’t do that, then I start feeling overly stressed during the week, and that can be hard on the relationship between me and students. I’m feeling beleaguered, and I’m probably not being my best self. So yeah, I think it’s important to have a life separate from work, any kind of work.

In considering the purposes for the boundaries professors build between themselves and their students, and if those boundaries are indeed productive, it seems that professors can’t always keep boundaries that would protect their own well-being. Rather, the boundaries the professors in this study discussed are mainly in place to protect students, and keep pedagogy purposeful.

Asking to Be Called By Title:

One particular boundary some professors in this study were not willing to cross with their students is having students call them by their first name. Dr. Allen told me she requires all her undergraduate students to address her as Professor Allen, though she prefers for graduate students to call her Amy. She said she's happy to go by "Professor" with her undergrads for many reasons:

One of them is that students would call me Mrs. Allen which really made me angry, as a feminist. It became tied to ideas about heteronormativity for them and I don't even think they realized it. Also, when I started teaching, I was really young... I had my first class when I was like 21 or 22 and the students were 18, and I felt like they didn't see me as a teacher. And then, being a female teacher, I still feel like I'm not treated with the same level of respect that I see male colleagues get, so all of that led to wanting to be called Professor. It works for me.

I like it.

While Dr. Allen has used her title for her entire teaching career, Dr. Simons told me it was just in the last few years that she started to care if her undergraduate students called her "Dr. S" or by her first name. She pinpointed her change in attitude to one student's email:

I had a student email me and say 'Hey J!' Just my first initial. And it just, something in me just snapped. Like no, you get to call me Dr. Simons thank you very much. It just bothered me. Maybe I had been reading too much about the disrespect that women get in the academy. Maybe there was just a part of me that was like 'I'm done with this.' So yeah, it's only just recently started to matter to me, so what I've been telling students, undergrad students in particular, where I

feel like I really want them to treat the classroom environment with some respect, treat each other with respect, please treat me with respect. I've been asking them to call me Dr. But this is brand new. A little bit too much informality, and I just got done. So, and when I sign off in my emails to them it's Dr. S... Maybe it's because I'm getting older. I was just done, like something snapped in my head. 'No, you don't get to call me that.' So there's been a change, and I'm mostly okay with it. I applied for full professor this year It's probably a whole bunch of things, 'I'm a grown up. Treat me like a grown up, I deserve this.' I don't think I could have said that five years ago or ten years ago.

For Dr. Allen and Dr. Simons, asking undergraduate students to call them "Professor" or "Dr." is a way of creating distinction between themselves and the students: the playing field is not "level." This boundary is productive in that it serves each professors' pedagogy by allowing for authority and respect, two concepts evidently tougher to maintain for female professors than for male professors, even within this study's small sample size.

Findings: Building Class Rapport

Table 4: Categories and Codes

Determining the Degrees of Knowing	Building Class Rapport	Maintaining Class Rapport	Leveling the Playing Field
Collecting Student Information	Valuing Knowing Students' Names	Checking In	Allowing a First Name Basis
Distinguishing Roles as Professors	Getting Students to Know Each Other and Work Together	Laughing with Students	Getting Student Voices into the Classroom
Knowing Students as Students	Sharing Personal Stories	Running Jokes	Valuing Student Input
Knowing Students as People	Getting Laughs	Teasing Students	Breaking Classroom Spatial Boundaries
Building Productive Boundaries			Sharing Own Working Practices
Asking to Be Called by Title			

I've learned from this study that it's impossible to ask professors about "knowing" without rapport entering the conversation. I define rapport as the nature of the back and forth exchange between a professor and an individual student, or a professor and an entire class. We typically think of having a rapport as positive, and the absence of rapport as negative. Anyone who has been a teacher or a student has felt the "vibe" or "mood" of particular classes, and noticed that some classes' "vibes" are certainly better than others. I really began to see the idea of rapport between professors and their classes when I observed professors teaching. I then asked several rapport related questions in the second round of interviews, and found that how professors build and maintain rapport depends on the professor's teaching persona, the size and

type of the class, and students' level of interest in the subject matter. Originally, I had "Building and Maintaining Class Rapport" as a single category, but soon realized "Building" and "Maintaining" contained enough codes that they could hold their own as separate categories. These categories are also related to "Leveling the Playing Field," which I will delve into later. Importantly, professors do not build a "good rapport" with their classes on the first day, and then proceed through the quarter swimmingly with nothing but "good vibes." Rather, professors must first build rapport with their classes, then vigilantly maintain that rapport for the next ten weeks, making adjustments as needed.

Notably, my findings on how professors build and maintain rapport are related only to in-person classes, not online classes. The professors in this department have repeatedly rejected the addition of online classes to the department's course offerings because of the distance online classes necessitate between professors and students. For the professors in this study, it seems face to face interaction is important to rapport and "knowing." I would imagine every teacher has their own strategies for how they build rapport with their classes, but I found the professors in this study employed four main rapport building moves: valuing knowing students' names, getting students to know each other and work together, sharing personal stories, and getting laughs.

Valuing Knowing Students' Names:

I'm tempted to say it's obvious that professors value knowing their students' names, but it's important to qualify that this seems obvious only based on my experiences with this department and the English departments where I did my undergraduate study. In my undergraduate experience, all of my English professors knew my name, and plenty of my other

professors did not. Of course, in my Biology 101 or Math 121 classes, I was one of about 80 students, whereas my English classes were never bigger than 25 or 30 students. In this department though, professors work to learn the names of their students even in 75 student classes, which are the largest English classes at our university.

Dr. Simons and Dr. Allen both occasionally teach classes of 75 students. They acknowledged the difficulty of learning 75 names, but that it is possible. In the second round of interviews, I asked professors about what they do to establish a rapport with a class. Dr. Simons said “the first thing I try is to learn their names in the first week, and that’s brutal for the large classes. I can’t do it [in the first week] for the large classes, but for the smaller ones I can.” She said even though she might not form the same “deep relationships” with every student in a class of 75 as she would with a class of 20, she still learns all their names. As I mentioned in my discussion of “Collecting Student Information,” Dr. Allen collects details from her students to help her associate names to faces, and like Dr. Simons, will learn all her students’ names even when there are 75 names to learn.

Dr. Turner told me that currently he doesn’t teach any class bigger than about 30 students, which he called “a humongous privilege.” He said that teaching smaller classes gives him the opportunity every quarter to know each of his students by name. When I observed Dr. Turner’s first day with a writing studies class, he told the students “Names are important to me. I should have them pretty much down by the end of today.” As I mentioned earlier, at the start of the class Dr. Turner had each student say their name, where they’re from, and why they’re taking the class. Later in the class session while students were working in groups, Dr. Turner walked around the room and checked each student’s name, so he could confirm he had them down.

I also observed Dr. Neal's first day of winter quarter with her "major author" literature class. After taking roll, she told the students "So I already know most of you, and with a class this size I should be able to get your names pretty quickly." When I asked Dr. Neal about what building rapport means to her, she told me:

I establish a way of communicating, a way of dialoguing in the classroom. It means facilitating a sort of atmosphere of open-mindedness and respect, so I like to establish a rapport where students feel comfortable around me, where they feel that I'm not a threatening person. I don't think that they do [think I'm threatening], but in all of my classes it's important that students feel safe, and they feel like this is a learning environment and not a judgmental space. And how I do that is just by things as simple as remembering their names.

For the professors in this study, knowing students' names seems to be valuable because it not only allows them to begin to recognize their students as individuals, but it also demonstrates to students that the professors care about them and respect them as members of the classroom community.

Getting Students to Know Each Other and Work Together:

Alongside learning students' names early in the quarter, it also seems important to the professors in this study that students get to know each other. In the first round of interviews, I asked professors to tell me about what they typically do on the first day of class. Dr. Lock told me that especially in lower division classes, he will "emphasize something that gets them to know each other and talking to each other on the first day." He said he's teaching a class that requires students to have some basic historical knowledge, so his "favorite thing he did this year"

for a first day activity was giving the class a list of 20 events, then asking the students to work together to get the timeline in the right order: “So they all had to talk to each other, work collaboratively and share their knowledge, which is something I try to do in all of my classes. And it worked really well. They were all talking to each other and the room was buzzing. I really like that ‘room is buzzing’ feeling.”

Like Dr. Neal’s first day activity where students introduced each other to the class, Dr. Peters told me she’s done activities with her classes where she asks students to talk to each other, then present their partner to the class and tell “what they found interesting about that individual.” She added that from studying student success and freshmen retention rates on the First Year Experience Committee “It’s actually making friends on campus that is the number one factor in whether students stay at [this university] their first year, or end up dropping out or moving to another school. So just that importance of connections, students feeling like they have a friend in class, it’s huge. It’s really huge.” Although Dr. Peters was referring to freshmen in particular, encouraging students to make connections or friends in class seemed to be important to each professor in this study.

I was able to observe Dr. Simons, Dr. Lock, Dr. Turner, Dr. Boone, Dr. Neal and Dr. Allen, and they all asked students to collaborate in groups or work as partners at some point during class. The first time I observed Dr. Simons, she passed around a worksheet and told students they could work together if they liked. I noticed that Dr. Turner specifically used the word “friends” when asking students to form groups: “Find two friends, people next to you.” In Dr. Lock’s class, the students came in with partially completed essays for peer review. Dr. Lock reminded the class that the fundamental rule of peer review is to “be nice, but not too nice. Give solid sound advice. You can with the sense of respect we’ve been building all quarter.” He asked

students to arrange the desks into two U shapes, one inside, one outside. The students faced each other in pairs for four minutes to review specific sections of each other's papers, then students in the outer U would move one desk to their right. Rather than keeping time with a stop watch or timer, Dr. Lock had made a playlist of songs all four minutes long, which the students seemed to appreciate. Dr. Boone gave her class several writing prompts, then asked students to partner up to share what they had written. Dr. Allen told me the day I observed her class was an "atypical class" because the students were giving presentations they had prepared in groups. Although these activities are all different, they demonstrate that part of class rapport rests on how professors encourage students to get to know each other and work collaboratively. Rapport can, of course, exist between a professor and a single student, but rapport for an entire class seems to rely on rapport between students as well as rapport between students and the professor.

Sharing Personal Stories:

If rapport between professors and their students relies on a "back and forth," then it makes sense that professors have to give something in order to get something back from their students. I observed that professors will sometimes share personal stories with their classes as a way of relating to students, or to illustrate a particular concept or theory the class is examining. Importantly though, professors maintain boundaries on how much and what they share with their students just as vigilantly as they determine the degrees to which they get to know students.

The first time I observed Dr. Neal, she told her students at the start of class "So my son wanted you to know he really likes this class. I was taking him to school and he asked if I was teaching the first class again, the one where I kept saying 'um.'" She and the students laughed, and a student asked how her son's Halloween costume went over. Dr. Neal told them he was a

box, but no one really knew what he was supposed to be. She said her son ended up being really sarcastic when people would ask what he was, and would tell people he was an apple. Dr. Neal said the box was kind of hard to walk in so he didn't get all that much candy, but that he's at an age where he'd rather give out candy than get it.

A student said "I didn't think there was an age for that," and Dr. Neal and the class laughed.

Dr Neal said, "I didn't either."

Obviously, her son's Halloween costume wasn't related to what they were dealing with in class that day, but the interaction did seem to serve a pedagogical purpose. As I observed Dr. Neal telling this story, the students were listening to her, and laughing with her. The "vibe" in the room was open, comfortable, and personable. By sharing this personal story, Dr. Neal was inviting her students to see her, even if only for a few minutes, as something other than just their teacher. Sharing a quick personal story reminds her students that she is a whole person, not just a professor.

In our second interview, I brought up the Halloween costume story, and asked Dr. Neal to tell me more about how she uses personal stories in her classes:

I do all the time. I often will use personal (but not too personal) anecdotes. The one example I can think of, and this is going way back, but when my son was an infant I happened to be teaching Lacan's mirror stage. So I used my son as an example of holding him up in the mirror. I use a lot of parenting experiences to talk about ideas in a class, so I will draw on my experience as a parent. But that's the extent of it. I don't really talk about my marriage, or other relationships. But now it's my dog, I talk a lot about my dog. I'll use examples, I do that a lot

actually. Sometimes I worry that I might do it too much, but no one's complained so far.

Dr. Neal is not the only professor who “worries” about potentially sharing too much with students. When I asked Dr. Allen about sharing personal stories with students she told me she does, but “very sparingly”:

I laugh and talk loudly with them, but I try not to share very much about my personal life. I've always felt like I shouldn't. But then occasionally something comes up, and it just seems so relevant, and I will bring it up, and then I always feel bad later. But, then students will say ‘Oh when you gave the example of when your book was published and this happened, and that helped me.’ Students seem to love those moments. So I don't know. I'm very uncomfortable with it, and I don't know if I should do it, and I don't know if it's bad teaching or bad teaching not to.

