2-11-2013

"Doing School" Right: How University Students from Diverse Backgrounds Construct their Academic Literacies and Academic Identities

Whitney Ann Tudor Sarver
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

“DOING SCHOOL” RIGHT:

HOW UNIVERSITY STUDENTS FROM DIVERSE BACKGROUNDS CONSTRUCT THEIR ACADEMIC LITERACIES AND ACADEMIC IDENTITIES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Whitney Ann Tudor Sarver

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2012

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Whitney Ann Tudor Sarver

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____ _____
Gloria Park, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of English, Advisor

_____ _____
Bennett A. Rafoth, Ed.D.
Professor of English, University Professor

_____ _____
Dr. Susan E. Welsh
Associate Professor of English

ACCEPTED

_____ _____
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: “Doing School” Right: How University Students from Diverse Backgrounds Construct their Academic Literacies and Academic Identities

Author: Whitney Ann Tudor Sarver

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Gloria Park

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Bennett A. Rafoth
Dr. Susan E. Welsh

This study explores the academic lives of three multilingual undergraduate student writers in order to better understand how they have constructed their academic literacies and academic identities since taking the required English courses at a mid-sized state university. Within the overarching discussions of academic discourse and the idea of western academic discourse (e.g., Bizzell, 1992; Canagarajah, 2002; Flowerdew, 2002; Hyland, 2000), the academic literacies model (e.g., Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Blanton, 2005; Lea & Street, 2006; Seloni, 2012), genre theory and pedagogy (e.g., Cheng, 2007, 2008, 2011; Dean, 2008; Hyland, 2004; Johns, 2009), and academic identities as constructed through academic socialization and “doing school” (e.g., Pope, 2001; Valenzuela 1999), the following research questions are addressed:

How do students from diverse backgrounds develop their academic literacies and academic socialization in the undergraduate context?

- How does a student situate him/herself within the academic community?
- How does genre theory/pedagogy play out in a student’s development of academic literacies or academic socialization?
- How is academic identity constructed within writing, and how can it contribute to academic literacy development?

This study employs case study methodology (Yin, 2009) because doing an in-depth focus on each individual participant provided multiple sources of data, which in turn allow for an accurate understanding and depiction of the participants experiences and negotiations with academic literacy, socialization, and identity development. Data was collected in various ways: semi-structured interviews, monthly blogs, literacy autobiographies, and documents produced during the data collection period for classes in which the participants were enrolled.

Following data analysis, four themes emerge: (1) challenging the undergraduate liberal arts curricula; (2) privileging English courses in the liberal arts curricula; (3) constructing good student versus "doing school" identities; and (4) perceiving written work as writing or non-writing. Understanding the experiences of the participants in relation to the themes leads to pedagogical, curricular, and professional development implications to allow teachers and administrators to assist students in the development of their academic literacies, academic socialization, and academic identities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I must thank my dissertation advisor, Dr. Gloria Park, for her constant support of me and this work. When I came to her—after two years of not working on a dissertation—and asked her to help me, she jumped in without hesitation. I am grateful for her tireless enthusiasm for her own scholarship and teaching as well as for her students and their work. I would also like to thank my readers, Dr. Bennett A. Rafoth and Dr. Susan E. Welsh, for agreeing to share their knowledge, expertise, and criticism when it was most needed.

Next, I thank Dr. Claude M. Hurlbert who knew better than I did when he suggested that my original dissertation topic wasn't working anymore. He lifted a weight from my shoulders and encouraged me not to give up but to simply change direction. It was with that encouragement that I went on to conduct this study and write this work.

My husband, Jay W. Sarver, deserves a medal for all the times that he encouraged me, chided me, pushed me, pulled me, and otherwise convinced me that I deserved to and needed to write this dissertation. Thank you, Jay, for always believing in me.

My family has supported all of my endeavors, wholeheartedly, ever since I can remember. I'd especially like to thank my parents, Ed and Ann, for their love, support, and understanding of this project and of me—from the time I told them I was moving to South Korea to teach to when I told them I was changing dissertation topics AND committees—I could not have done this without them. I also thank my younger brother, Joshua, for his quiet support and encouragement. I know that he and my parents are proud. Also important and ever present in the completion of this work is the memory and loving support of my maternal grandmother—my Nana—who, when I was an unhappy

chemistry/pre-med undergraduate student, reminded me that I could be whatever I wanted to be. It didn't matter, as long as I was happy.

There is no way I can individually thank all of my many IUP friends and colleagues for their interest and support in my work as both a teacher and a scholar. But, I would like to extend a special thank you to the following IUP folks: Amanda Goldberg, Dawn Fels, Maggie Herb, Christine Pristash, and Ann Amicucci for sharing their lives and their own writing processes, successes, heartaches, and advice. Thank you, my dear friends, for always sharing with me.

This dissertation would not exist without my students—especially the student participants of this study: Will, Nkiruka, and Drew. I am a teacher, first and foremost, and I appreciate the opportunities that these students have given me to learn and understand their academic experiences and endeavors in the hopes of making my classroom and pedagogy better.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this dissertation and all the work behind it to my daughter, Emma Lovell Sarver. Remember that you can be whatever you want to be, as long as you are happy. And I promise, my darling girl, that you will never actually have to read any of this.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
One	INTRODUCTION	1
	Conceptualizing the Study	1
	Pedagogical Awakening	1
	Research Questions	3
	Connecting to the Fields of Composition and TESOL	3
	Understanding Academic Literacies and Research Literacies	4
	Development of Research Focus	6
	Emerging Syllabus Design	6
	Understanding my Students through their Literacy Autobiographies	9
	Research Approach	11
	Researcher Positionality	14
	Chapter Organization and Beyond	14
Two	LITERATURE REVIEW	16
	Western Academic Discourse	18
	The Academic Literacies Model	21
	Academic Identities constructed via Academic Socialization and "Doing School"	36
	Academic Socialization and "doing school"	36
	Academic Identities Construction	41
	Genre Theory/Genre Pedagogy	52
	Summary of the Review of Literature and Research Focus	60
Three	METHODOLOGY	64
	Constructing Teacher-Scholar Positionality	64
	Qualitative Research Design	67
	Case Study Methodology	68
	Research Context	72
	Site	72
	Understanding the Research Writing Course at MPU	72
	Prospective Participants	74
	Data Collection	76
	Literacy Autobiography	77
	Individual Semi-structured Interviews	78
	Virtual Writing (Blog Space)	79
	Documents	81
	My Teaching Journal and Field Notes	81
	Data Analysis	82

Trustworthiness of the Study and Ethical Considerations 83
Chapter Summary 85

Four THE ACADEMIC LIVES OF THREE UNDERGRADUATES.....86

Will Russo: "My mind isn't very open to new literacy" 87
Background.....87
Within the Academic Community 88
"Doing School".....90
Academic Writing.....93
Will's Academic Identity.....98
Interpretive Analysis of Will's Academic Literacies Development and Socialization.....99
Nkiruka Adichie: "Nobody knows I'm an international".....101
Background.....101
Within the Academic Community 103
"Doing School".....105
Academic Writing.....106
Nkiruka's Academic Identity.....112
Interpretive Analysis of Nkiruka's Academic Literacies Development and Socialization.....114
Drew Kingston: "Not going to college wasn't an option".....115
Background.....115
Within the Academic Community 117
"Doing School".....119
Academic Writing.....120
Drew's Academic Identity 124
Interpretive Analysis of Drew's Academic Literacies Development and Socialization.....125
Chapter Summary 127

Five UNDERSTANDING THREE ACADEMIC LIVES.....128

Revisiting the Purpose of the Study.....128
Discussion of the Themes 129
Theme One: Challenging the Undergraduate Liberal Arts Curricula 129
Theme Two: Privileging English Courses in the Liberal Arts Curricula 132
Theme Three: Constructing Good Student Versus "Doing School" Identities.....134
Theme Four: Perceiving Written Work as Writing or Non-Writing 139
Implications for Teaching, Curricular Development and Professional Development 143

Future Research Directions....145
Reflections of a Teacher-Scholar....146

REFERENCES....151

APPENDICES....163

Appendix A—Syllabus for Research Writing Class....163
Appendix B—Initial Email Message Regarding Participation....173
Appendix C—Informed Consent Form....174
Appendix D—Voluntary Consent Form....176
Appendix E—Sample Interview Questions....177
Appendix F—Blog Prompts....178
Appendix G—IRB Approval Letter....179

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Date and Duration of Interviews.....79

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Conceptualizing the Study

Having taught a class designed around the concept of research writing for the past several years at Midwest Public University (hereafter referred to as MPU, a pseudonym), I have come to think more and more about this class and my students' navigation of this class. My experiences and observations teaching this class each semester have been quite varied, but one observation remains: most students do not see the importance of taking yet another writing class, especially one as specific as research writing.

Pedagogical Awakening

My dissertation developed slowly, and it was after an experience in a class I taught in the fall of 2009 that I began to formulate more of what I wanted to know about my students and how they learn to do research writing. Research writing at MPU is a requirement—all students have to take this class in order to graduate. Most of my students are native English speakers (NES), or monolingual writers. However, there are times when I have non-native English speakers (NNES), World Englishes (WE) speakers,[1] and Generation 1.5 students[2] throughout my classes; hence, the term multilingual writers will be used to denote these linguistically and culturally diverse students. As an English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher trained to understand the

[1] "Over the last 25 years, the terms 'world Englishes' and 'new Englishes' have been widely used to refer to the localized forms of English found throughout the world, particularly with reference to the Caribbean, West and East Africa, and parts of Asia" (Bolton, 2005, p. 69; see also Kachru & Nelson, 2006).

[2] Generation 1.5 refers to the student who has needs between those of a first generation and a second generation learner. Goen et al. (2002) define this type of student as "those immigrants who arrived in the U.S. at a young age, learned English primarily through informal means, received most or all of their education in the U.S., and entered college with language and literacy profiles somewhere between those of a 'basic writer' and 'ESL [English as a Second Language] student'" (p. 103).

differences that make up my students' identities and then enact appropriate pedagogies, and as one who has taken numerous classes on second language acquisition, second language literacies and discourses, cultural awareness, etc., I strive to make my activities culturally sensitive (Gay, 2002), regardless of the student makeup of the room. To me, this idea of cultural sensitivity involves an understanding that students may or may not have the background to participate in the activities I design. This might include the understanding that their cultural experiences may not allow them to participate in certain discussions, activities, or group work. Therefore, as a teacher, I need to be aware of my students' backgrounds and experiences so that those students can participate as much as possible, regardless of who they are or where they come from.

With that said, however, one day, I had given the students a task to complete concerning description. I asked them to pick their favorite movie or television show, describe the set without using any identifying names, and then the class was to guess what the movie or show was. The object of the activity was to get the students to consider the importance of detailed description in their writing in addition to being a fun activity. I walked around the room, watching the students struggle over how exactly they were going to describe their show, and I noticed one of my NNES students staring out the window, looking at his feet, fumbling with this pen, totally disengaged from the activity. I realized then that I had done something that was unfair; I had asked this student to come into a culturally specific activity with background knowledge that he didn't have, and complete an activity that would only illustrate that he wasn't "from here." That is when I began to wonder—what can I do in a classroom with mostly NES students, in a class

designed to introduce students to the western-based academic discourse found in research papers, when I have NNES, WE or Generation 1.5 individuals as my students?

Research Questions

Through this pedagogical awakening, I began thinking about how I could situate this study, which led to the following main research question with several ancillary questions to help address the main question:

How do students from diverse backgrounds develop their academic literacies and academic socialization in the undergraduate context?

- How does a student situate him/herself within the academic community?
- How does genre theory/pedagogy play out in a student's development of academic literacies or academic socialization?
- How is academic identity constructed within writing, and how can it contribute to academic literacy development?

Connecting to the Fields of Composition and TESOL

While this research developed from one teacher's personal experience in her classroom, the experiences of the participants in this dissertation could be applied to other contexts as well. Scholars and teachers often think about students as having specialized or different issues and problems within the academic context—whether in a "regular" composition class or in an ESL class in an intensive English program. However, the experiences and negotiations of students in these types of classes could be similar. I believe that my research shows the resourcefulness of my participants in fitting into the academy and developing their academic literacies. I am not trying to generalize the experiences of all students; however, I think that the experiences of my participants

provide insight into how all students, regardless of linguistic or academic association, could potentially understand and negotiate their experiences within the academy.

Understanding Academic Literacies and Research Literacies

The field of academic literacies[3] has been growing due to the expansion of literacy development research in higher education (e.g., Zamel & Spack, 1998; Lea & Street, 2006;Seloni, 2012). The term academic literacies refers to a complex understanding of particular languages, cultures and situations found in various academic situations, which Zamel and Spack (1998) define as follows:

> academic literacy, which once denoted simply the ability to read and write college level texts, now must embrace multiple approaches to knowledge. Hence, our use of the term academic *literacies*. College classrooms have become sites where different languages and cultures intersect, including the various discourses of students, teachers, and researchers. (p. ix)

Students now not only have to learn how to read and write at the college level, but they also must learn how to develop specialized knowledges and understandings which are dependent upon the academic situations that they find themselves in. Due to my interest in how my students are developing these academic literacy skills—which involve not only developing reading and writing skills, but also coming to understand and engage in situations where diverse learners, cultures, and perspectives are woven together, creating knowledge based on their unique experiences and interactions with others—I thought more about how my syllabus was constructed.

[3] A more complete discussion of academic literacies can be found in chapter two.