When I observed Dr. Turner's first day of class, after the students had introduced themselves, Dr. Turner told the students a little about himself. He said he only passed high school English because he begged his teacher, who was really nice and let him through. He said he was “the first in my family to even say college, let alone go,” and told students where he did his undergraduate and graduate study. He concluded by saying “That's me, academically at least. You'll probably learn more, unfortunately.” I interviewed him a second time after this observation, and asked him to say more about what he meant by saying “unfortunately.” To my surprise, he didn't remember having said that, but he wasn't surprised he had. I asked him if he shares personal stories with his classes, and he told me he will “fabricate” stories that he has actually gone through, but will make them about someone else:

I don't want tell a story about me right now, because that's not useful. I want to tell a story that you can place yourself in. That's what it is. I have a teaching persona that I'm very aware of, and it's high energy, lots of movement, and so I'm already drawing people to me. If my story is also drawing you to me, I don't know that we're actually engaging the content.

It seems, then, that sharing personal stories is most purposeful for some professors when it allows students to engage more deeply with the content at hand, rather than engaging with the professor. Dr. Lock told me that he will occasionally "talk about something that happened to me in graduate school. 'I was really struggling trying to figure this out... I spent six hours trying to read the first three paragraphs of Kant's essay on the sublime and I finally gave up and it was super embarrassing.' Kind of to put students at ease sometimes." Funnily enough, Dr. Lock had shared that anecdote with a class I took from him, and it absolutely did make me feel like less of an idiot when I took what felt like was years to wrap my head around Edmund Burke's *A Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*.

The first time I observed Dr. Simons' class, she stopped to check in with me while the students were working on an assignment. She told me that the work itself is the same for them as it is for her. She elaborated on that comment in our second interview, when I asked her about sharing personal stories with her students:

There are two patterns I can think of for the kinds of things I share with [students]. The first one is like with you, talking about how the work that I do is very similar to the kinds of things that they do in the classroom. It's about the work, how and why the work matters. The other pattern that I'll note too is that I really do try to connect the things they do in class with the things they do outside

of class. I'll share with them stories of other work experiences that I've had that had nothing to do with working in a university context, and how I could not have done those jobs if I hadn't had the training I had as an English major. And so I think they tend to be more oriented toward what the subject of the class is about. I don't tend to like talk about my pets or my kids.

From the data I've gathered, it seems that the question is not whether professors do or don't share personal stories with students, but to what end. Depending on the professor's chosen classroom persona, personal stories can serve to build rapport by humanizing the professor, putting students at ease, or demonstrating how concepts from the class can transfer to the students' lives outside of school.

Getting Laughs:

It's apparent from Table 4 that I found several codes related to humor in the classroom, but I found professors "getting laughs" from students to be directly related to building class rapport. In observing professors, I saw that they would often intentionally make jokes and "get laughs" from their classes. When I observed Dr. Lock, he and his students were discussing a particular passage from an autobiography in which one character is trying to convince another to cooperate. Dr. Lock said "I love the picture of him putting his arm around him and saying 'come on, don't be a dick.'" The whole class laughed, including me (despite my efforts to be a non-participatory observer). Later on in the class, Dr. Lock asked a student if her hand was up, but it wasn't. She was just stretching. The same thing happened again with another student, and Dr. Lock said "I'm not really that eager." The class laughed again.

I watched Dr. Allen's class giving group presentations, and one of the groups was focused on a topic within U.S. History. To announce their group, Dr. Allen said "Okay, U.S. history is taking over, as it does during Thanksgiving." The whole class, including me, laughed. On the first day of class with her "major author" class, Dr. Neal told the students the last time she had taught the class they read about 1,000 pages. She said, "So I'll wait if anyone wants to leave," and the class laughed (and no one did get up to leave). In Dr. Boone's class, she and the students were discussing a creative non-fiction essay, and Dr. Boone commented on how she would have edited it "If [the writer] had asked me, which she didn't," and the class laughed. As I've written out these "jokes," it's obvious that they aren't all that funny isolated on the page. Importantly, professors are able to "get laughs" from students because the professors are building a rapport between themselves and students that allows for laughter, comfort, and fun in the classroom. Dr. Turner told me "I like to have an informality because I am completely convinced that if you're having fun you're actually learning. That's the whole dopamine research, and I buy it. So I try to laugh with them, whatever that takes, on the first day."

Findings: Maintaining Class Rapport

Table 5: Categories and Codes

Determining the Degrees of Knowing	Building Class Rapport	Maintaining Class Rapport	Leveling the Playing Field
Collecting Student Information	Valuing Knowing Students' Names	Checking In	Allowing a First Name Basis
Distinguishing Roles as Professors	Getting Students to Know Each Other and Work Together	Laughing with Students	Getting Student Voices into the Classroom
Knowing Students as Students	Sharing Personal Stories	Running Jokes	Valuing Student Input
Knowing Students as People	Getting Laughs	Teasing Students	Breaking Classroom Spatial Boundaries
Building Productive Boundaries			Sharing Own Working Practices
Asking to Be Called by Title			

Building a rapport with a class is like planting a seed. It takes knowledge and some care to do it so the seed will sprout and grow, but it's only the beginning of a longer, continually involved process. Maintaining a rapport with a class once the rapport is built or "planted" is like tending a (possibly temperamental) plant. Maintaining rapport with a class requires professors to pay close attention, and make adjustments depending on what the class needs. As I said earlier, how professors build and maintain rapport depends on the professor's class persona, the size and type of the class, and the students' interest in the subject matter and level of excitement to be in the class. To maintain a rapport with a class, professors in this study continually "check in" with their students. Checking in can be about academic performance, happiness with the class, or personal well-being. Allowing for humor in the classroom seems essential to maintaining rapport

as well. Professors “get laughs” from students as a way of building rapport, but will maintain rapport through laughing with their students, keeping running jokes running, and sometimes playfully teasing students. Again, the difference in each professor’s teaching persona affects how she or he employs these varying rapport-maintaining strategies, but nevertheless these four moves seem to be integral to how professors in this department maintain the rapport with their classes they work so hard to build.

Checking In:

In the plethora of articles on Google under “how to get to know your students,” many list “checking in with students” as an effective method. I pointed out earlier that when I check in with students at the start of class, I don’t necessarily “get to know” my students on any personal level, but checking in does seem to accomplish something in terms of maintaining rapport. Dr. Neal told me that she likes to start every class with asking her students how they’re doing: “I used to not do it, but I like to do it in the very beginning [of class] just to let my students know ‘Hey, you know I actually value your well-being, so how are you?’” By creating space for students to speak at the start of class, and acknowledging that she genuinely cares how they’re doing, Dr. Neal’s “check in” maintains rapport with her classes because it allows for a continuous back and forth between her students and her. She told me that class size does affect checking in, though. She said she still does check in when she has a class of 75, rather than 30, “but that does affect the extent to which I can just let down my guard a little bit and have a tangent about our weekend. I feel like in those smaller classes there’s just more space for that for some reason.”

Checking in with students at the start of each class is one way of maintaining, and monitoring rapport. While these check-ins can often allow for brief tangents about students' weekends or funny anecdotes, checking in throughout the quarter can also help professors spot when the rapport between them and their students is going south. Dr. Lock told me about a senior seminar he taught where his expectations for the students weren't matching up with their abilities (or perhaps their willingness to try something difficult):

I assigned a couple of Shakespeare plays and it was as though I had told them that holding burning irons to their faces was part of the class requirement. They were just not prepared to read Shakespeare. Without having someone walk them through every nuance of every little bit of every page they just couldn't get it. They didn't know how to begin. They would read Sparknotes. So that sort of threw off the dynamic in that class a lot I think. Some of the students were fine, but it really highlighted differences between students who had a certain kind of preparation and students who didn't. I'm aware of other kinds of differences, class differences and differences in learning styles, and it threw that into relief in a way I wasn't happy with and I wasn't expecting. So I felt like the mood in that class never completely recovered the first month we were working on Shakespeare. Lots of people were feeling really bad and didn't want to say anything about it, and it's like 'ughhhh.' It all worked out okay in the end, but it definitely had an effect on the class.

Though it's not exactly fun in the way of hearing about students' plans for an upcoming break, checking in with students by monitoring their well-being as it relates to the course material is an important factor in maintaining rapport with a class. Dr. Lock didn't abandon the Shakespeare

plays, but he did adjust his expectations for his students' Shakespeare comprehension. By acknowledging his students' struggles with Shakespeare, rather than simply staying frustrated with their Sparknote-ing, Dr. Lock demonstrated to his students that he cares when they're struggling. That acknowledgment alone might not have made Shakespeare easier to read, but it does help students see that professors care when they're struggling, and professors don't want challenging curriculum to strain the class rapport.

Laughing with Students and Running Jokes:

I observed six professors, eight class sessions, and seven different classes. Of all the many patterns I noticed, laughter jumped out at me as I was coding. I've "gotten to know" the professors in this study, and have found they all have very different personalities, and teach different topics in different styles. Regardless of those differences, laughter from the professors and the students filled the room in every class I observed. The two professors I didn't observe, Dr. Peters and Dr. Williams, I've had as professors, and know that we laughed together in class most every day. Why are laughter and jokes so seemingly integral to rapport between professors and students? And what might laughter mean for "knowing" and availability?

In our second interview, I mentioned to Dr. Simons that she and the students laughed together both times I observed her teaching. She told me, "I think it makes a difference to be willing to have a sense of humor. If we can laugh together that's a really good first step. If we can get the class to laugh together, especially early in the quarter, it can just be a tension reliever, right? Even if it's a small moment I think those small moments matter." Evidently, laughter in the classroom serves a pedagogical purpose. Room for humor helps decrease tension for both the professor and the students, which means the rapport between them can be relaxed.

In observing Dr. Lock with his 300 level literature students, an interaction at the beginning of the class caught my attention. A male student told Dr. Lock, “That’s a cool shirt. It looks warmer than your other ones.” Dr. Lock said “Yeah, that’s why I chose it,” and he and the student laughed. This is one of the “small moments” Dr. Simons mentioned. Even though this was only a 15 second interaction, it’s important to note because this moment of laughter demonstrates a rapport, and a degree of “knowing” between Dr. Lock and his student. I saw laughter as a signal of a comfortable, established rapport in Dr. Neal’s and Dr. Allen’s classes as well, through apparent running jokes between the professors and their students. When I observed Dr. Neal’s 300 level literature class about halfway through fall quarter, a male student came in with a cinnamon roll.

Dr. Neal said “There he is with his food again.”

Another student said “Where do you always get these treats?”

Dr. Neal and the students, including the student with the apparently habitual cinnamon roll, laughed. In Dr. Allen’s class, a group of students was attempting to turn on the projector to use for their presentation. A student held up a remote and asked Dr. Allen if it was the right one, and Dr. Allen said “You’re asking me? You know you’ve been mocking me all quarter.” She and the class laughed together. In our first interview, Dr. Allen had told me she sometimes feels uncomfortable with her level of technological skill. However, apparently she and her 200 level students, a class of 75, had a rapport that allowed for them to joke with her, even about something she is self-conscious about. Laughing with students and having running jokes seem to allow professors to maintain rapport with their students. The jokes and laughter are signals of a particular degree of knowing between the professors and their students.

Teasing Students:

In my second interview with Dr. Turner, I asked him about establishing and maintaining rapport with his classes. He told me he gets rapport through teasing, which I saw when I observed his writing class. Although it was the first day, he already knew some of the students from having them in other classes. A male student arrived a couple of minutes late, and Dr. Turner said “Hi people, thanks for letting me start late. [He] was late.” The late student and the others laughed at this, and it was obviously meant good-naturedly. Before the class started, Dr. Turner had said he was going to start late because he expected students to arrive late on the first day. Later, when students were introducing themselves, one student said he’s from Duvall, and the next said he’s from the Tri-Cities. Dr. Turner said “Yeah, I know Tri-Cities, not like Duvall,” and the students laughed.

After Dr. Turner had named “teasing” in our second interview, I realized I had seen other professors tease their students as well, but I hadn’t coded it that way originally. I had conflated teasing with “Getting Laughs.” The two are related, but function slightly differently. During a five-minute break in Dr. Lock’s class, a group of students were chatting about taking a 400 level class with Dr. Lock the following quarter. One of the students said she wasn’t taking that class, and the students said to Dr. Lock “she doesn’t want to be with us.”

The student said “It’s not about you!”

Dr. Lock responded, “Yeah sure, I’ve heard that before,” and he and the class laughed.

On the first Day of Dr. Neal’s major author class, she asked students if they had seen any movies over winter break that she should see. A male student asked her if she meant new movies. Dr. Neal said yes, “I’m not a hipster like you” which got a laugh from the student and the class. Because Dr. Neal knew that student, and many of the others in the class, that moment

of teasing allowed her to maintain the rapport of fun and humor she had established with those students in the past, and begin to build that rapport with the students who were taking a class with her for the first time.

These instances of teasing were all in good fun, but anyone who has been the teaser or the teased knows that there's a fine line between teasing that's funny for both parties and teasing that's potentially hurtful. After telling me he gets rapport with classes through teasing, Dr. Turner qualified that he has become self-conscious of teasing students lately:

I find myself at the end of classes saying 'Hey, I'm super sorry about that teasing, I hope that was okay.' Which I'm doing more and more, and I'm like okay if I'm asking that, why am I teasing? But I have brothers. I liked when teachers teased me. It felt like, okay, this is a space where we can have a little bit of fun. But there's a power dynamic. So when I'm teasing someone, they're not really allowed to tease me back, even though that's exactly what I'm trying to offer.

Earlier in the interview, Dr. Turner had told me that occasionally a student will call him "Turn Turn" in class. I asked how he responds to that level of informality, and he told me with a laugh, but the kind of laugh that implies students are nearing his boundary. I asked if that means it's "Mr. Turn Turn" to them, which made us both laugh. Obviously, Dr. Turner's students aren't going to start calling him "Mr. Turn Turn," but that title does represent the combination of remembering who is "in charge" while still maintaining a fun and playful rapport. Keeping on the right side of boundaries seems to be as important to building and maintaining rapport as it is to determining the degrees of knowing students. To make matters more complicated, there is an idea many students and educators (including Eliza Jane Schaeffer in "Level Footing: The Professor-Student Dynamic" which I mentioned earlier) seem to push as the best way to foster

rapprochement and positive relationships between professors and students: “leveling the playing field.”

According to Schaeffer and others, an ideal professor/student relationship relies on the professor and student being on “level footing.” But considering power dynamics between professors and their students, is “level footing” ever a real possibility?

Findings: Leveling the Playing Field

Table 6: Categories and Codes

Determining the Degrees of Knowing	Building Class Rapport	Maintaining Class Rapport	Leveling the Playing Field
Collecting Student Information	Valuing Knowing Students' Names	Checking In	Breaking Classroom Spatial Boundaries
Distinguishing Roles as Professors	Getting Students to Know Each Other and Work Together	Laughing with Students	Allowing a First Name Basis
Knowing Students as Students	Sharing Personal Stories	Running Jokes	Getting Student Voices into the Classroom
Knowing Students as People	Getting Laughs	Teasing Students	Valuing Student Input
Building Productive Boundaries			Sharing Own Working Practices
Asking to Be Called by Title			

Like “knowing students,” the phrases “level footing” and “leveling the playing field” are phrases educators use and hear all the time when referring to their relationships with students. However, like “knowing students,” what it actually means to get on “level footing” with one’s students or to “level the playing field” isn’t clearly defined. If educators and students are going to talk about “level footing” or “leveling the playing field” in reference to the professor/student relationship, what are they actually talking about?

If you ask Wikipedia the origin of “level playing field,” it will tell you: “In a game played on a playing field, such as rugby, one team would have an unfair advantage if the field had a slope. Since some real-life playing fields do in fact have slopes, it is customary for teams

to swap ends of the playing field at half time. A metaphorical playing field is said to be level if no external interference affects the ability of the players to compete fairly.” If we think of the classroom, or perhaps the university on the whole, as a playing field, the idea of a slope makes some sense. Considering the power dynamic between professors and students, there is a “slope” between them. The metaphor runs into trouble though when we apply it to professors and their students, rather than to two rugby teams. First of all, professors may have an “advantage” in that they are the authority figure in the classroom, but that “advantage” isn’t exactly “unfair” given the inherent and necessary power imbalance of the professor/student relationship. Also, professors and students aren’t (or at least shouldn’t be) competing against each other. An ideal professor/student relationship isn’t about switching sides half way through a term so both the professor and the students have an equal chance at “winning.” It may sound corny, but I’ve gathered from the professors in this study that in an ideal professor/student relationship “everybody wins.” While professors and universities on the whole have systems in place like disability resources and accommodations to offer equitable opportunities to all students, those systems exist so students can succeed as individuals, not “beat” each other or their professors.

Ultimately, the idea of a “level playing field” between professors and students just isn’t possible in practice, because of the power dynamic many of the professors in this study pointed to. The power dynamic between professors and students inhibits absolute “levelness” at any given time. The field is never actually going to be level when one person (the professor) is in a position of authority and the others (the students) are not. Players on opposite teams may need a “level playing field” for a fair game, and players on the same team may be on “level footing,” but a professor and their students aren’t teammates.

While I am arguing that there's no such thing as a truly level playing field for professors and students, that's not to say professors don't make attempts at decreasing the slope, so to speak. However, unlike the idea of keeping a level playing field by switching once at half time, professors allow the slope between themselves and their students to oscillate, adjusting as necessary. Unlike a static field, the professor/student relationship is dynamic. Professors can control the power dynamic, or slope, between them and their students like the up and down of a teeter totter. As long as two kids on a teeter totter each push off from the ground with the same amount of force, they can keep the teeter-totter going up and down smoothly for eternity. But, unless the two kids are the exact same weight, the teeter-totter will never sit perfectly level. If one kid is stronger, and wants to use their strength to control the slant, they can. Even though the professor may be the "stronger kid" compared to students in the teeter-totter scenario, the professors in this study don't use their authority as a means to keep absolute control over the "up and down" of their classes. Instead, they empower their students by letting them come to play, and have some control over the movement of the class. So, even though the "field" will never be absolutely level, professors do allow the slant to oscillate. Professors also allow the distance between themselves and students to decrease at times, to be on more, if never completely, "level footing." If the seats on a teeter totter are far apart, the slope will be steeper. If the seats are close together, or even touching, there's no slope at all. The idea of a teeter totter demonstrates that the relationship between professors and their students includes both horizontal distance, like that of degrees of knowing and intimacy, and vertical distance, like that of hierarchical power.

Importantly, leveling the playing field can feel insincere to students when the teacher attempts to come down to the students' level. It's pandering for the professor to hop off the teeter totter and come sit beside the student, who is now stuck on the ground. Professors realize that

they are in the power position (the stronger, heavier kid on the teeter totter), but the professors in this study also demonstrated that their job or goal is to empower their students. The idea of leveling the playing field, or getting on “level footing,” can be pedagogically successful when the leveling is about raising students up, rather than coming down to them. When professors allow their students some control over the slant between them, they empower students not just by lifting them up, but also by demonstrating that students can lift themselves up. The codes in this category are all methods professors demonstrated of “leveling the playing field” by empowering their students. These leveling methods are genuine when there is power-sharing in the classroom. Notably, each of these methods is rhetorical and particular. Professors must be aware of who is on the other end of their teeter totter to decide how much the distance can shrink, and how much power the students should have. Thus, again it becomes important to pedagogy that professors know their students.

Breaking Classroom Spatial Boundaries:

When I think of Michel Foucault’s ideas on panopticism, it’s in relation to how traditional classrooms are set up. Rows of students, seated in desks, face the board. The teacher occupies a sacred and isolated space at the front of the room, where no student dares to tread. I asked the professors to tell me about the classrooms they remember from their college years, and this traditional model is mostly what they described. Desks were often bolted to the floor, and professors typically stood at the front of the room for the duration of class. The playing field can seem a nebulous, somewhat metaphorical space. But, when we consider the actual classrooms where students and professors meet, the playing field becomes a physical, actualized setting. When there is a “teacher space” and “student space” dividing the classroom, the field is certainly

not level. The professors in this study intentionally break those spatial boundaries in the classroom as a way of engaging more directly with their students. In doing so, professors reduce the horizontal, intimate space and vertical, hierarchal space between themselves and their students.

One of the simplest boundary breaking moves for professors is to sit down beside students, rather than stand and deliver from the front of the room. Every professor I observed taught at least part of their class from the front of the classroom, as they either needed to use the projector or the whiteboard. But, each professor also moved around the room. Dr. Boone and Dr. Neal had students move their desks into a circle for discussion, then joined students at desks in the circles. During Dr. Allen's class, students were giving group presentations, and Dr. Allen chose a desk at the very back of the classroom surrounded by her students. I noticed Dr. Turner and Dr. Lock both sat on or leaned against tables near the front of their classrooms rather than remaining standing. Though Dr. Simons didn't sit down with her students either time I observed her, the first time she did walk around and stand next to or crouch down next to students to offer help as they worked independently. I don't mean to suggest that if a professor stands for an entire class they are invoking some kind of power move; for example, Dr. Simons told me she typically stands when she teaches because she just has "nervous energy" in the classroom. What I am suggesting is that when students see a professor sit down beside them, rather than stand in front of them, the dynamic of their relationship and the playing field can shift, even if only for the duration of a class discussion. As Dr. Neal put it "my ideal classroom is the smaller class with the table and we're all sitting around it. I just like the way that facilitates discussion, and it really isn't about just this one person talking to the group, even though sometimes it is."

Allowing a First Name Basis:

In my discussion of how professors determine the degrees of knowing between themselves and students, I pointed out that Dr. Allen and Dr. Simons specifically require undergraduate students to call them either “Professor” or “Dr.” If that strategy seems to be a method of maintaining respect, authority, and putting a boundary on familiarity, what then is the purpose of professors asking students to call them by their first names?

Dr. Turner asks his students, graduate and undergraduate, to call him Max, and has done so since his first day as a teacher. Like he said when I asked him about making jokes on the first day of class, Dr. Turner likes to create a “level of informality” in his classes, and asking students to call him Max instead of “Dr. Turner” is one way to get to there. However, Dr. Turner pointed out his position as a “loud, white, middle-aged man” means he doesn’t have to “worry about his authority going away.” He told me “I don’t have any respect that I often have to earn,” and that his “embodiment is privileged.” Dr. Lock is also a white, middle-aged man, but his approach to titles is slightly less casual than Dr. Turner’s.

Just one step short of asking to be called by one’s first name, Dr. Lock and the majority of the professors in this study go with the “call me whatever you’re comfortable with” method. Dr. Lock told me,

What I usually say is you can address me in whatever way is the most comfortable for you. If you’re comfortable calling me Dan that’s fine; if you use first names that’s okay with me. If you’re more comfortable calling me by a title, call me Professor Lock. That would be my preferred form of address in email. For any given thing I say I figure about two thirds of the students are listening, if I’m lucky. So, usually that results in the students who weren’t listening addressing me

in sort of a random distribution of Professor Lock, Mr. Lock, 'hey Prof,' Daniel, whatever. And then I get a lot of students who call me Dan and are very comfortable with that. Some are clearly not comfortable with that, especially in larger lecture classes.

Like Dr. Lock, Dr. Neal tells her students they can call her either by her first name, Anna, or her title, Professor Neal. Dr. Neal told me about one instance when a student called her Professor Neal and she said "You can just call me Anna." The student then called her "Professor Anna," so clearly students sometimes can't get the formality of titles out of their vernacular. Dr. Boone told me she doesn't specify to her students what she wants them to call her: "If [students] do ask me, I say it's fine to say my first name.... it's more intuitive. I feel like saying Professor Boone or Dr. Boone feels much more formal than I am as a person and in the classroom, so the first name seems more natural. Although, I do still get a little thrill when someone calls me Dr. Boone."

In the second round of interviews, I asked the professors what they had called their professors when they were students. Each professor said they wouldn't have called their undergraduate professors by their first names, unless maybe if they were working with them as a teaching or research assistant. As graduate students, the professors did call at least some of their professors by their first names, which indicates the "field" was more level between graduate students and professors. All of the professors in this study allow or even specifically ask graduate students to call them by their first names. As Dr. Simons put it, graduate students are "more like colleagues." So, allowing undergraduate students to call them by their first names doesn't mean the professors in this study have created a completely level field between themselves and their students. A first name basis is simply one way of decreasing the distance between themselves and their students. Importantly though, racial and gender privilege, specific experiences in the

classroom, and teaching persona can all factor in to each professor's decision on what to be called.

Table 7: Professors' Preferred Forms of Address from Undergraduate Students

First Name	First Name or Title	Title Only
Dr. Turner	Dr. Lock	Dr. Allen
	Dr. Neal	Dr. Simons
	Dr. Boone	

Getting Student Voices into the Classroom:

In observing these professors' classes, it seemed important to each professor not only that students get a chance to speak, but that the students feel their comments will be valuable to the class. When I asked Dr. Turner about what he does on the first day of class, he told me: "No matter what, their voices first. They have to say their name and tell me something simple... so that is always really important." Although all the professors in this study do some lecturing (or direct teaching, to use a less loaded word), none of them run their classes with lecture as their primary pedagogy. In the first round of interviews, I asked professors if they have a favorite class to teach, and what can make a class have that "favorite" feeling. Dr. Lock told me his favorite classes depend on the students and how the "group gels":

There's a kind of chemistry in the room, and [the students] are all willing to play with ideas and not only listen respectfully to me (which all students will do if I make them), but are willing to engage in some back and forth. Not in a forced way, like 'I require class participation so you have to say something,' but they seem genuinely interested and enthused about the material. At least there's a

critical mass of students in the class who can kind of get to that point and will talk to each other.