My interest in how students develop their academic literacies within research writing, in essence how they "do school" (Pope, 2001) in terms of research, led me to develop a syllabus that was geared around the idea of understanding reading and writing in the academy. As Pope (2001) defines it, "'doing school' means 'going through the correct motions' of school—not necessarily learning what is being taught or engaging with the subjects" (p. 4). While students may be learning some things, these are not things that *they* believe will be useful to them in the future. Their idea of "doing school" means understanding how to navigate the system—how to get the grades, classes, special treatment, etc., that they want and/or think they deserve. In this sense, the idea of "doing school" is not necessarily something students should be, nor are they, proud of, though it is something that they do. They have learned how to beat the system. I believe that my students have also learned how to "do school" at the high school level; they have learned how to produce "good" writing, how to write the lab report their chemistry teacher wants, how to answer questions on the state mandated assessment tests. However, they now need to learn how to "do school" at the university level. In this case, I believe that "doing school" at the university level is a bit different. Students may still need to learn how to do particular things for particular professors, but it is more important that students understand what it means to belong to the university community and to utilize what they are learning throughout their academic careers. I think that this idea of belonging should contribute to the students' success, since with a sense of belonging comes a sense of investment (Norton, 2000). Therefore, I believe that learning how to "do school" is not necessarily a negative, as implied by Pope's work.

Development of Research Focus

Emerging Syllabus Design

The syllabus I designed for my research writing class addressed what reading, writing and research mean in the academy, and was designed to help my students understand what it means to join the academic conversation of their field (See Appendix A for the syllabus). Simply put, I want my students to understand what their field looks and sounds like—the academic writing and academic conversation that is going on in terms of the research being done. Canagarajah (2002) discusses the academy and the academic conversation: the academy is another name for the academic community to which scholars, students, professors, researchers, etc., belong. It is a discourse community—defined as a way to "provide identity and group solidarity to their members, while socializing them into community-based values and norms" (p. 162). More simply put, the discourse community, the academy in this case, is a group of people who share a language, values, and a reality with each other, but at the same time, embrace and celebrate multiple perspectives and discourses within that community. Canagarajah (2002) continues to discuss the idea of writing, and writing within a specific community: "writing—in fact, any act of communication—is a social activity. We are addressing others when we speak or write. Even when we write for ourselves, we don't use a private symbol system, but language that is socially constructed" (p. 161). Because writing is a social act, and occurs within a specific discourse community, there are certain expectations and ways of understanding that members of the community are privy to. To write is equal to joining a conversation.

It is with this understanding of the academy, and therefore the community associated with it, that I wish to teach my students what it means to belong to the academic conversation. Canagarajah (2002) supports this idea by saying that "the writing classroom can serve to initiate students into the ways and words of the academy" (p. 162). This is one of my primary goals in my research writing class—helping students understand what it means to read and write within the academy. This is by no means a simple undertaking. Because each field is different, each conversation is different. MacDonald (1987) discusses those variations that exist within academic writing: "research physicists pass along to students notions of writing formed through their own research, while philosophers pass along different notions because of the discipline of philosophy. The formal features that vary from one discipline to another… internalized, implicit assumptions that exist within disciplines" (p. 315). I want my students to be able to read and contribute to their field—whatever that field is—by knowing what the conversation looks and sounds like: understanding what those features of academic writing look like (see also Elbow, 1991; MacDonald, 2010). They achieve this understanding by reading and analyzing academic articles, by conducting research, and by writing their own research-based papers according to standards set forth by the academy and their individual fields of study.

The class I designed was informed by genre theory and, in turn, genre pedagogy (Cheng, 2008; Dean, 2008; Hyland, 2004; Johns, 2009). "Genre theory is based on the idea that writing is social and that it responds to situations; consequently, writing isn't the same for every person or every situation" (Dean, 2008, p. 3). The very idea of what genre means should also be defined. It seems quite simple, but it is actually very complex. I

will go into more detail in my literature review, but for now, I will use the brief definition that Dean (2008) offers: genre refers to "texts developed in and responding to recurring situations" (p. 10). Dean's definitions mesh well with Canagarajah's (2002) understanding of the academy, as mentioned above. It was this combination of ideas that led to the research writing class I designed.

My idea was that helping students identify and understand genres and rhetorical patterns within western academic discourse would help them become more "rhetorically flexible" with their own writing (Johns, 2009). Johns (2009) defines "rhetorical flexibility" as a tool which "enables [the students] to move from the familiar, assess an academic situation, and write successfully in the genre that each situation requires" (p. 204). This idea of rhetorical flexibility would then, hopefully, allow the students to develop another tool to use in order to better participate in and understand the academic conversations related to the academy and to their fields once they left my class—an understanding of reading and writing within the academy.

Designing my class in this way was informed by many questions that I had about literacy, western academic expectations, professorial expectations and student expectations: What do professors and the academy expect undergraduate students to be able to do in research writing classrooms? What do professors expect students to be able to do in their major/field in terms of research after having completed a required research writing class? What do students expect to be able to do in terms of research and writing after having completed a required research writing class? What are the differences between a native, a non-native, a World Englishes, and a generation 1.5 student in terms

of their academic literacies—or more specifically, their research literacy? Do students transfer what they have learned to other forms of academic writing that they must do?

Although these are not the actual research questions for my dissertation, asking these questions provided me with ways to reflect on the answers to the questions, my thinking, and my teaching. These insights then allowed me to focus on my pedagogy and curriculum for research writing.

I conducted the class following the syllabus I designed, in part to help me understand some of these questions, but also to help my students understand these questions. Most professors, from what my former students have told me, expect students to be able to write and research without any difficulties after having completed a sophomore level writing class. Unfortunately, research writing is not inherent. It is a very specific genre within academic writing, and then within research writing, there are many sub-genres that students are expected to master. There is also the idea of research writing within each specific field situated in the academy. A lot of my students, when they enter the class, have no concept of what it means to do research outside of visiting Google, and they are certainly anxious about how to then take that research and write an academic paper.

Understanding my Students through their Literacy Autobiographies

Also influencing my research interests and research questions are my students' literacy autobiographies and my own reflective teaching journal. The literacy autobiography was the first assignment I gave my students. The prompt, found in the syllabus, is as follows:

> Please write 2-3 pages (double spaced) in response to the questions below. Think about this assignment as a way to explore your understanding of literacy, academics, and yourself as a researcher and writer. What types of research, reading, and writing have you done with your student life? What are your experiences doing research and/or writing research papers? Who or what has influenced your reading and writing within and beyond your school life? (see Appendix A)

I stressed to my students that the length limit on the assignment was to get them to consider important aspects of their reading and writing selves, and that of course they could not tell me their entire life story in two or three pages. Because the subtitle of my research writing class was "Literacies in the Academy," the purpose of the literacy autobiography was to allow the students an opportunity to think about and understand what they already knew about themselves and about literacy—specifically, their own literacy.

I found upon reading these autobiographies that many students' experiences with reading and writing were not positive in terms of their school lives, and their experiences with research and research papers were very small and restricted. Understanding my students' situations and experiences then made it easier to design the class activities to meet their needs. I was also better able to think about my own research interests and begin to further formulate my research question of how students develop their academic literacies. I have retained the literacy autobiographies of my participants,[4] and discuss

[4] These literacy autobiographies were returned to me, at my request, after grades were submitted for the semester and after the students had agreed to participate in the study.

those further in chapter four. Naturally, each participant's experience is unique, but there are similarities that arise when they are compared with each other. I will go into further detail in chapter four and explore how my participants have learned how to do school, focusing particularly on their understanding and negotiation of how to position themselves within the academy in terms of their writing development and their development of academic literacy.

I kept a teaching journal the entire semester that I was teaching the research writing class. Every day, I would reflect on what had happened in the class that day. My journal was divided into 3 sections: Overview; Interactions; and Questions, Thoughts, Comments. In the Overview section, I described what I asked the students to do for that class period. In the Interactions section, I focused on how the students interacted with the material, with each other, and with me. In the Questions, Thoughts, Comments section, I reflected on how the students had interacted, I posed questions about what could be done differently, and I considered changes that could or should be made in terms of the course and class design.

My reflective teaching journal was used in my data collection and analysis in order to consider how I negotiated the course that I designed; my reflections influenced the way I taught the course, and in turn, affected how the students understood and learned from the course.

Research Approach

From my own classroom, I identified several students with whom I conducted my research— NES, NNES, WE and Generation 1.5 undergraduate research writing students—in other words, multilingual writers. After having completed my class, and

after their grades were submitted, I approached a number of these students and asked them to consider participating in my study. I initially sent an e-mail asking my students to meet with me to discuss the possibility of their participation in my research (see Appendix B). During the initial meeting, the possible participants were given the informed consent form (see Appendix C), and if they consented, they filled out and kept a copy of the voluntary consent form (see Appendix D). I began this study with six participants; however, three dropped out due to various reasons. The three participants that are discussed in this dissertation are Will Russo,[5] Nkiruka Adichie, and Drew Kingston. Their backgrounds and stories are further explicated in chapters three and four.

I approached my research using case study methodology (Yin, 2009) because doing an in-depth focus on each individual participant provided me with multiple sources of data, which in turn allowed me to accurately understand and depict my participants' experiences and negotiations with academic literacy development. I used several forms of data in order to complete my analysis. I looked at my students' literacy autobiographies, I conducted semi-structured interviews, I asked my students to respond to a monthly blog, and I collected a variety of documents from my participants which included work done for the research writing class already completed (from Spring 2010) as well as any work they were doing in their classes during the semester of data collection (Spring 2011). As I mentioned earlier, my participants had already written literacy autobiographies as part of the class. These were used to help me understand the complex nature of each individual's literacy history.

[5] A pseudonym—all participants' names have been changed. The pseudonyms were chosen, by me, at the request of the participants. It was important that I chose names which honored the cultural and linguistic heritage as well as the personality of each participant. All of the participants approved their pseudonyms.

I interviewed the participants several times, and all interviews were digitally audio recorded and transcribed. I began by interviewing the students about their histories and their experiences in my class as well as their experiences within other university classes, focusing mainly on the ways in which they saw how they have been taught and then how they use writing as part of their academic identity (see Appendix E for a list of types of questions).

I asked participants to utilize journaling through blogging on a monthly basis. This was an online writing space, moderated by me, which allowed the participants room to reflect on what types of writing they were working on in their classes during the course of the semester. I then intended to incorporate information from their blog entries into the interviews. This method of data collection did not go as well as I had intended, as I discuss further in chapter three.

My teaching journal, class syllabus and field notes served to enrich my research, and they allowed me to chronicle my own experiences teaching the research writing class. These are important for understanding my research questions because they complete the picture I create using interviews, collected documents, etc. They also served as reflections of my teaching and my researching process which helped me continuously consider the design of my study, as well.

For data used from these and all exchanges, pseudonyms were assigned. All student participants' identifying information (name, student number, etc) was replaced with pseudonyms during the photocopying process, with all originals being returned to the participants.

Researcher Positionality

Having had a prolonged relationship with my participants as former students, I have formed a unique relationship with them as both an instructor and a researcher, which allows me to present a multi-faceted understanding of their experiences. In addition, my experiences teaching the research writing class over several semesters has allowed me to design my class based on my experiences with several students—not simply my participants. This experience gives me a unique perspective from which I can understand my students' interpretations and memories of their literacy experiences.

While I do have a relationship with all of my participants, and this allows me to better understand and interpret their experiences, it can also be a potential limitation to the research. Because I was in a position of authority when we began our relationship, it may be that my participants still felt as if they had to act or answer questions in a certain way. To aid in establishing credibility for my research, I prepared field notes as I conducted the study in order to, as accurately as possible, record my experiences. In addition, in order to present thick description,[6] I engaged in member checking, which involved the participants reviewing interview transcripts, in order to represent the experiences of my participants as truthfully as possible.

Chapter Organization and Beyond

Chapter one served as an introduction to my research by providing context for the development of my research interests and research questions. Chapter two serves as an in-depth review of literature. My third chapter discusses the case study methodology

[6] Thick description is difficult to define, but "to thickly describe social action is actually to begin to interpret it by recording the circumstances, meanings, intentions, strategies, motivations, and so on…it is this interpretive characteristic of description rather than detail per se that makes it thick" (Schwandt, 2007, p. 296).

which I employed for data collection and analysis, and the fourth chapter consists of data analysis in terms of the presentation of the participants' narratives. Finally, the conclusion discusses themes, as well as addresses pedagogical implications and recommendations for professionals who are teaching students how to "do school" right.

In the next chapter, I develop my understanding of the literature that informs my dissertation. I define and discuss the concepts of western academic discourse, the academic literacies model, academic socialization, academic identity construction, and genre theory and pedagogy. An understanding of this literature allows me to situate my dissertation in the fields of both composition and TESOL, showing a need for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

As I discussed in the introduction, my research developed out of a long process of thinking, re-thinking, and looking at my own teaching and views on composition and literacy, as well as trying to understand how my students were viewing writing, the academy and how they fit into the academic conversation. As Canagarajah (2002) notes, writing is a social act, with certain expectations dependent on the particulars of the community the writer wishes to join. These differing expectations have driven me to investigate how multilingual writers are developing their academic literacy and academic socialization. How do students see themselves fitting into the academic community—in other words, how are students developing the literacy and socialization necessary to succeed at the undergraduate level?

Within the overarching discussions of academic discourse and the idea of western academic discourse (e.g., Bizzell, 1992; Canagarajah, 2002; Flowerdew, 2002; Graff, 1992; Hyland, 2000; Lemke, 1989), the academic literacies model (e.g., Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Blanton, 2005; Lea & Street, 2006; Seloni, 2012; Zamel & Spack, 1998), genre theory and pedagogy (e.g., Cheng, 2007, 2008; Dean, 2008; Hyland, 2004; Johns, 2009), and academic identities as constructed through academic socialization and "doing school" (e.g., Pope, 2001; Valenzuela 1999), the purpose of this review is to raise awareness of the importance of teaching students how to negotiate western academic discourse in order to develop their academic literacies, academic socialization, and academic identities, as well as their understanding of the academic communities to which

they belong. I am interested in how this combination contributes to their understanding and success at the undergraduate level.