For Dr. Lock then, getting student voices into the room means that students are engaging with him, each other, and the content of the course. Obviously it's nice for professors when students listen during lecture, but that doesn't seem to be the marker of a "favorite class." Rather, it's equally or even more important that the students have something to say, and get the chance to say it. A class "gels" when the playing field is level enough that students feel empowered to actively participate and voice their ideas. There can be no "gelling" if the professor holds all of the power, all of the time.

To that end, Dr. Simons told me she sets up her classes so that students will come in with questions to drive the conversation:

Every day an hour before class, a certain subset of the students post what their questions are about the text. I want to have class discussion get driven as much by their curiosity as possible. Nine times out of ten, the things they ask about are things I would have wanted to talk about anyway, but it's really satisfying to know where the confluence is between what they care about and what I care about. It helps to confirm for me that I'm on the right track, that I'm meeting them where they are. And with that tenth question, that one from left field, I'm like 'Huh, yeah, why is that?' They always throw surprises at me, and sometimes it can be the basis for some really exciting conversations.

The playing field is not completely level between Dr. Simons and her students, because she has the power to require this system in the first place. However, requiring students to drive the conversation with their own questions is a way Dr. Simons shares power with her students. She

sets up the system, but the students have the power to feed their own knowledge into it. I observed Dr. Simons' 400 level literature course twice, and saw this approach in practice. The second time I observed, Dr. Simons began the class by saying "I really appreciated the posts you all submitted." She then asked a few students to share what they had written in their posts, which began a back and forth dialogue between herself the students. Later in the class, Dr. Simons was elaborating on a particular story the class had read. She stopped herself and said, "Okay, that's me doing a lot of talking, so I'm going to stop." That got a laugh from students; However, it's also indicative of the emphasis Dr. Simons' puts on student voices in her literature courses. Dr. Simons is not sitting at the top of the teeter totter, talking down to students for the entire class. Rather, she lets them have some control of the "up and down" of the class, thus empowering them to come prepared to discuss what they're really interested in. Dr. Simons recognizes her students not just as learners, but as knowledge holders with the power to offer valuable questions and ideas to the class.

When I observed Dr. Boone's 400 level creative writing class, Dr. Boone kept student voices coming into the room by calling on students by name. The class was discussing an essay they had all read, and Dr. Boone called on many of the students, especially those who hadn't already volunteered their thoughts. She asked "what were you looking at?" and "was there anything in particular you were looking for?" These types of questions indicate that rather than quizzing her students for particular answers she hoped to hear, Dr. Boone was facilitating discussion by encouraging students to share what had genuinely caught their interests. Of course, if students offer completely off the wall comments or steer the discussion too far afield, professors can and will intervene to steer the discussion back to a productive thread. Allowing students' observations to drive the discussion (even when the professors called on the students

to share their ideas) doesn't put the professor and their students on perfectly level footing, but it is a form of power-sharing. Like Dr. Simons, Dr. Boone has the power to put a system in place to facilitate discussion, but empowers her students to bring their knowledge to that system and make it work.

Valuing Student Input:

Professors often seem to level the playing field between themselves and students by simply listening to students and valuing their input. It might seem like listening to others is simply the mark of a decent human being; however, when there's an inescapable power dynamic, it's not so cut and dry. When one person holds the power in a relationship, that person isn't necessarily required to value or even receive input from the other party. However, professors can level the playing field between themselves and their students by listening to them, and genuinely valuing their input. Feeling that their input matters empowers students to be active participants in their classes, rather than powerless bystanders. Sometimes, valuing student input takes the shape of encouraging students to speak during class and allowing students to drive class discussions. Other times, it means hearing students' concerns, ideas, and feedback on courses. Obviously, there are course evaluations at the end of each quarter as required by the university, where students can offer praise, lament their frustrations, or make suggestions for how professors might improve their courses. Those required evaluations aside, professors in this study appeared to value student input throughout the quarter, not just when the course was finished. Dr. Peters said for her, knowing students is rooted in being available to listen to them:

For me [knowing students] means creating a comfortable situation where students will talk to me and I can listen. That's the biggest thing, really hearing what

they're telling me, and not being so headstrong with what I think our class is doing and what we're doing with our time that I don't understand their experience of our shared time together. So for me, knowing students means listening to them.

As I mentioned earlier, professors' methods for leveling the playing field can't work if the professors don't know their students. Simple as it seems, just listening to students seems to have major impacts on the teacher/student relationship. The playing field in Dr. Peters' classes comes a little closer to level because she actively listens to how her students are experiencing their class together, rather than gauging the class dynamic or rapport based solely on her own experience. That's not to say professors often don't listen to their students, and hold tyrant levels of power in their classrooms (and I certainly did not see any instances of that in this study). I would argue though that given the "advantage" professors have, it is an active leveling move to let students know that their input is valuable, and that they are heard. If students believe their professors value their input, then the power is being shared between professor and students, and the field is on less of a slope.

In the second round of interviews, I asked the professors if they could come up with a metaphor for their ideal teacher/student relationship. Perhaps stereotypically if not unsurprisingly, the creative writing professors had a much easier time with this question than the literature and writing studies professors. When I asked creative writing professor Dr. Boone if she had a metaphor, she immediately said, "Well, I have this bowl." She reached across her office and grabbed said bowl, which is the shape of a pair of cupped hands:

It's a safe place, and I want my relationship [with students] to feel like that. It's an open space that both of us can bring things to, but we have a container for it. It's not just free form. So we have the container of the office hours, and the sessions

that they have with me, and the classroom. All of these things kind of create this container, and we both contribute to it. So it's my responsibility to bring the container, create it, and then we both contribute to it.

Similarly, Dr. Neal's metaphor for an ideal teacher/student relationship relied on some give and take between herself and her students. While she didn't have a bowl to hand me, she said her metaphor would be something to do with enlightenment: "I'm like a spark, but then they're the ones who light up. So you need both, but ultimately they have to come to that realization and I'm just there to kind of push it. Or to create space for it." Apparently, an ideal relationship for the professors in this study is not at all captain/crew as in *Dead Poets Society* cheesiness. While none of these professors' students seem about to jump on their desks and declare their allegiance, there is still a hierarchical power dynamic between professors and their students. Importantly though, students have some power, too: they will get to evaluate the course, and those evaluations can affect tenure, raises, or future job prospects (not to mention self-esteem, at least for some of us new, not-yet-toughened teachers).

Taking those "we both need to bring something to the relationship" metaphors and demonstrating how they show up in the non-metaphorical classroom, Dr. Simons told me that she often asks students for their input on what they want to learn. Plenty of professors structure their curriculum based on what students seem to respond to, but that doesn't mean they are "pandering to their customers." For Dr. Simons, asking students for input on what she might teach is a leveling move. It empowers the students to consider their learning as active participants, rather than passive receptacles for professors to throw knowledge into solely at their discretion. Dr. Simons said she regularly has students in 300 level classes who go on to take 400 level classes from her, so she can ask for their input on curriculum:

Usually for [400 level courses] I find out from my [300 level] students what they want to know more about. Then I'm like 'okay, let's go deeper,' because I like to be able to teach courses that they're interested in taking. One of the classes that I regularly teach is the capstone course for the literature major... and again topics vary there. I've been doing the same kind of thing for that class that I do for the [other 400 level classes], asking 'what do you all want to learn?'

Alongside valuing student input on what they are going to teach, sometimes professors ask for student input on classroom policies, which I saw on the first day of Dr. Turner's class with his 400 level writing students. For this class, students work in groups on projects that last the duration of the quarter. Dr. Turner serves as a moderator and mentor, but ultimately, how the students proceed with their work is up to them. With that in mind, as Dr. Turner went through the syllabus with his students he said, "What we need to work out together are the classroom policies." The syllabus said "My hope is that we can build policies together such as: Attendance, Timeliness..." Because of the nature of the class, Dr. Turner said he can't impose policies on the students like he might for other classes. In order for the student-driven projects to work, the students needed to be involved in deciding what policies should dictate their behavior and labor in the class. Asking for students to contribute their ideas to the syllabus is a pedagogical strategy, but it's also a way of empowering students. Like the systems Dr. Boone and Dr. Simons have in place to get students to lead discussions, Dr. Turner's method of seeking student input on course policies is a system in which he maintains ultimate control. But, even though the professors have the authority to pull back power from students as the professors see fit, sharing power with students at all levels the playing field.

While just saying “I really care what you all think and feel about this class” might be one of the transparently insincere leveling methods I mentioned earlier, the professors in this study seemed to genuinely value their students’ input. Like Dr. Lock said, a class becomes his favorite when the students are actively engaged with each other and the curriculum, not just with him. Dr. Boone and Dr. Neal crafted metaphors for the ideal teacher/student relationship that rely on active participation from the students. Dr. Peters said she knows her students by listening to them, and her teaching relies on that practice. Of course, that doesn’t mean each professor takes every single student course evaluation to heart (One professor mentioned a student writing that she should put lotion on her hands more often). The examples above do indicate, though, that part of building a successful rapport with students seems to rely on genuinely listening to students’ ideas and suggestions and empowering students to believe that their input and participation is essential to the class.

Sharing Own Working Practices:

The data within this code is similar to the data under “Sharing Personal Stories.” However, I found enough distinction between the two that it would have been an oversimplification to combine them into a single code, or make one a subcategory of the other. As I discussed earlier, professors in this study sometimes share personal stories in class to demonstrate a concept or theory, or just to remind their students that they are whole humans with funny stories about their kids or their pets, not just egg-head teachers. Sharing personal stories seems to be a way of building class rapport, while sharing their own working practices appeared to be one way professors decrease the slope of the playing field between themselves and their students. Sharing working practices is also a pedagogical move where sharing personal stories

often serves no pedagogical purpose. These two codes demonstrate that rapport building strategies and pedagogical moves, while different, are not entirely divorced from one another. There is some overlap, because rapport informs pedagogy, and pedagogy will affect rapport. The distinction between personal stories and working practices is that while a story may or may not relate to the class or curriculum, when professors shared their own practices with students it seemed to be a way of saying “We’re all writers/researchers/thinkers here.”

In Dr. Neal’s class, a student had asked about writing in passive voice, and another student commented that she often accidentally falls into passive voice in her writing. Dr. Neal said “Yeah it does distance the writer from the topic. In my own writing I’m constantly revising in my head.” While obviously Dr. Neal is still the professor teaching her students, just mentioning her own writing potentially decreased the distance between herself and her students. The first time I observed Dr. Simons’ class, the students were working on an assignment transcribing archival materials. Dr. Simons told me that the actual work the students were doing is the same for her as it is for them. She told the students she would recommend creating an alphabet for the piece they were transcribing, so they could recognize each letter more quickly based on how it looks in the particular piece. Importantly, Dr. Simons said that’s a strategy she uses when she’s transcribing, so students could see that although Dr. Simons is teaching them how to do the work, they all can get the work done using the same strategies. Thus, sharing a working strategy is both a pedagogical move and a leveling move.

In Dr. Allen’s 75 person class, the students were writing poems as part of their final project. They were required to turn in four drafts with the final version. Dr. Allen gave the students several ideas for different ways to draft, and told the class that even as a poet she doesn’t sit down, write a poem, and get it perfect all in one go. In my second interview I asked

Dr. Boone about sharing her own working practices with her creative writing students. I noticed when I observed her class that when she gave students a writing prompt, she told students how long she would usually spend on a similar prompt if she were warming up to write. Dr. Boone told me that beyond sharing writing strategies, she also shares her writing with students:

Oftentimes, and this is going to sound so egotistical, but oftentimes it's the best example that I can show, or I think it is (We both laugh). I also have the insight into how it was built, created, and so I did that much more than I thought I was going to last quarter. I haven't gotten student evals yet and I don't know if they might've felt like I overshared, but I do tend to share quite a bit. And my writing is very personal, so in a way too I want to show them I'm a real person, and this is how I deal with writing personal material.

It seems that it can be useful to share a working strategy with students because it has been successful for the professor in the past. Other times though, professors share their own practices to empathize when something is difficult for students, like Dr. Neal did in acknowledging her own revision for passive voice. Dr. Turner told me that he shares practices with his students based on what he struggles with. He said he'll tell his students:

'Okay, so I try this and I just fall apart. Here's what happens. Here's what I try next.' So when I teach exploding paragraphs (a method of incorporating research and evidence into claim heavy paragraphs) to 101 students, I teach that as something that helps me because I'm constantly just piling on claims and assuming you understand... And that's cool, because then it's like 'by the way, I'm not an expert at this. We're in this together.' 'Expert' might be the wrong word. I'm not 'done' learning how to do this.