I conducted a thorough literature review which includes thirteen years of scholarship of six academic journals, from 1999 to 2012. These included three journals associated with the field of TESOL[7] and three associated with the field of composition.[8] I also reviewed doctoral dissertations available through the ProQuest Digital Dissertations database from 2005 to 2010. The parameters for the literature review included a search for academic literacies, academic socialization and academic identity. Each journal was chosen for its association with the field, as well as for the likelihood that it would contain academic articles related to my research. In order to conduct my literature review, I began by reviewing titles and abstracts for each issue. When there was no abstract, I skimmed the article, continually looking for mention of academic literacies, academic socialization, and academic identity. All of the journal articles that I found that addressed these three issues were qualitative in nature, and many of those used case study methodology.

My examination of the six journals yielded several articles that I have included here in order to illustrate how I situate my research in the larger scholarly conversation, taking into consideration the connection between the ideas, theories and pedagogies found in the composition and TESOL journals. I also show the need for my own research and how I contribute to the academic conversation by narrowing the gap that I have found within the scholarship of TESOL and composition. I believe that my own research

[7] *The Journal of Second Language Writing; Journal of Language, Identity and Education*; and *English for Specific Purposes*

[8] *College Composition and Communication*; *College English*; and *Composition Studies*

is situated within the fields of both composition studies and TESOL. By discussing the concepts in the order that I do, I establish a relationship between the previous research and my own research questions. The previous research provides my study with a background, or framework, and illustrates the need for continued research, thus leading to my interest in how students are developing their academic literacies and academic socialization in the undergraduate context.

As for the dissertations reviewed, I looked at dissertations published over a five year period beginning with 2005 and continuing to 2010. I found 39 dissertations that address the concepts of academic literacy, academic socialization, and academic identity. I reviewed titles and abstracts for mentions of these concepts; after cross-referencing, I found that no dissertations that mentioned academic literacy or socialization also appeared during the search for academic identity development. However, there were four dissertations that I felt illustrated support for my own research, and I have included them in this literature review.

Western Academic Discourse

Western academic discourse is an important concept to define and consider because it informs my understanding and teaching of my research writing class, from which this research developed. In addition, understanding western academic discourse helps in thinking about the issues I am most interested in: academic literacies, academic socialization, and academic identity. Unfortunately, in western academic discourse, there is a right and wrong way of producing effective, acceptable academic writing and discussion (e.g., Bartholomae, 1985; Canagarajah, 2002; Graff, 1992; Hyland, 2000; Lemke, 1989).

This leads me to the idea that academic discourse and, therefore, academic writing is context specific. Hyland (2000) notes that "successful academic writing depends on the individual writer's projection of a shared professional context" (p. 1). Therefore, whether or not the student is successful depends on how the student interprets the context, not on how the context is defined by the profession. In fact, "[academic] writing therefore displays a professional competence in discipline approved practices. It is these practices, I [Hyland] suggest, and not abstract and disengaged beliefs and theories, that principally define what disciplines are" (Hyland, 2000, p. 1). Ultimately, the discipline defines the writing, and the writing defines the discipline. This is the way of the academy. People are not born with inherent knowledge of the academic community to which they will belong; therefore, they must learn how to negotiate this academic community. In addition, they must be socialized, by members of the academy, into navigating this community successfully (see also Canagarajah, 2002; MacDonald, 1987; MacDonald, 2010).

In an example of discussing the complexity of defining and teaching "academic discourse," Bizzell (1999) discusses traditional academic discourse, and then moves on to a discussion of what she is calling "hybrid" academic discourses. Traditional academic discourse is alive and well, but it is also now "sharing the field with new forms of discourse, and [Bizzell] believe[s] that is happening at least in part because the academic population is becoming more diverse" (Bizzell, 1999, p. 11). She goes on to offer some traits of hybrid academic discourse, which include writing in a non-standard form, using non-traditional cultural references, using personal experience, using humor, and coming to the main point indirectly (p. 16). Her suggestions for teaching hybrid discourses amount to giving students the chance and the authority to experiment with academic

discourses—allowing them to create their own hybrid discourse rather than teaching more standard forms of hybrid academic discourses.

Bizzell (1999) shows that the academy, and therefore, the academic discourse of the academy, is expanding. Her discussion of academic discourses illustrates an understanding of the increasingly diverse student population, and addresses the fact that these diverse students will come to the academy with certain experiences, beliefs and values that can positively impact their academic socialization and academic literacy development (see also Bawarshi, 2006; Canagarajah, 2006; Hawisher, Selfe, Guo, & Liu, 2006).

Because academic discourse is context specific, it is only logical to suggest that different types of academic discourse are context specific as well. One of the most difficult things for any student to become accustomed to upon entering the university is the academic discourse required by the academy and by their particular field. NES learners find the academy daunting; this is especially true for multilingual learners who have not necessarily had all of their schooling in the western system. Their knowledge of the required academic discourse, their academic literacy, is more limited because their western academic socialization has not reached its full potential yet. The multilingual learners' dominant academic discourse is that of their native culture—they are not necessarily privy to the literacy required by the western academy. And, going from one academic community to another can be challenging, especially in a second language context. The importance of developing academic literacies leads to a better understanding of the required academic discourse, thereby allowing students to succeed within the academy.

The Academic Literacies Model

Academic literacies, as defined in chapter one, refers to a complex understanding of particular languages, cultures and situations found in various academic situations (Zamel & Spack, 1998). This is an important concept for this dissertation because my research question is centered on how students develop their academic literacies. Lea and Street (2006) explain the importance of the academic literacies perspective and the results of using this perspective within writing programs at two separate universities in the United Kingdom, which builds upon their previous work on literacy development—specifically that of academic literacy (Lea, 2004; Lea & Street, 1998, 1999; Street, 1995). Their work, in turn, is informed by New Literacy Studies, which views literacy as social practice (Barton & Hamilton, 1998). Barton and Hamilton (1998) define literacy as "primarily something people do; it is an activity, located between thought and text…. Like all human activity, literacy is essentially social, and it is located in the interaction between people" (p. 3). Lea and Street's research, and New Literacy Studies, was designed to contribute to and expand how literacy is viewed and defined.

According to Lea and Street (2006), "a dominant feature of academic literacy practices is the requirement to switch their [the students'] writing styles and genres between one setting and another, to deploy a repertoire of literacy practices appropriate to each setting, and to handle the social meanings and identities that each evokes" (p. 368). This idea further develops what many researchers and teachers previously used as approaches to writing, learning and literacy. The "academic literacies model" is both an expansion and a combination of other learning/teaching models: study skills, which looks at the specifics of writing and literacy rather than the content, and the academic

socialization model, which is focused around the students' "acculturation into disciplinary and subject-based discourse and genres" (p. 369). My own research, having developed from a class designed around and grounded in genre theory and pedagogy, goes beyond the basics of genre pedagogy and the academic socialization model because it takes into consideration ideas which are central to the "academic literacies model." That is to say, "paying particular attention to the relationships of power, authority, meaning making, and identity that are implicit in the use of literacy practices within specific institutional settings" (p. 370). Not only were my students working towards an understanding of what it means to write a research paper, but they were also working towards being able to successfully navigate the literacy expectations of the field to which they belonged.

The work of Goldschmidt and Ousey (2006) illustrates the ideas of Lea and Street (2006) and how the theory/model of academic literacies can impact a specific population of students. Goldschmidt and Ousey (2006) discuss a class that was designed to help immigrant students who had graduated from American high schools and were preparing to enter college. Students' misconceptions and expectations about the reality of college, in terms of ideas such as grades, language proficiency, and the "culture of the academy" had the potential to greatly limit their academic success (p. 18). Likewise, faculty members also had misconceptions and expectations about these students because they had graduated from American high schools. Faculty members often expected these immigrant students to perform and have the same academic background and understanding as American born students.

According to Goldschmidt and Ousey (2006), this preparatory class is successful because it allows the students to begin developing their academic literacies and their understanding of what it means to be part of the academic community prior to the actual start of the academic year. For example, students study syllabi from several courses in order to understand the faculty members' expectations, as well as to understand how much reading, writing and studying are expected in the class. As Goldschmidt and Ousey (2006) state, "The students are shocked! They soon realize that for every hour they are in class, they are expected to (and will need to) study 2-3 hours outside of class" (p. 20). In addition to the syllabus activity mentioned above, students learn and discuss the misconceptions and expectations of both themselves and faculty, they interact with faculty members to understand what the faculty members expect as well as to illustrate their understanding of what it means to be in college, and they learn strategies to deal with things such as time management, reading loads, literacy skills, part-time jobs, etc. These interactions between the faculty members and the students allow both the students and the faculty members to understand what it means to work together, what it means to be part of their particular academic community, and how they can both be a part of helping the students to succeed at the college level. Preparing students to be members of the academic community allows them to develop their academic literacies as well as their understanding of institutional, departmental and faculty expectations, all of which contribute to their success at the university level.

In another example of helping students develop their academic literacies, Blanton (2005) discusses her experiences observing two ESL university students and their struggles with literacy. She refers often to the experiences of the two students, but her

work ultimately discusses the necessity of helping university level students develop their overall literacy rather than specific composition skills; it is often the case with students, especially those identified as Generation 1.5, that they never developed literacy skills in their first languages. Therefore, it is of more importance to teach skills dealing with their overall literacy development rather than just putting them in classes such as remedial composition (p. 110). She gives several suggestions, such as allowing lower level students to shadow more experienced students, finding alternative courses for students to take that would foster their literacy development rather than test their composition skills, and providing "tailor-made instruction—not a one-size-fits-all curriculum" (p. 118). These adjustments would give students with limited literacy experiences the chance to join the academic community and a chance to develop their academic literacies and potential.

Continuing the discussion of generation 1.5 students and academic literacy negotiation, Crosby's (2007) dissertation was a case study of three generation 1.5 undergraduate students in their first year of study at an American university. Her study "focuses on the academic literacies difficulties these students experienced as well as the strategic practices they utilized to overcome these difficulties and complete the academic literacies tasks" (abstract). Naturally the experiences of the participants varied, but Crosby (2007) found that the difficulties that the student had was due to "the situatedness of academic literacies" rather than the fact that they identified as generation 1.5. The study also identified that the participants had a different understanding of academic literacies than did their instructors, which influenced their navigation of their first year of university course work.

Crosby's (2007) research is important to consider because she looked at a particular group of first year undergraduates and their experiences with academic literacy development. My own work looks at multilingual undergraduate writing students. I studied students who were past their first year of study, hoping to find out how their experiences in the liberal arts classes impacted their understandings and negotiations of their own academic literacies development.

Jones (2000) discusses ways in which he asks first-year composition students to examine academic discourse and academic expectations, much the way Blanton (2005), Goldschmidt and Ousey (2006), and Crosby (2007) asked their students to do. Jones (2000) asks his students to consider the conflict that exists between academic writing and personal writing, and this is how he conducts his class, with this consideration of conflict in mind. He believes that this alternative approach to teaching academic discourse is beneficial to the students and their ability to compose academic discourse. He asks them to read and respond to a variety of academic texts, and by reading and responding to a variety of scholars, students understand what it means to write within the academic community; "many are able to realize some of the benefits as well as the limits of academic discourses" (110). This knowledge of what it means to write within the academic community varies within the particular academic discourses in which the student has situated himself. Jones (2000) contributes to the discussion of academic literacy because he is illustrating an attempt to get students to consider the benefits and limits of academic discourse. By considering the benefits and limits, students are developing an understanding of what it means to belong to the academic community, and what it means to write within this community—how to navigate the western academic

discourse. And as Canagarajah (2002), MacDonald (1987, 2010) and others have said, this academic discourse and academic writing is specific to the community or field in which the student is situated. Learning to recognize these differences and what certain discourse communities expect are all part of developing academic literacy.

In order to look more closely at the development of a specific academic literacy skill, as opposed to the broader understanding that Jones (2000) and Blanton (2005) discuss, Davis and Shadle (2000) look at the research paper as moving past the traditional model and into an alternative method for teaching and writing the academic research paper. They begin with a discussion of how research writing has become stagnate and that research assignments are teaching students to reproduce boring, uninteresting academic discourse that is completely irrelevant to anyone, especially the students. What the authors are suggesting, in their re-envisioning of the research paper, is what they term "alternative research writing" (p. 421). They see this idea for the research paper as, "a broadened field for composing, the practices of alternative research writing enact a revised understanding of the purpose of academic work" (p. 421). In their view, alternative research writing expands the researcher's, writer's, and academic's understanding of what research is and "mixes the personal and the public and values the imagination as much as the intellect" (p. 422).

Davis and Shadle (2000) survey alternative research writing methods in order to look for a way to get back to the original intention of the research paper, which was to create knowledge. In turn, they discuss "the research argument, research essay, personal research paper, and multi-genre/media/disciplinary/cultural research project….viewed consecutively, these methods trace a movement away from the template discourse of the

research paper and into an increasingly complex world of rhetorical choices" (p. 427). Their understanding is that these alternative forms of research writing represent a progression, taking the student-researcher away from the scripted, fill-in-the-blank research paper being written towards a broader understanding of research and academic writing.

The Davis and Shadle (2000) article is an interesting discussion of the very particular, peculiar genre of research writing, and provides evidence that several years ago, there was the beginning of a push towards taking research writing away from something scripted and boring into something inquiry-based and interesting. This article illustrates both academic literacy development and academic socialization because Davis and Shadle (2000) are concerned with their students' literacies and academic development, wanting to move them beyond the expected academic discourse, contributing to something larger than the expected academic research and writing style.

Looking again a specific population, like Jones (2000) and first-year composition students, or Blanton (2005) and ESL students, Richardson (2002) explores what African American female literacy practices are, as well as what they mean, in order to illustrate ways in which African American female literacies can be used in general African American literacy education. The literacies of African American females are by no means simple, as is true for any other group. The African American females' literacies, however, are complicated by racism, classism, and history, as well as other socio-historically and socio-politically situated identities. Richardson (2002) then goes on to apply Street's (2000) definition of literacy practices, "the events and patterns of activity around literacy [linked to] something broader of a cultural and social kind," to those of

African American females (as cited in Richardson, p. 686). These literacy practices extend from storytelling to code-switching to "steppin and rhyming" (p. 693). These literacy practices all contribute to the ways in which African American females are portrayed both in society and within school. As Richardson says, "rather than being a barrier to literacy achievement, black female language practices, knowledges, and understandings can be and have been used advantageously to help black females in their literacy experiences in schools" (p. 698). Using those literacy practices mentioned above—storytelling, code-switching, "steppin and rhyming," etc.—can all contribute to the literacy development of African Americans within formal literacy education situations.