That “we’re in this together” is crucial. Of course, Dr. Turner isn’t at the exact same place as a student in English 101, but it is important that he acknowledges that he struggles with the same things in writing that he sees his students struggling with. Students might not necessarily buy into “we’re in this together” wholeheartedly, but it does decrease the distance between professors and students when students can see that professors do more than teach; they’re often also doing the same kinds of work the students are doing.

It’s important to remember that none of these methods I’ve discussed make the playing field between professors and students completely level. As I’ve said, there can’t be a level field or level footing between two people who don’t possess the same amount of power and authority. However, professors can level the field, if temporarily or incompletely, by sharing power with students. For this power-sharing to serve not only the professors’ pedagogy but also the students’ learning, it must serve to empower students and lift them up. If professors attempts to come down to the students’ level, they are no longer sharing power, they are pandering. Part of knowing students as a means of serving pedagogy relies on professors knowing how much power to allow students to have in the classroom, and then actively encouraging students to use that power for their own learning.

“Can You Tell Me What You Mean by ‘Know’?”

The Distance-Degree Continuum:

I began this project by asking if “getting to know students” is always the positive thing we seem to think it is and what professors actually mean when they talk about knowing their students. Some degree of knowing between professors and students is positive, but defining what “knowing students” actually means is much more complicated. “Knowing students” is positive because professors say that knowing their students leads to a rewarding teaching experience and serves their pedagogy. However, these professors distinguish between two degrees of “knowing”: “knowing students as students” and “knowing students as people.” Knowing students as students means having a sense of their academic abilities and struggles, their habits of thought, and how they may act in class. Knowing students as people means knowing things about them that are not directly related to the course curriculum, like details about their family life, their personal interests or hobbies, and so on. Of course, any of these personal details can affect the student’s academics. While knowing these details does not always directly serve teaching the way knowing students as students does, knowing students as people can still be beneficial for professors. For some professors, knowing students as people is what makes teaching rewarding, but it can also be where knowing gets tricky.


Earlier, I compared the teacher/student relationship to two kids on a teeter totter because the relationship is dynamic, and either person can have some control of the motion. The professor is the “stronger kid” in that scenario; however, the professor empowers the students on the other end by giving them opportunities to control the teeter-totter, or to alter the hierarchal, vertical distance between them. I also pointed out that if the horizontal, intimate distance between the seats is decreased, the teeter-totter can sit almost level. I use that analogy as a way

of representing the vertical, hierarchal distance between professors and students, as well as the horizontal, intimate distance. What “knowing students” means is then dependent on each of these types of distance, and how professors work to establish, maintain, and occasionally decrease or increase both hierarchal and intimate distance between themselves and their students. Allowing either type of distance to decrease can serve to empower students and work as a pedagogical strategy, but it can also cause complications and possible negative relationships between professors and students. In “Leveling the Playing Field” I outlined how professors make pedagogical, distance-decreasing moves as a way of acknowledging their students as fellow learners, writers, and researchers. While that’s all to the good, in “Determining the Degrees of Knowing” I discussed professors’ constant work of building and maintaining productive boundaries between themselves and students. These boundaries protect both professors and their students, so that neither becomes implicated in an uncomfortable or potentially damaging relationship. “Knowing students” is rooted in professors’ ability to distinguish between the degree of knowing, whether “as students” or “as people,” and in controlling and adjusting the degrees of distance between themselves and their students. These distinctions and adjustments both build and maintain the rapport between professors and their students, and allow professors to manage the level and function of “knowing students” in their individual classrooms.

I have argued that “knowing students” is rooted in both hierarchal and intimate distance, both of which inform the degree or type of knowing between professors and their students. Degree and distance work together to shape the kind of “knowing” that occurs between professors and students. To take this idea to a cosmic level, consider the space-time continuum. To understand how the universe works, cosmologists needed to put space and time together as a continuum, where distinct parts (time and space) meld together to create one whole (the

universe). Just as the melding of space and time into the space-time continuum helped make sense of the universe, I would argue that a distance-degree “knowing” continuum can help us to understand what we really mean when we talk about “getting to know students.” When I use the word continuum, I do not mean a flat line with a start and end. Rather, I am considering this distance-degree continuum as a cyclical, spherical entity, as represented by Figure 1. Distance and degree make up the x axis, while roles and rapport make up the y axis. The horizontal and vertical arrows represent that each element is connected, and influences the others. The arrows that join the elements circularly represent motion, in that the relationship between each of the four elements is constantly dynamic.

Figure 1: The Distance-Degree Continuum



Distance and degree are central because they are the roots of roles and rapport, which are the other elements of “knowing.” If professors don’t attend to the degree of knowing or distance between themselves and students, then professors also can’t understand how to embody appropriate roles or build and maintain rapport with students. If a professor is struggling with

one element of the continuum, rapport for example, they could use the continuum to consider how other elements of “knowing” may be affecting their rapport with a class. Earlier I mentioned Dr. Lock’s students’ difficulties with Shakespeare, which had a negative effect on the class rapport. By acknowledging the distance between his expectations for the students’ abilities to comprehend Shakespeare and their actual levels of understanding, Dr. Lock was able to salvage the class rapport, and help his students through their Sparknotes struggles.

Distance between professors and their students can be as concrete as how near or far the professor stands or sits from students in the classroom; but distance can also be generational, social, political, economical, and on and on. The professors in this study range in age from early 40s to mid 60s. At our high-residency university, most students are in their late teens to mid 20s. Thus, there is a different degree of distance between a 60 year old professor and her students than there is between me, 24 at the time of writing, and my mostly 18 to 20-year-old students. What professors “know” about students will be different if they’ve been teaching for forty years or if they’ve been teaching for two, not just because their own experience levels are different, but because students are different now than they were forty years ago. The degree of distance in years between the professor and his or her students affects the degree of knowing between them. Importantly, this kind of distance is beyond professors’ control. Professors can decide to decrease distance between themselves and their students by sitting down next to students rather than teaching solely from the front of the room; but professors cannot stop distance in years between themselves and their students from stretching further and further the longer they teach. Students taking English 101 at this university will typically be 18 to 21 years old for the foreseeable future, but I will never be a 24-year-old 101 instructor again.

“Knowing” in terms of distance can also be considered in terms of location. For example, professors at this university have said that teaching in the Pacific Northwest is very different from teaching on the East Coast, partly because students are different in either location. “Knowing students” is always multi-dimensional and particular then, because the degree to which a professor may “know” one group of students can be very different from how he or she “knows” another. A professor may feel they “know” how students behave in one city, but can’t use that “knowing” as a lens on students in a different city. Different locations also come with different expectations for the degree of “knowing” that is conventional between professors and students. The professor who mentioned the difference between East and West Coast students also mentioned that on the East Coast nearly all professors went by their titles, while here, most professors go by their first names. Though distance and degree can look different in different places, they continuously meld together and inform one another, and ultimately inform “knowing.”

Rule Breaking vs. “Role Breaking”:

So far, I have discussed “knowing students” as a positive for both professors and students, while acknowledging that professors are constantly building and maintaining boundaries to ensure the “knowing” doesn’t become problematic or harmful. For “knowing” to be appropriate between professors and their students, it must have a pedagogical purpose. Often, educators consider pedagogy only within the classroom. Here, I mean that “knowing” must serve teaching and learning in some way, whether related to the class the student is taking from the professor, or the student’s professional goals or career aspirations. Problematic relationships between faculty and students can arise from blatant rule breaking, like prohibited sexual

relationships. I did not see any instances of rule breaking in this study, but we have all seen headlines featuring salacious teacher/student relationships, or encountered the teacher/student relationship trope in pop culture: take Tom Perrotta's *Election*, Van Halen's "Hot for Teacher," or the episode of *Friends* where Monica warns Ross not to get a reputation as "Professor McNails-His-Students." Rule breaking and the consequences of explicitly prohibited professor/student relationships are clearly defined, but easy to spot rule breaking isn't the only thing that can lead to problematic knowing between professors and students. Sometimes, the teacher/student relationship becomes awkward, strained, or harmful because either the student, the professor, or both are acting outside of the roles that are conventional given their relationship. I call this behavior "role breaking."

Professors in this study deemed the roles of mentor, role model, and teacher as the most productive roles to embody in their relationships with students. Professors can "role break" by active choice, or perhaps more often, by accident. There's an important distinction to be made between deviating and being deviant. Where rule breaking is typically black and white, role breaking is a sliding scale. Knowing a student too well can lead to "role breaking" in which the professor may become a friend or a therapist to their students, or in more titillating, rule breaking cases, a romantic or sexual partner. When a student referred to me as "a friend" in a course evaluation, I realized I must have had moments of accidental role breaking. Though problematic for my pedagogy, those accidental deviations from the role of "teacher" are on the less deviant side of the role breaking sliding scale. As Dr. Turner mentioned, trying to fulfill the role of therapist for a student who confides about depression or anxiety rather than referring them to the student health center would be role breaking in a way that could be damaging to the student's health. Like I said, I saw no rule breaking in this study, but professors did say repeatedly that

they had to build and maintain boundaries to avoid role breaking and acting as a therapist or friend to their students. Therapist and friend are negative roles for teachers in their relationships with students because embodying either role can directly interfere with the professor's pedagogy. The positive roles I have outlined are positive for the teacher and the student because they allow the student/teacher relationship to remain bounded by its intention: to share and engage with knowledge and craft.

For the roles of a professor and student to be productive, the roles must serve the professor's pedagogy and aid the student's learning. To avoid "role breaking," professors must constantly build and work to maintain productive boundaries between themselves and their students. Without clear definitions of and limits on "knowing" students, professors cannot maintain productive boundaries or avoid engaging in potentially harmful or problematic "role breaking." It's not useful to advise teachers to "get to know students" when the potential problems of that action are as unclear as the definition of "knowing." An article that lists "ten ways to get to know your students" isn't helpful until we understand what "knowing students" actually is, and how to navigate "knowing" effectively. Educators can understand and define "knowing students too well" in terms of role breaking. A professor who "knows their students" within the productive roles is practicing acceptable, even commendable, pedagogy. A professor who "knows their students" outside the productive roles is role breaking, and allowing their relationships with students to turn away from the relationship's inherent purpose: to facilitate learning.

Ultimately, "knowing students" comes down to professors understanding and maintaining productive roles in their relationships with students. Degree of knowing and distance between the professor and students affect these roles, and these roles are not static. By

accounting for degree and distance, balancing empowering students with maintaining authority, and distinguishing between “knowing as students” and “knowing as people,” professors can make use of this “knowing” continuum. “I’ve known them for years,” tells us something, but “I’ve known them for years, with x amount of hierarchal distance, x amount of intimate distance, in this particular role, with this type of rapport” gives a much more complete conception of “knowing.” So, go ahead and make use of those “10 ways to get to know your students” lists. When asked “how well did you know this student?” when providing a recommendation, try to consider all the elements of the “knowing” continuum. But always know what you mean by “know.”

But Wait, There's More!

This project exists because at the end of my first year of graduate school, I didn't feel done with the work in the grounded theory course I had taken. Writing this, I am gripped with the same feeling I had then; I still have so many questions about the professor/student relationship that I want to explore. So, this is not a conclusion with a declaration of "done!" Rather, these last pages are an outline of my remaining questions, as well as an offering to those who may also want to know more about "knowing."

I mentioned briefly at the start of this paper that, originally, I had six categories of data, but I cut down to the four categories I have discussed. The two categories that didn't make it into this project were both about availability, particularly how professors make themselves available to students. I named these categories "Grappling with Availability" and "Offering Availability Beyond the Classroom." I do see availability as related to "knowing," but I found that the codes on availability could warrant a separate project from my work here. What it means to "be available" to students seems difficult to define, just as "knowing" is. I began researching availability with the consideration that "being available" likely entails much more than hosting required office hours, and I found that availability, like "knowing," is multi-dimensional and particular. With the widespread implementation of email and educational interface platforms like Canvas and Blackboard, "being available" to students is no longer bounded by the physical walls of campus offices and classrooms. A study of how varying forms of communication might affect professors' levels of availability and the professor/student relationship is worth pursuing further. Appendix A contains the questions I asked professors about availability interspersed with questions about "knowing."

As I worked through this project, I kept a list of questions that I suspected I wouldn't be able to get to, but that would be worth exploring in the future. Earlier, I outlined the limits of my study, one of which is the small sample size I worked with. While the sample of professors included here is fairly representative of this university's English Department, it would be interesting to apply this study to larger departments, or across multiple universities. It's also important to remember that the professors in my study are all tenured or tenure-track. I suspect that this study could look very different with a sample of adjunct faculty, or graduate teaching assistants. My study focuses on "knowing" only as it relates to professors in an English department, so I would be curious to see how a similar study would take shape in other disciplines, perhaps particularly outside of the humanities. In "We Want to Know Who Our Students Are," Patricia Bizzell asserts that "Composition studies concentrates on students, not texts. We in this field want to know who our students are" (442). She asks "What abilities to use language do they bring to the academy? What new kinds of intellectual work are they able to do? What challenges does academic discourse pose for them?" (442). From those questions, I gather that by "know who our students are" Bizzell is considering a combination of knowing students as students and knowing students as people. She is also making a distinction between how writing professors and professors in other disciplines see and know students. If composition studies is focused "on students, not texts," then it seems Bizzell is arguing that other disciplines work the opposite way, with a focus on texts first, students second. I wouldn't go so far as to say that professors in disciplines other than writing studies never want to know who their students are, but Bizzell's assertion does make me wonder about how "knowing students" could be different across disciplines. How might "knowing students" be different for a creative writing professor and for a chemistry professor? How might "knowing" between professors and students happen

differently when they are studying objective knowledge, like how two chemicals will interact, versus subjective craft, like writing poetry? By interviewing and observing professors who teach a variety of disciplines, I got some sense of how course content may affect “knowing.” For example, when I asked professors what additional things they might learn about students from their writing, the creative writing professors said they learn a great deal, often including personal information about the students. The literature and writing studies professors said they might learn about the students’ academic abilities or habits of thought, but don’t learn a great deal about the students as people. I would be interested to learn more about the relationship between *what* a professor is teaching, and how that may influence their relationship with *who* they are teaching. This line of inquiry would be especially interesting in comparing the professor/student relationship in objective subjects, like math and the sciences, with subjective subjects, like the humanities.

Although I did not ask any specific questions related to gender in this study, it did creep in on a few occasions. I worked with six female professors and two male professors, and found that gender seems to be a variable in “knowing” between professors and students. As I noted before, two of the female professors in this study, Dr. Allen and Dr. Simons, require undergraduate students to address them by title. Dr. Turner, by his own description a “loud, white, middle-aged man” asks students to call him by his first name, Max. Of course, looking at this trend in this small of a sample cannot be conclusive. If I could continue this study with a larger sample, I would consider looking more closely at how gender might affect the professor/student relationship, because with my limited sample size, I did not find I could make any firm conclusions.

My sample size also affected my ability to research how cultural and ethnic diversity may affect “knowing.” Only about 25% of this university’s students are people of color, and the majority of professors in this English department are white. I did not ask the professors in this study about their ethnicities, because I knew that I did not have a large enough sample to really explore how ethnicity might affect “knowing.” I do not want to assert that ethnic difference between professors and students always means greater distance between them, but it does seem possible that professors of color and white professors may “get to know” students of color and white students in different ways. For example, Dr. Peters told me that she works to “find connections” with all her students, but that she doesn’t “try to pretend I understand what every student is going through, because students of color have entirely different stresses, anxieties, and fears. But, I can still acknowledge that and offer support from my position as a white instructor.” The important question here seems to be: How can white professors, and predominantly white departments, best “get to know” their students of color, and offer those students the support they may need?

It’s also important to note that classes in the English department at this university are all held in person, rather than online. That professors in this department prefer to teach in-person rather than online told me something about “knowing” right from the start; part of what professors here like about teaching is the opportunity to interact directly with students. However, in many other programs, and perhaps especially in community colleges, online classes are much more common and often the most accessible option for students. I am curious about what the distance-degree continuum could look like for professors who may never actually meet their students face to face.

In considering comprehensive universities compared to community colleges, it seems that “knowing” could mean something different in each context. In my community college experience, most everyone was working as well as attending school, and our professors often knew those details of our lives. I saw in this study that professors at this university also often know about their students’ lives outside of school. But, it seems that some professors expect that students attending comprehensive universities have school as their first priority while work is secondary or non-existent, which is less often true for community college students. Many community college students have full-time jobs, so community college professors recognize that school is not each student’s sole responsibility. How might “knowing” be different in contexts where professors are accustomed to their students fulfilling other roles than “student”?

A few of the professors in this study asked me “Are you going to get to talk to students?” I met this question with a wistful (and wishful) sigh. I did not interview students or focus my class observations on students directly in this study for a few reasons, none of which are because I didn’t want to. First, Institutional Research Board (IRB) approval is more difficult to get when working with students rather than professors, and each student in each class would have needed to sign a consent form for me to include them in the study. Beyond that added hurdle, I simply did not have the time to include students’ perspectives in this project. As I said before, I had to cut two categories of data as it was (with great remorse and personal turmoil), so adding students to the mix could have doubled the size of the project. To get a more complete understanding of “knowing” in the professor/student relationship, though, it seems important to continue this project with student participants. I asked professors what it means to them to “know” a student, but I would also like to know what students mean when they talk about feeling “known” by their professors. I have had former 101 students ask me for letters of recommendation because I am

the only teacher they have had at this university so far who they felt “knew them on a personal level.” I really couldn’t tell you much about those students beyond what came out of discussions in class or conferences in my office, all related to the course, and yet the students feel “known.” Perhaps, then, the next line of inquiry to follow is not “what do we mean when we talk about ‘knowing students’?” but rather “what does it mean for students to feel ‘known’ by teachers?”

In outlining grounded theory methodology, I emphasized that grounded theories are built from original data, rather than from existing theories in a given field. To me, grounded theory is the most fitting research methodology for studying pedagogy. As many theories as there are about teaching, the act of teaching itself is not theoretical. If we think of teaching as a noun, a thing, it can of course be theoretical. When I say teaching is not theoretical, I am thinking of teaching as a verb, an action the teacher embodies. Oftentimes, “theory” feels like something that happens elsewhere (perhaps especially within thick, esoteric books). There is no “elsewhere” in grounded theory, just as there is no “elsewhere” in teaching. What it means to “know” another person is a slippery question, but it becomes less slippery when grounded in real bodies doing real work. “Knowing” is about relationships, as are teaching and learning. Students and professors have a relationship to the subject matter and content of the classes they undertake, and, of course, part of teaching and learning is teaching and learning the material at hand. But, I’ve found that teaching and learning are like the proverbial teeter totter I keep coming back to. It’s one thing to know how to get on and get going, but it’s a different experience when we know the person sitting across from us, you know?

Works Cited

- Bizzell, Patricia. "We Want to Know Who Our Students Are." *PMLA*, Vol. 129, No. 3, 2014, pp. 442-447.
- Charmaz, Kathy. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. Sage Publications, 2014.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Pantheon, 1977.
- Gonzalez, Jennifer. "A 4-Part System for Getting to Know Your Students." *Cult of Pedagogy*. www.cultofpedagogy.com/relationship-building/. Accessed 10 May 2018.
- Grabill, Jeff. "Learning, Teaching, and a Culture of Care." *Michigan State University*. hub.msu.edu/learning-teaching-and-a-culture-of-care/. Accessed 10 May 2018.
- "Level Playing Field." *Wikipedia*, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Level_playing_field. Accessed 16 May 2018.
- Noddings, Nel. "Caring in Education." *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. www.uvm.edu/~rgriffin/NoddingsCaring.pdf. Accessed 10 May 2018.
- Perrotta, Tom. *Election*. Putnam, 1998.
- Peshkin, Alan. "In Search of Subjectivity: One's Own." 1988.
- Piercy, Marge. "To Be of Use." *Circles of Water*. Knopf. 1982.
- Schaeffer, Eliza Jane. "Level Footing: The Professor-Student Dynamic." *The Dartmouth*. www.thedartmouth.com/article/2017/05/eliza-jane-professors-students. Accessed 10 May 2018.
- "The One Where Ross Dates a Student." *Friends: The Complete Sixth Season*, written by David Crane and Marta Kaufmann, directed by Gary Halvorson, Warner Brothers, 2000.
- Van Halen. "Hot For Teacher." *1984*, Warner Brothers Records, 1984.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

First Interview Questions:

1. What are some of the classes you've taught, or are teaching this year?
2. Do you have a favorite class you've taught, or a least favorite class to teach? Follow: What makes a class your favorite or least favorite?
3. After 10 weeks with a class, do you feel like you've gotten to "know" your students? What does "knowing your students" mean for you? Follow: To what extent does it depend on the class?
4. Can you tell me about what you typically do on the first day of class?
5. What are some ways you get to know your students? What influences the extent to which you get to know students in different classes?
6. If it was on a scale of 1 to 10, 1 being not at all important and 10 being essential, how important is it to your teaching and to you as a teacher that you "know" your students?
7. What percentage of students make use of your office hours? What typically brings students into your office? Are there other ways you make yourself available to your students?
8. To what extent does technology affect how you are available to your students? I'm thinking about email, Canvas, and maybe having those apps available on your phone
9. When you leave school for the day, to what extent do you choose to leave your work behind? Do you have any boundaries in place for when you check and answer emails?

Second Interview Questions:

1. Did you ever have a class with a teacher or professor who you felt like really knew you as a student? What did the professor say or do that gave you this feeling? What was the class and level?
2. Can you tell me about a teacher or professor you had who you felt like you knew as a teacher? What did the professor do or say that made you feel this way? What was the class and level the professor taught?
3. At the time, did you feel like you knew that teacher well? Or did you come to realize this later, perhaps after you had become a teacher yourself?
4. How did you come to know that professor? Through office hours, from in class interactions, maybe from their comments on your work?
5. Can you tell me about the classroom where you had class with that professor? Can you tell me what the professor was doing in the classroom, where he or she located him or herself?
6. What did you call that professor?
7. What do you ask your students to call you? Does it depend on the class?
8. To what extent does the physical layout of the classroom you're in affect the activities you do, or how you are in the room?
9. Do you ever share your own stories in class to illustrate a theory, concept or practice? If so, can you give me an example?
10. Can you tell me about what it means for you to establish a rapport with students?

11. Is building rapport affected by the class size? How do you go about building this relationship with students?
12. To what extent is your ability to establish rapport with a class a reflection of the students' interest in the subject?
13. In comparison to what you might learn about students from talking to them in class or during office hours, what additional things do you learn about your students from reading and evaluating their writing?
14. If you were to use a metaphor to describe what you consider an ideal teacher/student relationship, what would it be?

Appendix B “Knowing” Code Book

This code book provides definitions of the categories and codes that appear within this project, as well as sample data points. Note that this code book has been condensed from the original version. My original code book contains more data points under each code than I have included here, as well as the categories on availability that I did not include in this project. To see the Availability Code Book, see Appendix C.

Category: Determining the Degrees of Knowing		
<p>Definition: This category encompasses data in which professors determine how they get to know their students. There’s variation if it’s a 75-person General University Requirement, a senior seminar, a graduate class, etc. The context also determines the way in which professors invite their students to get to know the professor, and how professors distinguish between roles that productive or unproductive given the context. For “knowing” between students and professors to be productive for learning, it must serve a pedagogical purpose.</p>		
<p>Code: Collecting Student Information</p>	<p>Definition: Some professors collect information about their students, often on the first day of class. Professors will ask for information like the students’ academic area(s) of interest, why they’re taking the class, where the students are from, and in some cases, the students’ preferred gender pronouns.</p>	<p>Examples: “I like to gather some information from them and ask them some questions to get them to open up and start talking, and a lot of times it can be things like: what’s your relationship to film? Are you completely new to this? Or, what kind of films do you like to watch? Something easy where everyone will have an answer.” (Dr. Peters, First Interview)</p> <p>“I always ask them for little bits of information about themselves. I usually try to link some pieces of information about them to their face, to their name. It’s harder in the big class, but if someone likes to play the banjo, it helps me remember their name. If somebody’s from a small town and really excited to be [here], it helps me remember their name. So I have them write a personal narrative, some kind of statement about what matters to them, and I give them a lot of freedom in that.” (Dr. Allen, First Interview)</p>

<p>Code: Distinguishing Roles as Professors</p>	<p>Definition: Professors distinguish between productive roles for themselves (teacher, mentor, challenger, fellow writer, fellow researcher, fellow reader) and inappropriate roles (therapist, friend).</p>	<p>Examples: “I think that there is a level of understanding who they are that I don’t want to know. So one of the things I say that I’m really proud of saying (and it’s in my syllabus) is do not friend me on Facebook because I am not your friend. And I say it exactly as that because I want to model for them the difference between being a role model, being a teacher, being a mentor, and being a friend. They’re different. So I don’t want to know them as if they’re friends, because that’s not my role, and it would be bad role modeling. I want to know them well enough to be able to guide them toward particular interests, and also to show some level of compassion for whatever brought them to the university.” (Dr. Allen, First Interview)</p> <p>“The challenge with teaching a class like this where you are dealing with personal material is not to cross any of those boundaries between teacher and counselor, or teacher and friend, any of those things. So being able to show interest and empathy, but without going overboard and losing my own sense of boundaries with them.” (Dr. Boone, First Interview)</p>
<p>Code: Knowing Students as Students</p>	<p>Definition: Professors articulate the need to know students in terms of the students’ learning abilities, learning background, academic interests, and career aspirations.</p>	<p>Examples: “So I don’t socialize with students, and in that sense I can’t say I know students the way I know friends, or know colleagues I’ve gotten to know outside the university. I’d say by the end of the quarter, especially if they’re active in class, but even if they’re not active at least from their writing, I get to know something about their thought, something about their intellectual and academic interest.” (Dr. Williams, First Interview)</p> <p>“I think it’s important with any kind of creative writing, nonfiction in particular, not that I need to know personal details of their lives but to know where they’re at as writers. What’s important to them as writers, what experiences they have as writers, because I can tailor it quite a bit to what they need.” (Dr. Boone, First Interview)</p>