Richardson (2002) examined a particular group within the category of "linguistically diverse students," illustrating that helping students use their mother tongue will help in their literacy development both inside and outside the academy (Kouritzin, 2000). Literacy development outside the academy will benefit because of the celebration of the students' mother tongue, giving credence to the language. In terms of within the academy, literacy development will benefit because of an expansion of what is seen as *correct* within the academy because, as World Englishes scholars Horner and Trimbur (2002) discuss, "what is called English inevitably adjusts to changing circumstance" (p. 616-617; see also Canagarajah, 2006; Leung, et al., 1997; Matsuda, 2006; McArthur, 1998).

Continuing the focus on particular populations of students, Haneda (2005) "explores the links between multicultural learners' life trajectories and their classroom learning of Japanese, particularly with respect to writing in Japanese, as they participate

in, move from, and enter into, different communities of practice beyond the classroom" (p. 270). She begins her article with a brief discussion of previous work that has investigated the development of writer identity in terms of L2 writing, using the background of research in L2 writing along with communities of practice, specifically the work of Norton (2000) and Wenger (1998), in order to theorize her own research.

From a two semester Japanese literacy course at a Canadian university which Haneda taught, she chose two participants who were the most different in their learning in order to "illustrate differential modes of engagement in writing in Japanese in the most salient ways" (p. 275). Data was collected from a variety of sources: interviews, both formal and informal, field notes, individual student conferences, writing produced for class, and questionnaires. Haneda (2005) found that

> The two students' differential investment in writing in Japanese resulted from an interaction among many factors: their learning trajectory with respect to Japanese; their attitudes toward learning Japanese, including composing expository essays in Japanese; their strengths and weaknesses in the target language; their sense of self as a writer or a person; and the different types of community membership in Japan and Canada, and the communities to which they wanted to belong in their projected futures. (p. 285)

Ultimately, the two students developed their Japanese literacy for specific reasons and in individualized ways.

Being aware of the communities of practice in which the student negotiates could prove valuable to an instructor. For example, one of the participants was learning Japanese in order to become an international businessman. His reasons for taking the

class were not to develop relationships with individuals, but to help him reach his goals of going to graduate school, getting a job in a company, etc. Therefore, his understanding of and investment in his literacy development was different from the other participant, who was a Japanese-Canadian, interested in developing his literacy in order to raise his status as a bilingual.

The implications regarding academic literacy development in Haneda's (2005) work point to the importance of the communities of practice and a student's investment in their learning—key ideas to the development of academic literacy. In addition, while this article did involve higher proficiency learners, it did not address how the students then used their literacy development in/from this particular class as they proceeded through their academic work and perhaps beyond. My hope with my own research is to shed light on how students have continued through their academic careers utilizing the academic literacy skills that were discussed in my own class.

In terms of the development of specific academic literacy skills, Hansen-Thomas' (2009) study focused on the content area of mathematics, and it explored how teachers encouraged the development of their students' academic math discourse. With data collection at two different middle schools in Texas, her case study ethnography found that "when ELLs [English language learners] are actively drawn in through elicitation of practice, they have more opportunities to engage and participate in the development of successful mathematical discourse" (p. 103). This speaks towards the students' development of their academic numeracy skills and that if given the opportunity, students—whether ELL or native speaker—will develop their academic literacy skills in math in terms of both the discourse they are learning and the content.

The age group and subject matter are different from that which I studied, but I believe that this article shows how students are developing their academic literacies at a variety of levels in different subject areas. While Hansen-Thomas' study focused mainly on how the teachers were encouraging student development, I looked at how the students perceive their development and their interaction with faculty in a variety of courses.

Like Hansen-Thomas (2009) and Richardson (2002), Chandrasegaran (2008) was interested in looking at the development of a specific literacy within a specific population—NNES students' development of argument. Chandrasegaran (2008) was interested in Singaporean students' abilities to construct academic (i.e., expository, according to the author) essays after hearing secondary school teachers repeatedly claim that their students were unable to argue. Her research involved looking at the students' informal arguments via message board postings and then looking at a graduate student's academic essays to "observe the transformations, if any, that the discourse acts of friendly argument may undergo when enacted in the formal context of the academic essay" (p. 238). Chandrasegaran (2008) chose to compare the secondary students' message boards with a graduate student's academic essay because she felt that secondary students are almost never asked to write expository essays, and she feared that doing so would only "re-enact their informal argument behaviors if asked to write an expository essay expressly for the purpose of this study" (p. 243). In addition, according to the author, looking at the academic writing of a graduate student would allow for more possibilities of elaborated argument stance and support.

It appears that contrary to the secondary school teachers' statements that their students "can't argue" (p. 238), students are able to argue, even if they are not explicitly

taught. Chandrasegaran (2008) admits that a student's ability to argue in an informal setting is not the same as a student's ability to write in a formal setting, and therefore, they use arguments in different ways. She suggests that students who are then explicitly taught how to argue may then have stronger skills in terms of their academic writing. These findings illustrate a specific populations' attempt at developing a skill within their academic literacy, whether explicitly taught or not. The ability to argue is evidence of the development of a student's academic literacy skills. Chandrasegaran (2008) found that students who were taught this skill then used it in their academic writing, supporting the idea of teaching students to be more rhetorically flexible and rhetorically conscious, which is important for developing variety within academic literacies.

Continuing the trend of teaching students specific skills, as Chandrasegaran (2008) investigated, Parkinson (2000) begins her discussion in terms of whether or not English courses for specific types of students, science students in this case, need to be specific or general. In other words, should students be taught the specifics of what they will be asked to do, or would it be more beneficial to teach general skills that can then be transferred as needed to other academic aspects. She is arguing for a language course for science students that "should go further than a skills course with science texts and topics as context," and she discusses a course she taught which ultimately supports her assertion that language courses need to be specific rather than general.

Parkinson (2000) draws upon the work of several literacy scholars such as Street (1984, 1993) and Heath (1986) to support her discussion of the academic development of students. Being literate in one language does not make one literate in another; therefore, Parkinson suggests that scientific discourse is varied, and, one is not necessarily literate

in all scientific discourses with the knowledge of one or two types of science (p. 371). She also discusses the variety of genres a science student is asked to engage with, which leads to support for the rationale behind content-based teaching.

Parkinson (2000) then goes on to describe the situation in which she taught a science-based language course at the tertiary level in South Africa, where equal access to all students had only recently (within the previous five years) been addressed (p. 375). The course was taught so that students could better develop "a range of literacies of science" (p. 376). She found that students responded well to the course, which she classified as a "theme-based language course," and the students developed different genres of science writing, which enabled them to improve their academic science-based literacies at the same time. While this research addresses a very specific group, science students, it is still relevant to this literature review because it supports the very class that I am trying to promote—research writing—which was designed to help students develop their overall academic literacy, rather than to develop specific skills to be successful only in a specific class.

Taking what Chandrasegaran (2008) and Parkinson (2000) illustrated above, in terms of argument and the transferability of skills, into a more general discussion of learning transfer, James (2010) conducted case study research to examine the level of learning transfer for students in an EAP (English for academic purposes) writing course. James begins by discussing the difference between EGAP (English for general academic purposes) and ESAP (English for specific academic purposes), saying that

> from a transfer perspective, EGAP writing instruction faces the greater challenge. With ESAP writing instruction, there is an expectation that learning will transfer

> to tasks and contexts that are relatively similar…; on the other hand, with EGAP writing instruction, there is an expectation that learning will transfer not only to similar contexts and tasks, but, more importantly, to very different contexts and tasks. (p. 184)

EGAP is commonly taught with the view of teaching students general skills that can then be transferred to other tasks. However, there are several scholars (Hyland, 2002; Leki, 2003; Russell, 1995; Wardle, 2007, 2009) who argue that students have difficulties transferring such skills, as all skills are specific and cannot necessarily be generalized.

Over the course of an academic year, James (2010) collected and analyzed the writing of 11 students enrolled in an EGAP writing course, from both their EGAP course and other courses in which they were completing writing. He analyzed his data to determine whether or not learning transfer was taking place, and to what degree, if any, the learning transfer was happening (i.e., what types of skills were being transferred). James (2010) found that transfer occurred for a variety of different learning outcomes, though it was more common for some disciplines and task types than for others.

James' (2010) results support the idea that EGAP writing instruction can lead to transfer but also show that "transfer in this context, while possible, is not inevitable" (p. 198). This study again shows that there is variety among learning transfer. James (2010) focuses his research on students who were taking EGAP classes along with regular academic classes, and my own work is focused on students who are beyond their introductory liberal arts classes—already in classes within their major. His research also shows that more needs to be done in terms of students who have completed the introductory classes and are now in their academic studies and major classes, which

supports the need for the research that I am doing. My research shows how students are developing their academic literacies beyond the introductory classes, moving into their major-specific classes.

Connecting to the idea of transferability (e.g., James, 2010) and the development of academic literacy, Seloni (2008) conducted an ethnographic study of six first year doctoral candidates at an American university and found that the way that her participants developed their academic literacy was quite complex, and occurred both inside and outside of the classroom. As Seloni (2008) says of her dissertation, the "main purpose of this study was to investigate the academic socialization processes that these multilingual students underwent while building academic knowledge and social relationships, and gaining an understanding of disciplinary knowledge and academic writing in a second language" (abstract, paragraph 1). This dissertation informs my own research because Seloni (2008) was looking specifically at how student developed their academic literacies. She focused on doctoral students, while I will focus on undergraduates, but her results—that the process of acquisition on academic literacy is complex—is one that I have confirmed with my own work with undergraduate participants (see also Seloni, 2012).

This thorough review of the literature in terms of academic literacies development informs and supports my own research by providing a model within which I analyze my own participants' experiences and understandings of what it means to belong to the academic community and the development of their academic literacies. As I've shown with the discussion of the previous literature, the sense of belonging within the academic community is varied and complex, as is the development of academic literacy (e.g.,

Blanton, 2005; Goldschmidt & Ousey, 2006; Jones, 2000; Seloni, 2008, 2012). I now want to consider the idea of academic identities as they are constructed through academic socialization and the idea of "doing school."

Academic Identities constructed via Academic Socialization and "doing school"

Academic Socialization and "doing school"

My primary research question is focused on the idea of academic literacies and academic socialization, looking at how students from diverse backgrounds develop their academic literacies and academic socialization in the undergraduate context. This section illustrates the work of several scholars (e.g., Barron, 2003; Newman, Trenchs-Parera, & Pujol, 2003; Pope, 2001; Valenzuela, 1999), who investigated how students are/have been impacted by the expectations and restrictions placed on them by the academy, thus impacting their academic literacy development and socialization into the academy.

Pope (2001) followed five high school students through a year of school and discovered some interesting developments in how the students learned how to survive in terms of school. The five students were all highly recommended by teachers and counselors for their success and dedication to their work. Pope (2001) found out, however, that the students were often engaging in behaviors not befitting a "good" student. In fact, "all of them admit to doing things that they're not proud of in order to succeed in school. These students explain that they are busy at what they call 'doing school'" (p. 3-4). The students cheat, manipulate the teachers, manipulate the system, argue for better grades, and more, all in order to maintain grades that they feel will either get them into a good university or get them accepted by others.

Pope's study illustrates some interesting ideas that need to be further explored. I think that her work is very revealing of the educational systems in which our students operate in that educational processes can often be oppressive (Freire, 1993). Many of my students have achieved "success" in the same way that Pope's participants did. They have learned how to "do school." As Pope (2001) discusses, "They are caught in a system where achievement depends more on 'doing'—going through the correct motions—than on learning and engaging with the curriculum" (p. 4). However, while that may be the case—that achievement is based on going through the motions—learning how to "do school" might not necessarily be a negative. In my own work, I am interested in how my students are developing their academic literacies, particularly in terms of research writing, but in addition, I am interested in how they are developing their academic socialization—how they are learning how to be students at the undergraduate level, and how they are learning how to join the academy. Granted, I would like to believe that my students are achieving a higher level of learning, have gotten past just going through the motions, and are learning the positive aspects of "doing school" and joining the academic conversation. I realize that this might not necessarily be the case, and I am interested in how a combination of western academic discourse, genre pedagogy, and academic literacies development contribute to their understanding and success within the academic community. In this sense, "doing school" in my own work is a process of socialization and is perceived to be something that can be positive to one's academic identity.

Another important work associated with Pope's concept of "doing school" is that of Valenzuela (1999). In her ethnographic study, Valenzuela (1999) investigates the academic achievement of immigrant Mexican and Mexican American students at a high

school in Texas. “Rather than functioning as a conduit for the attainment of the American dream, this large, overcrowded, and underfunded urban school reproduces Mexican youth as a monolingual, English-speaking, ethnic minority….it divests these youth of important social and cultural resources, leaving them progressively vulnerable to academic failure” (p. 3). Valenzuela (1999) addresses important issues in her book which relate to my own research questions. Because I am interested in studying undergraduate learners and how they situate and understand what it means to “do school,” I am concerned with if and how the development of academic literacies is, as Valenzuela puts it, “divest[ing] these youth of important social and cultural resources” (p. 3). How would developing academic discourse—academic literacies—impact students in terms of their language, culture, identity and understanding?

The studies of both Pope (2001) and Valenzuela (1999) helped with the conceptualization of my own dissertation, which looks at how multilingual undergraduate student writers are developing their academic literacies and academic socialization. Their studies are important not only in terms of academic issues such as “doing school,” but also in terms of their ethnographic approach. For example, Valenzuela (1999) explains her research methodology in her appendix: “the key modes of data collection are based on participant observation and open-ended interviews with groups of students. This approach allowed me to…explore reasons for the social, cultural, and linguistic divisions that I observed” (p. 273). While I did not interview groups of students or conduct participant observation, I was still able to learn from this research as I designed my own study, especially in terms of how both researchers discussed and understood the data that they collected from their sites.