<p>Code: Knowing Students as People</p>	<p>Definition: Professors describe knowing students as people as getting a sense of the student beyond the classroom. This can include learning about the students' personal interests, their work outside of school, or any accommodations. This code can also arise when a professor learns of a student's past or present trauma, or any struggles they are currently undergoing, like family problems, anxiety, depression, etc. Oftentimes, knowing students as "people" not just as "students" seems to happen for professors after the student has graduated.</p>	<p>Examples: "So I always try to remember they're people. The funnest thing about teaching is getting to know them as people. So as much as I can with the large numbers we teach I always try to interact with them and be present in my interactions with them to want to learn about them as people." (Dr. Peters, First Interview)</p> <p>"I'd say I probably feel like I know about half the students in each class. Again, what does that mean 'know.' With creative nonfiction writing you know they're writing about their lives so beyond just talking to them about craft when they come in to talk to me we end up talking about their lives, you know quite a bit, or just the content is there in the piece, so I'd say about half of them I really get to know in that way and then the other half either they're just not quite revealing very much either on the page or in person, and I don't want to push it." (Dr. Boone, First Interview)</p>
<p>Code: Building Productive Boundaries</p>	<p>Definition: Professors create boundaries for themselves and for students as a way of maintaining appropriate, pedagogically useful relationships with their students. These boundaries exist to protect both teachers and students, eliminate partiality, and keep professors' focus on students' learning and class performance. These boundaries can also serve as a form of time management, like, setting boundaries on when to check and answer email, which appears to allow professors time to refresh and engage in other work or personal activities.</p>	<p>Examples: "When there's not an assignment due I may set some boundaries for myself just to have down time, so that when I do come back on Monday I can be present and energized and available again. So I struggle a little bit with having those boundaries, because usually I don't have any. But that's not good for personal health in the long term either. It's nice when you know that your job is not on for a period of time." (Dr. Peters, First Interview)</p> <p>"Everything I'm doing with or for a student has a pedagogical purpose. Even drinking coffee and looking out the window, and they're telling me about their other classes. That has to be pedagogical for me or I'm breaking my own boundary, and to what end? If I can't answer that, I'm wrong." (Dr. Turner, First Interview)</p>

<p>Code: Asking to be Called by Title</p>	<p>Definition: Some professors specifically ask students to call them either Professor or Dr., rather than by their first name, or allowing the students to choose between titles and first names.</p>	<p>Examples: “I’m really happy that I go by Professor. There were so many reasons, one of them is that students would call me Mrs. Allen, which really made me angry. As a feminist I just thought ‘don’t.’ It became tied to ideas about heteronormativity for them, and I don’t even think they realized it. Also, when I started teaching I was really young. I had my first class when I was 21 or 22 and the students were 18, and I felt like they didn’t see me as a teacher. And then being a female teacher I feel like, I still feel like I’m not treated with the same level of respect that I see male colleagues get, so all of that led to wanting to be called Professor.” (Dr. Allen, Second Interview)</p> <p>“I had a student email me and say ‘Hey J!’ Just my first initial. And it just, something in me just snapped. Like no, you get to call me Dr. Simons thank you very much. It just bothered me. Maybe I had been reading too much about the disrespect that women get in the academy. Maybe there was just a part of me that was like ‘I’m done with this.’” (Dr. Simons, Second Interview)</p>
---	--	--

Category: Building Class Rapport		
<p>Definition: This category encapsulates all codes and data that relate to how professors build rapport with a class (which is different than having a rapport with an individual student). By rapport, I mean the back and forth interactions between students and the professor, and between students, the “vibe,” “mood,” or “dynamic” of the class. Like Determining the Degrees of Knowing how professors build rapport is dependent on the context of the class. How professors are able to build rapport with their classes seems to relate to three factors in particular: the size of the class, the level of the class, and the students’ interest in the subject matter. Building Class Rapport is separate from Maintaining Class Rapport in that Building happens mostly early in the quarter, while Maintaining happens throughout the quarter.</p>		
<p>Code: Valuing Knowing Students’ Names</p>	<p>Definition: Most professors place importance on knowing their students’ names, and learning their names quickly, even in large classes.</p>	<p>Examples: “Names are important to me. I should have them pretty much down by the end of today.” (Dr. Turner, First Class Observation)</p> <p>“I establish a way of communicating, a way of dialoguing in the classroom. It means facilitating a sort of atmosphere of open-mindedness and respect, so I like to establish a rapport where students feel comfortable around me, where they feel that I’m not a threatening person. I don’t think that they do [think I’m threatening], but in all of my classes it’s important that students feel safe, and they feel like this is a learning environment and not a judgmental space. And how I do that is just by things as simple as remembering their names.” (Dr. Neal, Second Interview)</p>
<p>Code: Getting Students to Know Each Other and Work Together</p>	<p>Definition: Professors encourage students to work and talk together, either for group projects/presentations, or in class discussions. So, professors not only get to know their students and vice versa, but professors facilitate students getting to know one another.</p>	<p>Examples: Dr. Boone groups students into partners and one group of three, and asks students to share what they wrote about. She says “You can read what you wrote, if you don’t want to that’s okay, just talk about what you wrote.” (Dr. Boone, First Class Observation)</p> <p>“Especially in lower division classes, I’ll try to emphasize something that gets them to know each other and talking to each other on the first day. So sometimes I’ll hand out just a very short passage and put them in groups and have them talk about it.” (Dr. Lock, First Interview)</p>

<p>Code: Sharing Personal Stories</p>	<p>Definition: Professors sometimes offer personal anecdotes in the classroom or to students in office hours. Sometimes, these stories are meant to help demonstrate a concept or theory, while other times the stories are for fun, like to warm up the room at the start of class. There also appears to be a relationship between “putting students at ease” - professors will share anecdotes of things they struggled with as students or still struggle with as scholars as a way of relating to students.</p>	<p>Example: “I often will use personal (but not too personal) anecdotes. The one example I can think of, and this is going way back, but when my son was an infant I happened to be teaching Lacan’s mirror stage. So I used my son as an example of holding him up in the mirror. I use a lot of parenting experiences to talk about ideas in a class, so I will draw on my experience as a parent. But that’s the extent of it. I don’t really talk about my marriage, or other relationships. But now it’s my dog, I talk a lot about my dog. Sometimes I worry that I might do it too much, but no one’s complained so far.” (Dr. Neal, Second Interview)</p>
<p>Code: Getting Laughs</p>	<p>Definition: Though this code is related to the code Laughing with Students in the Maintaining Class Rapport category, the distinction is that sometimes professors will intentionally make a joke. These jokes seem to be intended to “break the ice,” make students feel related to or more comfortable, or “make space” for fun/laughter in the classroom.</p>	<p>Examples: Dr. Allen says, “Okay, U.S. history is taking over, as it does during Thanksgiving.” The whole class laughs. U.S. history is one of the groups giving a presentation today. (Dr. Allen, First Class Observation)</p> <p>Dr. Lock says some more about the tone of the book the class is discussing: “I love the picture of him putting his arm around him and saying ‘come on, don’t be a dick.’ The class laughs. (Dr. Lock, First Class Observation)</p>

Category: Maintaining Class Rapport		
<p>Definition: This category encapsulates all codes and data that relate to how professors maintain rapport with a class (which is different than having a rapport with an individual student). By rapport, I mean the back and forth interactions between students and the professor, and between students, the “vibe,” “mood,” or “dynamic” of the class. Like Determining the Degrees of Knowing how professors maintain rapport is dependent on the context of the class. How professors are able to maintain rapport with their classes seems to relate to three factors in particular: the size of the class, the level of the class, and the students’ interest in the subject matter. While Building Class Rapport happens mostly early in the quarter, Maintaining happens throughout the quarter.</p>		
Code: Checking In	<p>Definition: Professors will often ask students “how are you?” or “how are you feeling?” Professors may also ask students particular questions about their jobs outside of school, their health, etc. This can happen one on one, or broadly to the whole class. Checking In can also relate to professors evaluating how students are responding to the course material or expectations.</p>	<p>Example: “Before class starts or at the very beginning I usually do this thing where I just ask ‘how is every body doing?’ And then I’ll say something like ‘Well, my Halloween...’ I used to not do it, but I like to do it in the very beginning just to let my students know ‘Hey you know I actually value your well being, so how are you?’” (Dr. Neal, Second Interview)</p>
Code: Laughing with Students	<p>Definition: Each professor I observed laughed with their students during class. This can happen in several ways: a student makes a joke and the class laughs, or there’s something funny in the material. Laughing appears to facilitate fun, playfulness, and comfort.</p>	<p>Examples: “I think it makes a difference to be willing to have a sense of humor. If we can laugh together that’s a really good first step. If we can get the class to laugh together, especially early in the quarter, it can just be a tension reliever, right? Even if it’s a small moment I think those small moments matter.” (Dr. Simons, Second Interview)</p> <p>A student says he’s an English major and is taking this class because he’s worried he has no future, and Dr. Turner and the class laugh. Dr. Turner says, “We might be inventing the model for the class. Can we just have a future?” The class laughs. (Dr. Turner, First Class Observation)</p>

<p>Code: Running Jokes</p>	<p>Definition: In some of the classes I observed there were moments I've dubbed "running jokes" that both the professor and the class are in on together. They seem to me like little anchors of fun and familiarity.</p>	<p>Examples: A male student who had stepped out a few minutes before comes back in with a cinnamon roll. Dr. Neal says, "And there he is with his food again." The student says, "I didn't have breakfast," and Dr. Neal says it's "Totally fine." Another student says "Where do you always get these treats?" The class laughs. (Dr. Neal, First Class Observation)</p> <p>A student in the group presenting holds up a remote and asks if it's for the projector. Dr. Allen says, "You're asking me? You know you've been mocking me all quarter." The class laughs. (Dr. Allen, First Class Observation)</p>
<p>Code: Teasing Students</p>	<p>Definition: This code refers specifically to when professors will tease individual students in the classroom. The teasing is always meant to be good natured, with the apparent intent of "making space" for fun and play in the classroom.</p>	<p>Examples: Dr. Neal asks the students if they saw any movies over winter break that she should see. A male student asks her if she means new movies. Dr. Neal says yes, "I'm not a hipster like you." The student and the rest of the class laugh. (Dr. Neal, Second Class Observation)</p> <p>During a five-minute break, a group of students are chatting about taking a 400 level class with Dr. Lock the following quarter. One of the students say she isn't taking that class, and the students say to Dr. Lock "she doesn't want to be with us." The student says "It's not about you!" Dr. Lock responds, "Yeah sure, I've heard that before," and he and the class laugh. (Dr. Lock, First Class Observation)</p>

Appendix C

Availability Code Book

This code book provides definitions of the categories and codes and sample data points relating to professor availability. I decided not to include these categories or codes within this project, but have included them here to demonstrate the scope of my research, as well as the data I intend to continue working with in the future. Note that this code book has been condensed from the original version. My original code book contains more data points under each code than I have included here.