To more fully illustrate the concept of academic socialization as discussed above in terms of Pope (2001) and Valenzuela (1999), Barron (2003) discusses academic socialization outside the context of academic literacies and/or academic identities. Barron's (2003) purpose is to "address the exclusivity of academic discourse, to encourage Latino students, parents, and community members to think about their perceptions of higher education, and to make mainstream academics aware of Latino students' possible ways of seeing college, teachers, and students who are from outside their community" (p. 12). After several years of teaching in higher education, Barron (2003) has seen many Latino students struggling with what it means to belong, both at home and at school, as well as with the very ability to remain in higher education. Her students face many challenges and are from different situations— "the stories are many, the stories are individual, but they are similar in that the biggest challenge is learning to *do school* and achieve some learning as individuals while also maintaining a sense of self as defined in their homes and by their groups" (p. 12, italics in original). This "involuntary minority," which is American—but not really—struggles with staying in school and overcoming Anglo stereotypes about Latino/Chicano students. This is an important consideration of the development of academic socialization—learning to do school while still maintaining a sense of self and social identity, resulting in academic socialization where doing school is not a negative.

Newman, Trenchs-Parera, and Pujol (2003), like Barron (2003), were interested in how students were developing their academic socialization, so they conducted a multi-case study in order to "compare how three culturally distinct groups of undergraduates (Mainstream USA, Catalans, Latino immigrants to the USA) interact with course content

to achieve academically" (p. 45).[9] Because of an increasing interest in academic literacy development, the authors were interested in looking at how three specific "culturally and demographically distinct" groups of students interacted with course content, looking at how the students achieved academically rather than simply how their learning was affected. According to Newman et al. (2003), "the idea [was] that any factors that emerge as common elements of academic literacy across the settings would be candidates for core literacy principles. Factors limited to one setting would be candidates for culture-specific components" (p. 50). The results showed that students' engagement in their learning varied, and less successful students were often less engaged. The student may figure out that there is minimal effort needed in order to minimally succeed, and therefore, the student does not necessarily learn the information. In effect, they found that there were similarities across cases and groups for students who had both successful and unsuccessful academic achievement.

The work of Newman et al. (2003) looks not only at the development of academic literacy, but also at academic socialization and the idea of "doing school." The researchers found that those students who are simply "doing school" are not as successful as those who are engaged in their learning and making use of what they have learned in other aspects of their lives. This is the connection that is relevant to my own work. I believe that the reason that some students may be "doing school" is that they do not see the link with what they are learning to other parts of their lives, so they do not engage with their learning and use it in their lives, academic or otherwise.

[9] In many ways, this study is similar to my own in terms of the variety within the population. Therefore, I borrow some of the language used in this study for the discussion of my own research.

Park (2009) also looked at the academic socialization of undergraduate students at an American university, but unlike Newman et al. (2003) and Ramsey (2008), she focused solely on ESL students. Park (2009) conducted an ethnographic study of ESL undergraduate students in which she looked at how the students learned to speak and write, along with their methods of learning (individual versus collaborative). According to Park (2009), "this study highlights how the negotiation process of each focal student's learning to write occurs idiosyncratically across intercultural, interdisciplinary, and intertextual levels" (abstract, paragraph 2). This dissertation[10] addresses the concepts of both academic literacy and academic socialization, especially in terms of how ESL students see their academic literacies and socialization developing.

Academic Identities Construction

Having defined academic socialization and "doing school," I now begin my discussion of academic identities construction by reviewing an important work by Ivanič (1998). In *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*, Ivanič (1998) talks in depth about how writers' identities are constructed by their writing, by others' expectations about writing, by the academy, and by their own selves. For a particular example, she goes into detail about two academics and their writing in order to illustrate "how the discoursal characteristics of [her] co-researchers' writing are related to discourse conventions within the wider socio-cultural context in which they are writing, and how these conventions position the writers who draw on them" (p. 255). In other words, a strong connection exists between the learner and the instructor, and the

[10] This dissertation is not discussed in greater detail because it is not available for review from either ProQuest or the author.

writing produced by the instructor has bearing on the writing produced by the learner. By understanding that an academic's identity as a writer impacts a student's writing and writing identity, teacher-scholars can better understand how to position themselves within academic writing and ultimately help their students realize and develop their specific identities and literacies within the academy as well.

In terms of how students' identities are constructed by their writing, the academy, their own selves, and those of us that teach it, Mauk (2003) discusses the "real" aspect of community college students' academic place, which doesn't necessarily translate into a place within the academy. These students' lives and priorities (e.g., children, work, and family) take on more importance than trying to belong to the academy, which in turn affects how students learn how to write and navigate within the academic system. Following a discussion of "materiality, body, writing" (p. 375), and theorists Fleckstein (composition), Condit (poststructuralism), and Russell (activity theory), Mauk (2003) states that "to understand the problems and nuances of any set of practices [e.g., community college composition classes], as they are acted out by a particular group of people, we must have some intellectual tools for understanding the spatial-social complexities of those practices" (p. 377). So, in order to understand this situation—the lack of the community college students' connection to the academy—Mauk (2003) introduces the notion of "third space," which comes from critical geography (p. 378).

According to Mauk (2003), "Soja's [third space scholar] notion of third space offers a lens for understanding the intersection of materiality, action, language, and consciousness—where language is both material and produced by material, where action

is both social and spatial, where consciousness is body and action" (p. 379). "Third space" allows composition teachers an opportunity to discuss and understand academic geography, because we, both teachers and students, need to understand what it means for a space to be academic, and what it means to belong within that space, and that the academic space can exist outside of the academic classroom context. Students become a part of the space, and therefore, the space becomes a part of them.

Mauk (2003) suggests that "[those of us in composition studies] need to understand what kinds of real and imagined spaces are 'out there,' beyond academia, what kinds of spaces constitute being 'in here' (within the ontological regions of academia), and what kinds of spaces are created at the intersection" (p. 380). Assignments, therefore, become more complex, asking students to take a traditionally "academic" prompt and expand that writing assignment into their daily lives. This allows students to make meaning out of the academic situation, and also out of their everyday existence, bringing together their selves and activities from various aspects of their lives. And this idea, in turn, leads to thinking about writing as not necessarily something which takes place inside an isolated classroom, but also as leading to better academic socialization and a further understanding of literacies within the academy.

Understanding the space in which a student exists allows researchers to understand who the student is and how his/her identity is constructed and negotiated. Ortmeier-Hooper (2008) examines the ESL identity of three writers in first-year composition classes. She is interested in how they negotiate their identities as not only second language writers but also members of a mainstream composition class. Ortmeier-Hooper (2008) discusses the problems associated with labeling students; often these

labels do not allow the students a chance to own the language they are using, and, therefore, they become disadvantaged, regardless of their linguistic skill. She was interested in finding out how various factors, such as culture, prior education and experience, play a role in the construction of identity in immigrant second language students. Ortmeier-Hooper was also concerned with how students felt about being labeled as "ESL" students—did they identify as second language learners?

Using questionnaires, writing samples and interviews, Ortmeier-Hooper (2008) was looking for "what subject matter they chose to write about and how they framed themselves within that subject matter, particularly as it pertained to their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and their immigrant experiences" (p. 396). She found, after her analysis, that each student "complicated her understanding of second language writers and made [her] question our current categories for second language learners" (p. 409). The students' understanding of their own identities and the labels that have been put on them challenge the basic definitions of those identities and labels.

Because these students have resisted the labels that have been placed on them in terms of their "second language" status, Ortmeier-Hooper (2008) suggests that composition teachers need to consider the identities that students have about themselves. Each identity is particular to each student, and understanding how the students understand their identities allows for the ability to know where each student is coming from, not only in terms of their linguistic background but also in terms of their identity.

This research is an important consideration of how linguistic labels and social identity construction may impact both academic identity construction and academic socialization of students. I believe the connection can be made with my own study in

terms of identity construction. How students construct and realize their academic and social identity plays an important role in how they see themselves fitting into the academic community, and therefore, how they understand their academic literacy and academic socialization.

To continue the discussion in terms of social identity construction and the impact on academic identity and academic socialization, Starfield (2002) focuses on two student essays from a larger ethnographic study in which she was interested in the academic literacy development and academic identity of students in a post-apartheid, urban, South African university. She collected data during a yearlong study, eliciting participants from an introductory sociology course. According to Starfield (2002), "these two very different essays highlight for [her] why it is so hard for Black students from socially and educationally disadvantaged backgrounds to become successful in their writing within an academic discipline" (p. 123). Her research, then, is aimed at understanding outside influences that may contribute to successful writing.

She begins her literature review with a discussion of Bourdieu (1990) and the notion of "*cultural capital*" (p. 124, italics in original). Cultural capital refers to "the different social and symbolic resources individuals possess, which are largely inherited from the family" (p. 124). Therefore, depending on the family's social, economic, educational background, a student will bring different resources with them as they negotiate their own education and literacy development. Starfield (2002) "extend[s] Bourdieu's *capital* metaphor by proposing that the different amounts of knowledge about texts, and about the relationships between texts, which students from vastly different backgrounds bring…can be referred to as their *textual* or *intertextual* capital" (p. 124,

italics in original). These resources, then, can both help and hinder literacy development, depending on the situation.

In her discussion of two students' essays, Starfield (2002) first discusses Philip's essay.[11] Philip's essay received a very high mark by the grader, even though he did not follow two of the criteria, "referencing and avoiding plagiarism" (p. 127), in his essay. Also, the reader thought that Philip needed to write in a more academic style. So how did Philip receive a good mark? Philip's academic literacy and understanding of academic discourse were high enough that he was able to convey his knowledge even if he neglected to fulfill some of the requirements of the essay. Starfield believes that Philip's *cultural capital*, and therefore his *textual* or *intertextual* capital, enabled him to succeed in the academic discourse.

The second student, Sipho, completed the same essay as Philip, but received a failing grade, "with 10% being deducted for plagiarism" (p. 133). What are the differences between Philip and Sipho and their writing? To begin with, Sipho did not understand and, therefore, did not correctly answer/interpret the question. In addition, even though Philip did not use references within his essay, he was not marked down for plagiarism, while Sipho was. When asked, the grader said that Philip had tried to understand the question/quote, while Sipho merely restated, word for word, without trying to understand/analyze. Sipho identified himself as "a second-language English speaker," a young Black student who spoke English as a third language; Sipho did not have the academic opportunities that Philip did. Sipho's academic literacy and understanding of academic discourse were too low for him to successfully convey his

[11] Participants have been given pseudonyms: Philip and Sipho.

knowledge and understanding of what was being asked of him. According to Starfield (2002), "when contrasted with Philip, Sipho brings few extra-textual and textual resources that will allow him to succeed" (p. 137). In other words, the resources that Sipho possessed—which he brought with him from outside—could not help him in this situation.

The cultural, textual and intertextual capital that a student brings with him/herself is of the utmost importance when a student negotiates the academic discourse community and their academic literacy. Because every student possesses different resources, there is no way to argue that cultural, textual or intertextual capital is universal. What may have worked for Philip in this case did not work for Sipho; however, in another context, Sipho may have success where Philip could/would not. While students are often taught how to navigate the academic discourse, there are many factors that contribute to their success. I believe that my own study will show the various influences on a student's academic literacy, socialization, and identity. I hope to better understand how my students are developing their academic literacies by understanding who and what has influenced them along the way, both outside and also within, the academic community.

As Starfield (2002) showed, plagiarism within the writing task was something that did not allow a student to succeed, and therefore limited his success in writing. Oulette (2008) discusses the development of a student's academic identity through "plagiarism." As he notes, the idea of plagiarism is actually quite complex, especially in terms of NNES writers. Oulette (2008) begins his article with a discussion of "the notion of 'plagiarism'" (p. 256) and how such an idea is culturally and discourse specific. Ultimately, the western academic view of plagiarism is that of identity theft: if someone

plagiarizes, they are stealing not only the thoughts and words, but the very ideas of the author—who the author is—his or her identity.

However, as Oulette (2008) points out, this view that plagiarism is identity theft problematic because of things like collaborative writing, "common knowledge," and electronic texts, which are all "blurring the lines between public and private discourse" (p. 257). This becomes even more obvious when looking at NNES writers and their work (see also Pennycook, 1996). Oulette (2008) discusses many other researchers and their views that plagiarism is actually a literacy practice, where the plagiarist is trying to fit their own writing within the specific discourse community for which they are composing. This, in turn, would mean that a plagiarist is actually developing their academic literacy and their academic identity by the borrowing of words, ideas, etc (see also Valentine, 2006).

Identity, as has been discussed previously, is complex, multi-layered, and difficult to define. In terms of Oulette's (2008) research, he was interested in understanding how a student's identity as a writer developed after being identified as a "plagiarist." He examined the student's essay drafts and journals to "consider the extent to which her choices might have led the writing tutor to identify her as a 'plagiarist'" (p. 261). What Oulette (2008) actually discovers is that the student is involved in something more complex than merely copy-and-paste plagiarism. The student is actually attempting to construct her academic writer identity, and she follows a pattern of development in terms of both her writing and her identity.

Oulette (2008) closes with suggestions that composition instructors consider plagiarism, especially in terms of NNES students, part of a writer's development and part

of the process to develop academic literacies and academic identities. He is not suggesting that teachers start "endorsing such acts, nor that the ideological construct underlying the ethical discourse should be entirely rejected" (p. 269). What he is suggesting, however, is that teachers take on a view of plagiarism that is less black-and-white, and one that is more open to understanding and helping students with the writing choices that they make. Oulette is again providing support that a student's academic literacy, socialization and identity is influenced by many complex factors, the very least of which is what a teacher thinks about the concept of plagiarism. My own work is designed to look at the factors that are contributing to literacy, socialization and identity development, and includes thinking about how students understand specific concepts within research writing, with one example being plagiarism.

Moving from specifics that may hinder an undergraduate student in their transition into higher education and their development of their academic literacies, Tang and John (1999) discuss contributions to student academic identity development within the academy. According to Tang and John (1999), most students are unfamiliar with the idea of academic discourse when they begin their tertiary education careers, and even with that lack of knowledge, they still try to produce writing that is "academic" in nature, resulting in something dry and impersonal (p. S23). At the time of publication, there was research that suggested "a growing trend away from the traditional notion of academic writing as distant and impersonal, towards a recognition that academic writing need not be totally devoid of the writer's presence" (p. S23). The authors then saw an opportunity to investigate how students are creating their writer identities within academic writing, and they chose to focus specifically on the use of first person pronouns.

By focusing on the use of the first person pronoun in student writing, Tang and John (1999) hoped to show the variety of writer identities constructed by their participants through collecting essays from 27 students in a first-year English language class. The essay was in response to a prompt about variety and richness found in the English language (p. S29). The essays showed a large variety in the ways that students use the first person pronoun, but most of those ways are not ways in which a student's identity is at the forefront. The authors suggest that educators consider not only teaching ways to use the first person pronoun in academic writing, but to teach students ways of developing writer identity in academic writing. By helping students develop their writer identity, educators can "encourage students to be critical thinkers and writers, people who are able and eager to create the meaning that they want to create, and the self that they want to present in their writing" (p. S36). The researchers found that the learners did not show that they feel empowered enough to belong within the academic community; thus, their academic identities and their voices were silenced.

Dressen-Hammouda (2008) builds on what Tang and John (1999) found in their study on academic identity development by looking at a long-term case of a student's development from undergraduate to graduate. She writes about identity construction of students who are engaged in the process of becoming experts in their fields, stating that "disciplinary identity may be structurally related to the specialist genres students must learn" (p. 233). This article addresses the field of academic literacies, but also academic socialization and identity, in a more tangential way. In an extended case study of a geology student, from undergraduate to doctoral level, Dressen-Hammouda (2008) found that over time, the student learned how to develop "an *entire* semiotic genre chain that

underlies [the] discipline's specialist activity in order to begin writing like specialists" (p. 249) through his mastery of the implicit cues regarding genre writing. According to Dressen-Hammouda (2008), "it is this complex rhetorical positioning characteristic of more experienced writers…and its linking to symbolic genres through implicit cues, that distinguishes the less experienced from the experienced writer" (p. 249). She believes that this case study shows why students in a genre-based course need to be taught not only the explicit writing of the genres of the discipline, but also how to understand the implicit cues as well.

This mastery of the explicit and the implicit is what leads to expertise in the field. Grounded in genre theory, Dressen-Hammouda (2008) discusses one student's development from undergraduate learner to graduate learner, while my own dissertation looks at how my participants understand what it means to develop their academic literacies as undergraduate learners after having taking their introductory writing courses. I illustrate how my participants use their understanding of the academy and writing to succeed in higher level classes.

As can be seen from the in-depth review of the literature in terms of academic literacies, academic socialization and academic identity, it is nearly impossible to separate the three theoretical constructs from each other. I have found that discussions of academic literacies are rarely separated from discussions of academic socialization, and it is equally as rare that discussions of academic socialization are separated from discussions of academic identity. The next section discusses genre theory and genre pedagogy, which informed the research writing class that I taught. Understanding all of these important theoretical constructs shows the need for further research in terms of

academic literacies, socialization and identity, as well as informs the data collection and analysis methods of this dissertation.

Genre Theory/Genre Pedagogy

Because my class and syllabus are informed by genre pedagogy, it is important to review some of the literature present within this field. Dean (2008) explains that "Genre theory is based on the idea that writing is social and that it responds to situations; consequently, writing isn't the same for every person or every situation" (p. 3). The very definition of genre, which at first seems quite simple, is rather complex, as I mentioned in chapter one. The idea of genres is continually expanding, so Dean (2008) feels that it may be best to characterize them, rather than define them, noting that they "depend on each other and interrelate in complex ways…Genres are social, rhetorical, dynamic, historical, cultural, situated, ideological" (p. 11). Much of what is written about genre pedagogy is in terms of second language learners. Hyland (2004) provides background into genre, as well as a discussion on "implementing genre-based teaching…and analyzing written genres" (p. 3). He contributes much to the field of genre pedagogy because, as he admits, "it emphasizes the central role of language in all social activity and argues that texts are a good starting point for understanding and teaching students to communicate effectively in writing" (p. 2). Genre theory and pedagogy, then, see language as socially constructed, leading to an understanding of writing that is constructed by the academy, resulting in variety within academic literacies.

I see a strong connection between the ideas of genre pedagogy and my earlier discussion of academic literacies. Hyland (2004) also refers to New Literacy Studies (Barton & Hamilton, 1998), whose work influenced that of Lea and Street (2006) and the

academic literacies model. As Hyland (2004) says, "this view of literacy shows that writing (and reading) vary with context….There are a wide variety of practices relevant to and appropriate for particular times, places, participants, and purposes, and these practices are not something that we simply pick up and put down; they are integral to our individual identity, social relationships, and group memberships" (p. 9). His work illustrates the need for this type of teaching and provides support for the choices that I have made in terms of my own teaching and syllabus construction in that I designed the class to prepare students to succeed not only in research writing but also as they take their writing skills and move on to other classes.

Many other second language scholars have also written about genre pedagogy (e.g., Cheng, 2007, 2008; Herrington & Moran, 2005; Johns, 2009), and this previous research supports the work done in this dissertation, allowing me to contribute to the scholarship. Johns (2009) discusses her research regarding generation 1.5 students who are often placed in remedial English classes once they enter university. Johns discusses the importance of teaching the students to use their prior knowledge and combining that knowledge with an understanding of genre in order to develop the students' "rhetorical flexibility…that enables them to move from the familiar, assess an academic situation, and write successfully in the genre that each situation requires" (p. 204). She then provides several situations and activities that could be used in a composition classroom in order to allow students to develop these skills and become "rhetorically flexible" (see also Kill, 2006).

Johns' (2009) discussion is important to my own teaching and course design because one of my underlying beliefs is that students should learn how to become

"rhetorically flexible" in order to join the academic conversation. I cannot teach each student the conventions and genres of their particular field. I can only teach them how to recognize certain aspects of academic writing and how to understand the academic situations in which they find themselves so that they can later produce writing and research that works for their individual situation. I tried to accomplish this by, for example, having students find an academic article in their field. They analyzed the article for what it was trying to do, and we worked as a class to determine what aspects of the academic articles were similar and which were different. Understanding these differences allowed the students to realize the specifics of the different genres with which they could be asked to engage in their academic field.

The idea of being "rhetorically flexible" is also found in Sengupta's (1999) article, which discusses a study completed with first year undergraduate L2 students at Hong Kong Polytechnic University, looking at academic literacy development within the L2 classroom. The aim of the research was to determine how rhetorical consciousness was developed within a reading classroom and how this influenced the students' reading and writing abilities. Within the frame of rhetorical consciousness raising, the article is focused around the ideas of how students at a tertiary institution define and understand "reader-friendly texts," and how this influences their own writing and self-perception of their writing abilities. The researcher found that the students became more rhetorically aware of what they were reading after they were taught, during tutorial sessions, how to identify, understand, and interpret rhetorical cues. Sengupta (1999) believes that "as teachers we can develop rhetorical awareness and empower students to talk as literate, educated adults about texts that they read" (p. 312). The researcher found that the

students were able to reflect on their understanding of the text, but it was less apparent in their production of original text that they were more rhetorically conscious than before.

Sengupta (1999) was looking at a specific population and a specific rhetorical pedagogy—trying to teach students to become more rhetorically conscious is a part of academic literacy development, as well as being associated with the idea of genre theory and pedagogy. Knowing how to identify rhetorical patterns within different genres is a key aspect of genre pedagogy. This study informs my own because Sengupta (1999) discusses how students are developing rhetorical awareness, and my own class—from which this research arose—was designed with the aim of helping students develop their rhetorical flexibility, or with becoming more rhetorically aware in order to understand, engage with, and produce genre-specific academic texts.

Continuing the discussion of specific populations, Spycher (2007) looked at academic literacy development and the use of genre theory/pedagogy in terms of academic writing and adolescent learners. It is well known that there are different styles within academic writing, and, as I mention earlier, students do not inherently possess knowledge of these styles of writing; they must be learned. Genre theory and genre pedagogies are then useful in helping students understand and create this academic language they are expected to master. She was interested in investigating the following ideas in her study: first, what are the challenges EL (English Learning) secondary students face in terms of academic writing, and how do those students respond to direct instruction on linguistic features of academic writing (p. 243)?

Spycher (2007) found, through analysis of a particular student's writing, that even though the student had only been writing in English for several months at the most, he

was able to utilize and reproduce the linguistic features he had been taught. According to Spycher (2007), if students are taught academic literacy skills, they can then use them in their own literacy development. She notes that one of the limitations of her research is that she doesn't know whether the students were able to take the skills that they learned and transfer them to other contexts, of if they were even able to sustain the skills over time. I find that Spycher's limitation is something I am interested in regarding my own research interests. Do students take the skills that they have learned in terms of writing and then transfer them to other contexts? How do they see these skills as useful to the development of the academic literacies? Does having a class based in genre theory and genre pedagogy influence that development of academic literacies?

Much like Sengupta (1999) and Spycher (2007), who were interested in specific skills within academic literacy development, Jackson, Meyer, and Parkinson (2006) surveyed the writing and reading assignments of undergraduate science students at a university in South Africa. A new literacy course was being developed for minority ESL students in order to give students a chance to study for science degrees at the university; therefore, the researchers were interested in knowing what types of reading and writing the students would be asked to complete.

The researchers want to make clear in their article that there is a disconnect between what the students are asked to read and what they are asked to produce (p. 263). They highlight this point because of the important role the lab report plays in the life of a science student, and the researchers believe that the students should be instructed in this type of writing. In general, survey respondents (instructors) cited a lack of writing skills as a reason for not assigning writing tasks, though most respondents did not see

assignments which were mathematical in nature as being a form of writing. According to Jackson et al. (2006), "no responses to the questionnaire identified academic staff as bearing any of the responsibility for developing discourse competence in students; lecturers of postgraduate students blame teaching of undergraduate students and those involved in undergraduate teaching blame the school system" (p. 273). According to the authors, the results of the questionnaire support the need for a literacy course at the first year level in order to give students guidance in the types of writing and reading that they will have to do as science students.

This article is important for realizing the types of literacy that science students are asked to do as well as identifying that the instructors of science at this particular South African university do not see it as their responsibility to teach these literacy skills. Because of this lack of responsibility, the teaching of literacy skills falls to other types of classes and instructors. This is an interesting point, and it relates to my own research because of the following question: at what level and in which classes are students expected to learn the specific genres of their fields if not in those very classes? This article by Jackson et al. (2006) addresses not only the development of academic literacy, but the development of academic socialization as well by bringing to light the idea of who is responsible for helping students develop their academic literacies, academic socialization, and academic identities.

Moving from a discussion of undergraduate students and research, Cheng (2007, 2008a, 2008b) discusses the need for further research in terms of genre-based instruction and L2 (second language) graduate students. All three articles are a discussion of work with graduate students in terms of understanding, recognizing, and reproducing genres

within writing. Cheng (2007) found that "the significance of genre-based learning can be captured more fully through observing how learners recontextualize their genre awareness in their writing" (p. 287). In his second article, Cheng (2008a) discusses how his participant showed the ability to evaluate and interpret genre, which in turn "highlights the potential power of genre as an explicit, supportive tool for building academic literacy" (p. 50). He contributes to the field of genre pedagogy by discussing his research on graduate students, which illustrates the underrepresentation of higher level learners and their experiences with genre pedagogy. It has long been accepted that genre pedagogy is useful in terms of ESL education, but not much has been discussed in terms of higher academic level L2 users (e.g., graduate students) or mainstreamed L2 users (Cheng 2007, 2008a, 2008b).

Gebhard, Demers and Castillo-Rosenthal (2008), in another example of looking at graduate students and the usefulness of genre theory and pedagogy, discuss a case study of a teacher education program in which Gebhard begins by asking teachers, both pre- and in-service, to consider how students develop their academic literacy through the available "local context" (p. 276). In addition, Gebhard asks the teachers to think about the idea that the development of literacy practices and the resulting identities are "not simply a matter of common sense" (p. 277). As mentioned before, there are many factors that contribute to the development of academic literacy and identity, and they vary from things like current schooling practices to the students' own backgrounds. With teachers being aware of these issues, students are better able to develop their academic literacies and identities in a way that will be most beneficial to them (p. 278).

Over the length of the course, the teachers in the teacher education program are asked to complete a case study research project investigating an aspect of student academic literacy development. In this article by Gebard et al. (2008), two of the participants in the class, Jan and Zoë, followed a first grader named Sara[12] and specifically investigated how she composed a story about music class. They found that while Sara's teacher was concerned with her code-switching between English and Spanish, Sara actually had a complex understanding of the construction of narratives, and that her literacy practices were quite advanced once orthographic issues were disregarded.

Jan and Zoë "report having a deeper understanding of the varied resources that emergent bilingual students bring to school literacy practices—resources that many educators often overlook or misinterpret as causing learning difficulties" (p. 286). Gebhard et al. (2008) note that as great as the research projects went, it is difficult to use this type of teacher education program when it comes to the larger context of public schooling, due to time and space constraints. In conclusion, the authors agree that "these examples of the use of genre theory and genre-based pedagogies in teacher education in U.S. public schools support Hyland's (2007) claim that a critical knowledge of genres may have important conscious-raising potential for teachers and therefore implications for their understanding of writing and their professional development" (p. 288). Because the course that I designed for my own students was informed by genre theory and pedagogy, the findings of Gebhard et al. (2008) support the idea that teachers as well as students need to understand how individuals develop academic literacy skills. This

[12] A pseudonym

understanding will better allow teacher-scholars to design classes and helps students succeed in their academic endeavors.