Category: Offering Availability Beyond the Classroom		
Definition: This category represents professors' availability to students outside of class time. Of course, professors are required to hold office hours each week, but professors offer availability beyond their office hours by being available through technology (specifically email and Canvas), by offering one on one help broadly to their classes or to individuals, and in some cases, by requiring individual conferences.		
Code: Offering One on One Help	Definition: This code encompasses data in which professors directly encourage their students to seek them out for help with matters related to the course, academics, or future careers during office hours, or offer help individually during class.	Examples: "You have to see how they interact with each other, and that says a lot about their learning, and if there are impediments to their learning. And sometimes it means trying to seek them out, or reach out to them outside of class in ways because they need support that they're not getting, and they're not telling you they need it." (Dr. Peters, First Interview) "I extend the offer. I do it in writing and I do it verbally. I assure them if I hand back a paper, I say 'If you stop by, I'm not here to scold you. I'm just here to show you what didn't work and how you could make it work.'" (Dr. Williams, First Interview)

<p>Code: Watching for and Responding to Troubled Behavior</p>	<p>Definition: This code is related to Offering One on One Help in that professors will reach out to students individually to offer their help, but in this case it is to offer help with accessing resources to aid with anxiety, depression, or trauma.</p>	<p>Examples: “Undergraduates are quicker to come in if they’re having a personal crisis. They tend to see me as approachable because I present myself that way, and I welcome that. I do this thing that I’m very proud of, where I will walk them, physically walk them, to the counseling center if they’re troubled.” (Dr. Allen, First Interview)</p> <p>“A student showed up yesterday because he missed the previous class. And I had only said to him ‘Hey, we talked a little about an upcoming assignment, if you stop by I can fill you in on the details because I’m probably not going to take a lot of time with it in class the next day.’ So he came in for what I think he thought was going to be a five minute meeting, but he was here for forty-five minutes. Because that conversation ended up being me checking in with him like, ‘You said you weren’t feeling well, I hope you’re feeling better.’ And then that lead to him talking a little, ‘Well it’s not only that I’m sick, I’m sick because I’m worn down because I’m not getting enough sleep, because in addition to all the stuff I’m doing for school..’ It also turned out that an emergency happened in his family and he’s been taking care of his family, so we ended up talking about that. So, okay we can talk about support services that are available to him, ‘Do you know about Student Life?’” (Dr. Simons, First Interview)</p>
<p>Code: Being Accessible Through Technology</p>	<p>Definition: While all the professors in this study are available to their students via email, this code includes data in which professors mentioned encouraging students to contact them over email, said they try to respond to email quickly, or will respond to email outside of standard workday hours.</p>	<p>Examples: “I give them both my personal and my academic email, and I don’t ask them to email only at certain times. I check email whenever I want. I have had many, (surprisingly many) conversations with colleagues about when you will answer an email, and some people feel that it’s somehow inappropriate to get or send an email to a student like in the middle of the night. But I often work at 2 in the morning, and I don’t see a problem with sending an email then.” (Dr. Allen, First Interview)</p> <p>“Most of my students prefer to connect through technology. And primarily through email. Canvas and email I would say are the two ways. And I appreciate how busy they are, and that’s more convenient lots of times, so I try to get back with email very quickly. I check it all the time, even when I’m at home. Sometimes on weekends I find it’s good not to be on my computer checking email, so I go back and forth on whether I’m on. When students have assignments, like a paper due, I always am on because I’ll often tell them I’ll read drafts over the weekend and give them feedback or answer questions. So when there are assignments I’m always available, like 24/7.” (Dr. Peters, First Interview)</p>

<p>Code: Offering or Requiring Individual Conferences</p>	<p>Definition: This is similar to offering One on One Help, but these conferences are more concrete. Some professors offer individual conferences outside of office hours, and some professors require students come in for at least one conference in the course of a quarter.</p>	<p>Examples: “Well I require them to [conference with me], so they do, and even then not 100 percent. But there are time slots they can sign up for, and I keep the office hour open for drop ins. So like right now I’ve only had one so far, but as the quarter increases hopefully it will increase a bit.” (First Interview)</p> <p>“My opening statement (sometimes my syllabi say this too) on day one is ‘I expect that at some point you’ll come in and talk to me. It can be about work, you can come talk to me about the weather. It can be a five minute conversation, it can be a half hour conversation, it can be a two hour conversation. Just come in and say hi, so I have a chance to get to know you.’ And I try to keep the stakes low so they don’t feel like they have to come in and knock the teacher’s socks off, because that can be scary. I’ve been in that position too, and that’s not fun. So I usually at least have a chance to have whatever level of encounter, and I don’t want to push students into conversations that they’re really not comfortable with.” (Dr. Simons, First Interview)</p>
<p>Code: Staying in Touch</p>	<p>Definition: Some professors said they’ve stayed in touch with former students through Facebook, email, or letters, and have become friends with those former students.</p>	<p>Examples: “Now, once they’re graduated, a few students I’ve gotten to know. There were two students in our program as undergraduates, each one had been in a class of mine. They eventually married, they got their Master’s, and they one day emailed me and said ‘We’re going to be in town and we’d love to see you.’ And they were no longer my students, and we see each other every year. They come up with their children, which has been great... It’s wonderful, so there are a few students who I have stayed in touch and I’ll see, and I’ll see socially, but I never do it while they’re still my students.” (Dr. Williams, First Interview)</p> <p>“I’m still in touch with students that I had when I first got here in 2004-2005. There’s maybe a dozen, a dozen and a half students, former students, who I would consider friends now just because some of those conversations became friendships once they graduated and those conversations didn’t stop. They were able to change into something else.” (Dr. Simons, First Interview)</p>

Category: Grappling with Availability		
<p>Definition: The data in this category represents the pressure professors often feel to be available to their students, sometimes in ways beyond the professors' control. For instance, the accessibility technology allows for has obliterated the concept of a work day, and professors cannot always (or maybe ever) choose to leave emotional labor in their office when they leave for the day.</p>		
<p>Code: Taking Emotional Labor Home</p>	<p>Definition: Professors said it is difficult or impossible to leave work behind when they go home for the day. This can be literal - they bring grading, email, Canvas home with them, but it can often also be emotional/mental. Emotional labor can mean a professor is preoccupied with a class that didn't go a well, they are worried or concerned for a student who is struggling, etc.</p>	<p>Examples: "I lose sleep. I wake up early and can't even necessarily go back to sleep because of weird stuff, like what does administration or certain faculty members think of this move I'm about to make, is anyone even going to notice, maybe they won't notice. The emotional work is harder for me to leave." (Dr. Turner, First Interview)</p> <p>"It's in my dreams. Honestly, I mean I'm thinking about class, especially if a class session doesn't go as well as I'd hoped, if it's not as vibrant, you can believe I am thinking about that until I see my students again. I'm not saying this is a good thing, I'm not saying that at all. But it is so present in my thought, and I'm trying to think how can I go back and clarify, or what can I do to sort of get the students going again. I'm thinking about it really until the next class session. Now when classes seem to go fine, perhaps I'm less preoccupied with classes, but I'm still always thinking of it. I'm thinking of what comes next and how best to prepare that, and one thing I thought when I began teaching was when I taught courses I had taught previously, that there'd be less time and preparation. Well that may be slightly the case, but, boy, you never can go on automatic pilot." (Dr. Williams, First Interview)</p>

<p>Code: Second-Jobbing with Institutional Roles</p>	<p>Definition: Many professors have institutional roles alongside their teaching. These roles put additional demands on the professors' time, leading them to categorize their work in terms of time to be available to students as professors and time to be available as their other titles.</p>	<p>Examples: "I never leave work. I never leave work. I'm working all the time. I'm working summers, I'm working days and nights, I never leave work...My work life is life. My vacation life is also my work life. When I, and part of that is being [position], too, if I travel anywhere I have to be available by email. Students don't reach out to me so much in the summer time, and I try to keep like time for family, but even so. My kids bring their work home, they do homework, I bring work home, I do homework." (Dr. Simons, First Interview)</p> <p>"Now that I'm [position] it's increasingly likely that if I'm here and my door is open, some sort of problem will present itself for me to solve. And that's okay, it's my job, but it is nice to sort of leave that behind. But it will find me by email sooner or later. And I work, you know I'm not in the office 30 or 35 hours a week or anything. I have a lot of things I do from home in the morning, and then I'm usually working into the evening, and I work at home on the weekends, so that boundary between office and home is very permeable." (First Interview)</p>
<p>Code: Losing Control of Boundaries on Technological Communication</p>	<p>Definition: When I asked professors if they have boundaries for when they check and/or respond to emails from students, they overwhelming responded with something along the lines of "I wish." Professors would like to have boundaries on when technological communication with students happens, but with very few exceptions, find themselves not maintaining those boundaries.</p>	<p>Example: "When there's not an assignment due I may set some boundaries for myself just to have down time, so that when I do come back on Monday, I can be present and energized and available again. So I struggle a little bit with having those boundaries because usually I don't have any. But that's not good for personal health in the long term either. It's nice when you know that your job is not on for a period of time. So, but yeah overall I'd say that I'm super available to students." (Dr. Peters, First Interview)</p>

Appendix D

IRB Consent Form

Participant Consent Form

Part 1: Permission for Initial Interview

I am conducting research for my graduate thesis, which examines the different ways professors define what it means to “get to know” and make themselves available to their students. My interest in these ideas began last year in Eng 598 (Research in the Teaching of English) when coding data from interviews with English professors. I began to suspect that “availability” and “getting to know students” are both more complex than offering office hours or learning a fun fact about students on the first day of class. To delve more deeply into these concepts, I will use grounded theory methods including conducting interviews, doing fieldwork, and coding data to look for patterns that may help deepen my understanding of professor availability and how professors get to know their students. This interview should take between 15 and 20 minutes, and I will ask you questions regarding the topics outlined above. Please know that you may choose to skip a question at any time.

I will record our interview using an app on my phone. My phone is passcode protected, and I will delete the recording as soon as I have transcribed the interview. You will have access to a transcription of this interview as soon as possible after the interview is conducted. I can deliver this transcription to you in hard copy, as email cannot be guaranteed as secure. I and my thesis advisor Donna Qualley are the only people who will see any of this research data before I remove all identifying features. I will save the interview transcription on my laptop, which is also passcode protected. Per university policy, I will store paper copies of signed consent forms for six years, in a secure drawer in my home office. I do not foresee any risk (personal, professional, or psychological) to you, but I will respect your wishes about privacy and confidentiality as I write my thesis. Unless otherwise indicated by you, I will not use your real name, and will remove all identifying features. I will not use any identifying features in publication. If my thesis goes on to professional publication, I will first seek your permission and remove any further information as it applies to you, per your request. You will have access to the completed article before publication, and I will only publish with your express permission. I hope by participating in this study, you will be contributing to deepening our understanding of commonplace perspectives about teaching English. By participating in my project, you are helping me to get a view of what these concepts mean for English professors, and how these concepts may relate to my own teaching in the future. Declining to participate in this study will not impact your relationship with the English Department or this university.

This project is being conducted by Chloe Allmand under the supervision of Dr. Donna Qualley. You may direct inquiries regarding study procedures to either Dr. Qualley or myself. Your participation is voluntary and you may decide to withdraw from the study at any time. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact Janai Symons, Research Compliance Officer (RCO), at 650-3082.

I have read the project description, and I agree / do not agree (**circle one**) to allow Chloe Allmand to use my statements and information from this interview in her graduate thesis.

Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Address/Email: _____

Date: _____

Part 2: Permission for Continued Participation, Including Further Interviews and Potential Class Observations

If you agree to continue to participate in my study beyond our first interview, I will solicit further interviews with you based on data that emerges from the first set of interviews. I will record and transcribe these interviews in the same manner described above. If you agree, I would also like to look at examples of your syllabi and course documents and visit your class on one to three occasions at your discretion and convenience. Below, you can sign for only future interviews, only class observations, or both. Whether or not I observe your class will depend mainly on scheduling. I will not identify any of your students in my writing, except by gender. I will also not use the title of your class in my writing, unless you give me permission to do so. The majority of these interviews and observations will occur during fall quarter, though I may request some follow up with you during winter quarter.

As a participant, you will have access to transcriptions of your interviews as soon as possible after the interview is conducted. You will also have access to my field notes from observing your class, as soon as I have had the opportunity to type them up. My field notes will have the same protections as interview transcriptions, i.e., I will save them on my laptop, which is passcode protected, and I will hand deliver a hard copy to you, as email cannot be guaranteed as secure.

I do not foresee any risk (personal, professional, or psychological) to you, but I will respect your wishes about privacy and confidentiality as I write my thesis. Unless otherwise indicated by you, I will not use your real name, and will remove identifying features of yourself, and or classes as we may discuss them, or I may observe them. I will, of course, also not identify any of your students in my writing. If my thesis goes on to professional publication, I will first seek your permission and remove any further information as it applies to you, per your request. I hope by participating in this study, you will have the opportunity to reflect on what “availability” and “getting to know your students” mean to you as a professor. By participating in my project, you are helping me to get a view of what these concepts mean for English professors at this university, and how they may relate to teaching English beyond our department.

This project is being conducted by Chloe Allmand under the supervision of Dr. Donna Qualley. You may direct inquiries regarding study procedures to either Dr. Qualley or myself. Your participation is voluntary and you may decide to withdraw from the study at any time. If you

have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact Janai Symons, Research Compliance Officer (RCO), at 650-3082.

I have read the project description, and I agree / do not agree (**circle one**) to allow Chloe Allmand to use my statements and information from interviews in her graduate thesis.

Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Address/Email: _____

I have read the project description, and I agree / do not agree (**circle one**) to allow Chloe Allmand to use my statements and information from class visits, and course documents in her graduate thesis.

Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Address/Email: _____

Researcher Copy