This discussion of the research in genre theory and genre pedagogy illustrates the variety of populations and types of research that have been conducted in terms of both undergraduate and graduate students. I believe that my current research and my research writing class are expanding what is considered to fall within genre pedagogy; my students and I look at more than just the individual genre of research writing, which means that we consider what this genre means in the fields to which the students belong, and also consider what these ideas mean to the larger university community to which the students now belong—the academy. We consider how our writing contributes to the academic conversation, whatever academic discipline or genre that writing is written in. These considerations are impacting the students' writing identities as well as their academic identities.

Summary of the Review of Literature and Research Focus

What follows is a summary of the review of the literature, and with this synopsis, I articulate the need for my current study.

- Within the field of academic literacies, the populations studied were generally either NES or NNES learners, rather than a cross-section or variety of learners.
- In terms of academic socialization, Newman, Trenchs-Parera, and Pujol (2003) conducted a study very similar to mine. However, while they were looking at how three groups interacted with course work to develop

academically, I want to look at how this interaction develops into an understanding of academic literacy and socialization.

- Within academic identity research, most studies are conducted using first year composition students, either NES or NNES. Only one study looked at development past the first year, and that research only looked at one participant's development.
- Within the field of genre theory/pedagogy, the most recent work (e.g., Cheng, 2007, 2008a, 2008b; Gebhard et al., 2008) is done with graduate students only.
- Most of the work within genre theory/pedagogy focuses on specific, individual genres (narrative, for example) rather than the larger genre of research writing.
- Of the four dissertations discussed, each addressed a very specific group of students, with most of those being first year undergraduates.
- No dissertation looked at students across types (NSE, NNSE, WE, Gen 1.5) or at undergraduates after the first year.
- Most articles and dissertations used qualitative methodology, more specifically, case study methodology.

These points are meant to illustrate how my own research fits into the scholarship of both composition studies and TESOL as it was discussed in the review of the literature.

In terms of my research question—how students from diverse backgrounds develop their academic literacies in the undergraduate context—I have discovered an interesting gap in both the ESL and composition literature. As I mentioned earlier, the

concept of research writing is one genre within the larger idea of "academic literacies" (e.g., Lea & Street, 2006). And within research writing, there are many sub-genres, which include abstracts, annotated bibliographies, citations, and the essays themselves, which are then dependent upon the field/major, etc. The idea behind the field of genre pedagogy and/or "genre-based learning" (Cheng, 2008a) is to help students identify rhetorical patterns and genres of writing so that they can become "rhetorically flexible" with their own writing (Johns, 2009). This idea of rhetorical flexibility is accomplished through the consideration and practice of different genres of academic reading and writing; understanding how academic texts are constructed allows learners to navigate the multitude of genres they can encounter in their academic career. Research on genre pedagogy is focused primarily on either graduate students or ESL students within ESL programs. But what about students from diverse backgrounds at the undergraduate level in mainstream second year writing classes? There is very little that has been done with this population, and my study will look at this particular group of students in order to add to the existing research in both composition studies and TESOL.

My research helps narrow the gap by looking at the experiences of several undergraduate research writing students, from diverse linguistic backgrounds, as they proceed from the required course on research writing into other types of academic writing, whether that is a class within their field or another required liberal studies course. I discuss their development and understanding of the participants' own academic socialization, their identities, and their literacies. In addition, I consider how the genre theory/pedagogy influence on the research writing class they completed has allowed the

students to develop an understanding of what it means to contribute to the academic conversation. Next, I explicate the study design in chapter three.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the methodology that guided this dissertation. Before I go into describing qualitative research and case study methodology, I explicate how this research developed from my personal experiences teaching a research writing course at MPU. I then follow with a short description of my research context in which I introduce my research participants. The methods of data collection and analysis follow, along with an explanation of how trustworthiness and ethical considerations were addressed. Finally, I provide a chapter summary and a brief introduction into the next chapter of the dissertation—the participants' cases.

Constructing Teacher-Scholar Positionality

As mentioned in chapter one, my research interests developed out of a small in-class activity that did not go as well for all of my students as I had originally thought it would. I was teaching a course that I had designed around the concept of place, which I developed out of an understanding of ecocomposition[13] (see Cooper, 1989; Dobrin and Weisser, 2002; Owens, 2001). The students wrote papers informed by the following questions: where are you from; where are you now; and where are you going? I wanted the students to consider how their place influenced who they were and the interests that they had. I greatly enjoyed teaching that class, and my students wrote some wonderfully reflective and investigative research papers. However, after the description activity of describing the set of a television show, I began to think more critically about what I was

[13] "Ecocomposition is the study of the relationships between environments (and by that we mean natural, constructed, and even imagined places) and discourse (speaking, writing and thinking)" (Dobrin and Weisser, 2002).

asking my students to do, and I reflected more on who my students were and the experiences that they had had.

My initial class was designed to allow students to be independent and to write about things that were important or meaningful to them. And, I do think that this idea worked very well; however, I wasn't taking everything into consideration that I should have, such as my students' backgrounds, the knowledge that they bring with them, or how my class could add to their understanding of writing at the university level. It was after the realization that I didn't fully understand my students that I began to think about reflecting on my own teaching as a preliminary step for designing my study.

I love teaching. However, developing my research interests based on my teaching and teaching experience was not something that was easy for me. I spoke with several colleagues and mentors, and eventually found that the questions I kept asking about my students, my teaching, and my class design naturally yielded a dissertation project and led me to re-think the design of my research writing class. After doing some initial research, I found that genre theory and genre pedagogy,[14] which are very strongly grounded in second language research, would be well suited for my own class filled with mostly monolingual writers because the idea that "writing responds to situations" was very relevant for my class and my class goals (Dean, 2008, p.3). I wanted my students to be able to write not just for my class but to be able to write for the different situations that they encountered in their academic careers. I then came to understand that designing a class with genre theory and pedagogy in mind would lead to a syllabus in which I could

[14] Dean (2008) explains that "Genre theory is based on the idea that writing is social and that it responds to situations; consequently, writing isn't the same for every person or every situation" (p. 3).

help students understand what it means to be part of the academic conversation—help students develop their academic literacy.

When I began teaching introductory writing classes in 2007, I believed in writing for writing's sake. In other words, I believed that a writing class should be for the purpose of developing a student's writing, period. I did not believe that the liberal arts writing courses were service courses[15] that were designed to get a student prepared to do other types of writing. Once I began to consider what my students and others wanted from the research writing class, I became less idealistic and single-minded about my view of composition. I still believe that a composition class helps students develop their writing, regardless of other writing they are or will be asked to complete as undergraduate students; however, I also understand, now, that I am teaching a service course. My initial reticence to believe that I was teaching a service course stemmed from the belief that people don't view service courses as important. They are simply courses that have to be taken and gotten out of the way. I now embrace the notion that I teach a service course, and I fully believe that it is a very important service course; it can help students establish skills and an understanding of what it means to be a student and a writer within the academic community—quite a large undertaking when considered in its entirety.

Coming to terms with the idea of teaching a service course, I was then able to design a class that would address the needs of my students as students. I finally understood that while writing within my class was important, they also needed to write

[15] "The special function of the service course is…focusing on the kind of prose that students will have to read and write in their other courses, and by suggesting techniques and approaches for dealing with their academic assignments" (Behrens, 1980, p. 562).

outside my class as well. I do not mean to say that I ignored these ideas in the original design of my class. I always taught my class with the hope that students would take the ideas and skills with them into other courses and throughout their lives as writers. However, I think that those goals were not always as explicit in either the syllabus or the day-to-day class activities as they should have been. In the re-design of my class, I strived to make those goals more explicit in all aspects. I wanted students to be able to see that my class would help them develop skills and an understanding of what it means to write at the university level, of what it means to not only follow the academic conversation, but to also contribute to it, leading to the students' development of their academic literacies. This thinking and class structure led to the development of the qualitative case study design of this research.

Qualitative Research Design

Traditionally, research design has been influenced by the scientific method; Erlandson, Harris, Skipper and Allen (1993) define the scientific method as "a single objective reality, ascertainable through the five senses and their extensions….This objective reality can be divided into successively smaller particles…that are governed by a common set of 'laws'" (p. 11; see also Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This reality is then systematically investigated to understand the laws that it is governed by. The idea, however, that there is a "single objective reality" is no longer supported by much of the current research being completed. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2011), "qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry….They seek answers to questions that stress *how* social experience is created and

given meaning" (p.8, italics in original; see also Creswell, 2006; Maxwell, 2005; Yin, 2009). My own research, looking at how students develop their academic literacies, was qualitative in nature because I investigated how students understood their experiences, which were socially constructed. This naturally led to a qualitative research design.

Qualitative inquiry is a blanket term which encompasses many different methods of data collection and analysis, such as ethnography, narrative inquiry, case study, etc. (Schwandt, 2001; see also Creswell, 2006; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Maxwell, 2005; Schwandt, 2007; Yin, 2009). Another distinction to bear in mind in terms of qualitative research design is that while it is in direct contrast to the scientific method, which is often thought of as quantitative in nature, qualitative research doesn't necessarily avoid using quantitative data in either collection or analysis. In fact, there may be times when using quantitative data is useful to a qualitative study (Creswell, 2006; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Erlandson et al., 1993; Maxwell, 2005; Yin, 2009).

The main distinction between qualitative and quantitative research design to keep in mind is that "quantitative studies emphasize the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes"; whereas, qualitative researchers are looking for how the world is constructed, emphasizing "the qualities of entities and…processes and meanings that are not experimentally examined or measured" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 8). This distinction led me to the methodology for this dissertation, which was case study research.

Case Study Methodology

According to Yin (2009), "case studies are the preferred method when (a) 'how' and 'why' questions are being posed, (b) the investigator has little control over events,

and (c) the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context" (loc. 313-15). In the past, case study methodology was discounted because it was a common held belief that "one cannot generalize on the basis of an individual case; therefore, the case study cannot contribute to scientific development" (Flyvbjerg, 2011, p. 302). But as Yin (2009) points out, "case study research includes procedures central to all types of research methods, such as protecting against threats to validity, maintaining a 'chain of evidence,' and investigating and testing 'rival explanations'" (loc. 332-34). There are several advantages that case study research provides to the naturalistic researcher:

- Emic[16] inquiry, where the researcher looks at how the participant characterizes his/her experiences, benefits from case study research.
- Allows the reader to really engage with the context and the participant prior to reading about the researcher's interpretations.
- Lets the interaction between researcher and participant be of focus, which often yields more in depth data.
- The case study provides "thick description," which is useful for the reader to judge the research for transferability.
- This type of research lets the reader judge for him/herself whether or not the research has established factualness and trustworthiness (Creswell, 2006; Erlandson et al., 1993; Flyvbjerg, 2011; Maxwell, 2005; Yin, 2009).

These advantages demonstrate the flexibility and usefulness of case study design, which allows not only for the participants' voices to be heard but the researcher's voice as well.

[16] According to Schwandt (2001), "Emic is used to refer to first-order concepts—the local language, concepts, or ways of expression used by members in a particular group or setting to name their experience" (p. 65).

Case study methodology was chosen for this dissertation because of the necessity to look at each individual participant's experiences and for its "ability to deal with a full variety of evidence—documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations—beyond what might be available in a conventional historical study" (Yin, 2009, loc. 505-7). Case study is the design of choice when there are many variables that cannot be controlled, when it is necessary to understand a real-life situation that is impacted by its context, and when studying complex situations—such as individuals.

A case is defined as the "unit of analysis" for case study methodology, and case studies can be based on either a single case or multiple cases. If individuals are being studied, as is true of the research for this dissertation, "the individual is the primary unit of analysis. Information about the relevant individual would be collected, and several such individuals or 'cases' might be included in a multiple-case study" (Yin, 2009, loc. 852-54). This dissertation is a multiple case study where each participant is an individual case, or unit of analysis.

Critics of case study methodology often bring up the fact that there are often a limited number of cases in a case study, and they dismiss this methodology as using a small sample size. But, it is important to remember that a case cannot be equated to a single survey respondent or subject due to the amount of data that is collected in a case study, and the goal of the researcher is not to replicate or generalize, but to provide the reader with a thorough picture of the case being discussed. Therefore, thinking of a case study as having too small of a sample size is incorrect (Yin, 2009). Understanding that the study cannot be replicated or the results transferred is an important step to realizing the complex nature of case study research.

This lack of transferability may lead to the question of why case study methodology needs to be undertaken at all since the main goal of most research is to be applicable to other situations and provide scholars with a chance to take the information and replicate it in their own context. So, while the results from case study research are not transferrable, they are applicable to certain situations. This application is found—not by the researcher but by the reader—in the thick description provided in the study. Thick description is difficult to define, but "to thickly describe social action is actually to begin to interpret it by recording the circumstances, meanings, intentions, strategies, motivations, and so on…it is this interpretive characteristic of description rather than detail per se that makes it thick" (Schwandt, 2007, p. 296). Thick description, then, is what allows the researcher to create meaning out of the data collected so that the reader can begin understanding the contexts and experiences of the individual cases in order to draw their own conclusions about the cases.

Using case study methodology for this research design allowed me to investigate the research questions I established in my first chapter:

- How do students from diverse backgrounds develop their academic literacies and academic socialization in the undergraduate context?
    - How does a student situate him/herself within the academic community?
    - How does genre theory/pedagogy play out in a student's development of academic literacies or academic socialization?
    - How is academic identity constructed within writing, and how can it contribute to academic literacy development?

In the next section, I discuss the research context, giving more background on the institution and my prospective participants.

Research Context

Building on the description of the university curriculum and the participants as described in chapter one, I now further elaborate on the site of data collection and the participants of the study.

Site

Midwest Public University (MPU) is a public liberal arts university in the midwestern United States. The undergraduate population is approximately 12,800 students, and the graduate student population is around 2,300. Many of the undergraduate students are in-state students; however, there are students from many other locations as well, including 48 states, 2 U.S. territories, and the District of Colombia. There is an international student population that makes up 4.3% of the total student population, which contributes to a diverse classroom situation ("Facts about MPU"). From conversations with students in my own classroom, I believe that many of the students are first generation college students from working-class backgrounds. However, following a conversation with the university's department of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment, I found that there is no way that the university can officially track this information. Therefore, my belief that many of the students are first generation cannot be officially verified.

Understanding the Research Writing Course at MPU

The research writing course at MPU is a component of the core liberal arts requirement, which involves accumulating 48 credits from a variety of required courses

from across the disciplines. The English classes within liberal arts includes four courses: a basic writing course (which students may be placed into prior to taking the first-year composition course), a first year composition course, a second or third semester introduction to literature course, and the research writing course. MPU is rather unique in that the final required writing class for all undergraduate students is focused on the genre of research writing. In addition, students are not eligible to take this class until they have attained rising sophomore status, resulting in the students not being eligible to take the class until at least their third semester. The fact that they are entering the class after having had at least two semesters of classes implies that they have been somewhat successful thus far in their university academic careers. They are not "new" to university expectations as a first semester student and/or a student in an ESL program may be. At this point in their undergraduate careers, most students are not taking many major-specific classes and are registered mainly for the required core liberal arts courses and introductory major courses. Therefore, their exposure to academic writing and research at the university level is often limited primarily to their English classes. This gives me a unique opportunity to see how students are developing their academic literacies in this very specialized genre of academic writing, which in itself contains many other sub-genres.

The research writing course is the fourth class in the English series,[17] and while some students take it simultaneously with the literature course, most wait and take it last in the series, as most advisors encourage them to do. The class is taught by English

[17] Most students usually only take three of the four classes; the first class, a basic writing class, is taken only if the students' writing placement essays indicate that they are in need of more writing practice.

faculty only; teaching associates, temporary faculty, associate professors, assistant professors, and full professors all teach this class. These classes are not relegated to the teaching associates and temporary faculty only. In addition, the English department allows all faculty to design their own classes. There is no required syllabus or text; there is not even a suggested text. This results in a wide variety of class designs and student experiences within the research writing class.

The expectations of those teaching the class vary, as there are dozens of different instructors teaching several different varieties of the class. However, the course description is quite clear: "Teaches students to read, analyze, and evaluate nonfiction sources and to present the results of their analysis in clear, organized, carefully documented research papers. The focus of reading and research in each section is determined by the instructor" (Undergraduate Catalog, 2010-2011, p. 181). With this open course description, I felt the chance to teach a class influenced by my research interests would not be a difficult thing to enact. My thinking in terms of my course design shifted, then, from thinking about my students' histories, presents and futures, to thinking about what they expected and were expected to know from the research writing class. From conversations with former students and also with professors in other departments, I considered what the purpose of the research writing class really is and what students expect to learn.

Prospective Participants

From my own classroom, I identified several students with whom I could do my research—linguistically diverse undergraduate research writing students. After having completed my class, and after their grades were submitted, I approached a number of

these students and asked them to consider participating in my study. I was hoping for a sample of students who varied across linguistic backgrounds, which is why I contacted the students that I did. I began the study with six participants; however, three dropped out due to various reasons. In what follows, I present the focal participants for this study.

My first participant is Will Russo, a native English speaker from central Pennsylvania. His major was hospitality management, which he switched from business during his junior year. He was in the first semester of his senior year during data collection. Will had spent time in the Disney College Program (DCP),[18] and he was currently the president of the DCP recruitment program at MPU. He was very dedicated to his major and the DCP, as well as to his fraternity and his part-time job. Will was a student of mine for both the introductory literature class that all students must take as well as for research writing.

My second participant, Nkiruka Adichie, is a Nigerian woman who self-identifies as a native English speaker; I would identify her as a World Englishes speaker. Her native language is English, but she also speaks Ibo, her tribal language. Her family moved to Botswana from Nigeria when she was in elementary school, so she also speaks some Setswana as well. At the time of data collection,[19] Nkiruka was a junior, with a double major in human resources management and marketing. She was eager to participate in the study once she understood what I was interested in. She thought she'd be good to talk about how to do school (with no prompt from me) because she thinks

[18] The DCP is a paid internship designed by Disney. Students spend time at the Disney resorts in either California or Florida, where they are given the opportunity to work and "gain real-world experience while expanding their education and planning for their future" ("DCP Informational Sessions").

[19] All data was collected during the 15-week spring semester of 2011.

there are two types of students in college—those who come to have fun, and those who understand why their parents have sent them there and realize that it is an opportunity which must be taken seriously.

My final participant is Drew Kingston, a native English speaker who moved to central/eastern Pennsylvania from Tennessee when he was in middle school. Drew was majoring in finance until recently; he was accepted into the 3 + 3 law program, which is an agreement between MPU and a large nearby university. The 3 + 3 program means that after Drew completed his third year at MPU, which was at the end of the semester in which the study took place, he transferred to the other university to begin studying law. When he completes his studies, he will have received a Bachelor's degree in general studies from MPU and his Juris Doctor (JD) in law from the other university. Drew is a very interesting case in that he is very aware of what it means to be a student at a university. He is very competitive as both a student and an athlete, and he is also active in the business college. He told me that he felt quite honored that I asked him to be part of my study because he knew he was a good writer and that he would have lots of things to say.

These three focal participants all brought unique experiences and perspectives to the question of "doing school," which led to a rich understanding of their negotiations and development of academic literacies and identities. I now turn to the data sources and the collection procedures.

Data Collection

As a way to see the perspectives of these participants' experiences in understanding and navigating their academic socialization, specifically in terms of

developing their academic and research literacy skills, I describe below the multiple sources I gathered in order to illustrate their experiences: the literacy autobiography, semi-structured interviews, virtual writing (blog space), various documents (course syllabi, drafts, papers, assignments), my own teaching journal, and field notes and reflections on the study. As mentioned previously, data was collected beginning in January 2011 and continued until the end of the spring semester, May 2011.

Literacy Autobiography

Steinman (2007) defines "the literacy autobiography as a reflective, first-person account of one's development as a writing being" (p. 563). The literacy autobiography that I asked my participants to complete was an initial assignment in my research writing class. The students were asked to chronicle, in 2-3 pages, their experiences with reading, writing and research, both in school and out of school. The literacy autobiography was a personal narrative, constructed by the students. Pavlenko (2004) suggests that "personal narratives, as a form of self-disclosure, knowledge, and authority…" (p. 59) could be a way for students to express themselves and share their experiences. Many researchers have used similar personal accounts as a way to better understand how their participants view their own lives and experiences (Barclay-McLaughlin et al., 2007; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Kyles & Olafson, 2008; Steinman, 2007).

The literacy autobiography my students completed allowed them to explore their background and understanding of reading, writing and research, and to articulate how they saw reading, writing and research in relation to their own selves as students. These autobiographical narratives were useful in addressing a segment of my research questions because they allowed me to see how my participants situated themselves within research

and academic writing prior to participating in my class. This in turn provided me with an opportunity to examine how they see research and writing as impacting their student identities, and, therefore, how they navigate the world of school.

Individual Semi-structured Interviews

Interviewing is a common data collection tool within qualitative research (Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori, 2011; Pope, 2001; Rubin & Rubin, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999; Yin, 2009). I interviewed the participants several times over the course of the semester. Table 1 identifies the date and duration of each interview for each participant.[20] I began by interviewing the students about their histories and their experiences in my class, as well as their experiences within other university classes, focusing on the ways in which they see how they have been taught and then use writing as part of their academic identity.[21]

[20] All of the interviews were completed upon receiving permission from the university's IRB.

[21] See Appendix E for sample interview questions.

Table 1

Date and Duration of Interviews

Will Russo		**Nkiruka Adichie**		**Drew Kingston**	
Date	*Duration*	*Date*	*Duration*	*Date*	*Duration*
2-23-11	56 min	1-28-11	46 min	2-25-11	65 min
3-18-11	50 min	2-7-11	68 min	3-16-11	60 min
4-4-11	48 min	2-17-11	42 min	4-12-11	46 min
4-25-11	50 min	3-18-11	18 min	4-27-11	46 min
		4-8-11	46 min		
		4-27-11	58 min		

The interviews were semi-structured in that I allowed my questions to adapt and shift according to answers from the participants (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). This type of interviewing is known as "responsive interviewing," where the researcher and the participant develop a "*conversational partnership*" (p. 79, italics in original). This partnership is important for understanding not only how the researcher and the participant relate to each other, but also how they relate to the research project. I did my best to maintain a conversational tone within the interviews in the hope that students would be more relaxed and feel less like they were being interrogated. The conversations that we had together, about their experiences, let me see how the students understood themselves and their positions within the academy.

Virtual Writing (Blog Space)

Journaling is an often used tool in data collection (Carter, 2008). Carter (2008) found that "it is perhaps via the medium of learning journal that their [the participants]

voices are revealed most clearly….journaling and reflection lead them to rich insights about their personal and professional selves" (p. 33). According to Carter (2008), journals allow participants another opportunity to reflect on their writing, courses and academic selves, through writing. The participants for my dissertation were to utilize journaling through blogging. This was an online writing space, moderated by me, which was designed to allow the participants room to reflect on the types of writing they were working on in their classes during the course of the semester in which data was collected. I originally envisioned this as an important tool for understanding my research question because the virtual writing space would have allowed my participants more time to reflect and respond, as opposed to the nature of the interview, where the participants may have felt like they had less time to reflect and construct answers to questions. I had planned to then incorporate information from their blog entries into subsequent interviews. Prior to each set of interviews with the participants, I posted a question or prompt that I wanted them to address in their blog posting.[22] The blog was password protected, and only the participants had access.

Unfortunately, the blog space did not go as intended. Out of the three participants, Nkiruka responded with two posts, Will with one post, and Drew did not participate in the blog at all. After each interview, I would remind the participants that I had posted a question, and I often followed up with an e-mail reminder. However, this source did not yield the writing or the thoughtfulness about the prompts that I had hoped it would.

[22] See Appendix F for the blog prompts.

Documents

"Texts…have provided an abundance of material for qualitative researchers" (Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori, 2011, p. 530). The documents I collected from the students included any papers or writing assignments written by them (including drafts) for classes that they were taking at the time of data collection. I also include documents that they produced for my class: the literacy autobiography, their research journals, the research papers, and their portfolios. These documents allowed me to develop a well-rounded, thorough understanding of my participants' writing and researching processes, which were central to understanding the question of how they understand and develop their academic literacies and academic socialization. And, just as with interviews, the collection of documents and similar texts are a common research tool (Erlandson et al., 1993; Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori, 2011; Pope 2001; Valenzuela, 1999).

My Teaching Journal and Field Notes

My teaching journal allowed me to chronicle my own experiences as an ESL and composition teacher teaching the research writing class. I kept a teaching journal during the semester in which I taught the research writing class. After every class, I returned to my office and reflected on the lesson for the day. Each reflection was centered on three ideas: overview; interactions; questions, thoughts, comments. In the overview section, I described what I asked the students to do for that class. In the interactions section, I focused on how the students interacted with the material, with each other, and with me. In the questions, thoughts, comments section, I reflected on how the students had interacted, I posed questions about what could be done differently, and I considered changes that could or should be made in terms of the course and class design.

I also included my informal observations of my ongoing research. Both the teaching journal and my field notes were important for understanding my research question because they completed the picture. They helped me continuously reflect on the design of my study, as well. Maxwell (2005) states that, "in qualitative research, design is something that goes on during the entire study, not just at the beginning" (p. 13). This continual redesigning of the project is one of the key features of a qualitative study. Field notes, field journals, reflections and artifacts are an important part of most research studies (Maxwell, 2005).

Data Analysis

After collecting the data, I transcribed all of the interviews from audio format to written documents in order to have a written transcription of all interview interactions. I removed all identifying information from all documents that I collected, including the interview transcriptions, and assigned the appropriate pseudonym to each set of data. Following this, I began my data analysis, as described below.

My data analysis followed the constant comparative method (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The idea with the constant comparative method is to continually analyze the data, beginning with the first day the researcher begins the project. According to Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori (2011), "in many cases, qualitative researchers…do not try to follow any predefined protocol in executing their analysis. By reading and rereading the empirical materials, they try to pin down their key themes and, thereby, to draw a picture of the presuppositions and meanings that constitute the cultural world of which the textual material is a specimen" (p. 530). The constant comparative method allows the researcher to recursively draw conclusions and to utilize an emergent design as well as emergent

data analysis (Erlandson et al., 1993; Miles & Huberman, 1994). This method of data analysis also allowed me to establish credibility and trustworthiness.

In addition to establishing credibility and trustworthiness, this method of data analysis was useful for investigating my research questions. The constant comparative method allowed the data and the analysis of the data to evolve as my research progressed. Since I was interested in the experiences my participants had in developing their academic literacy and academic socialization, coupled with their understanding of what they gained from this class, the constant comparative method of analysis was best suited for this type of research because it allowed the conclusions to emerge naturally from the data collected and from my participants' and my own experiences with this dissertation.

Trustworthiness of the Study and Ethical Considerations

All of the data collection tools and the constant comparative method of analysis allowed for the establishing of trustworthiness and credibility. It is necessary, within a research project, to establish credibility of both the research and the researcher. Case study methodology, as Yin (2009) notes, "includes procedures central to all types of research methods, such as protecting against threats to validity, maintaining a 'chain of evidence,' and investigating and testing 'rival explanations'" (location 332-34). These procedures to which Yin is referring include multiple sources of data, member checking, and acknowledgement of limitations of the research.

As I mentioned earlier, the multiple sources of data I gathered allowed me to accurately interpret and portray the experiences and understandings of my participants and their development of their own literacies. Each participant was asked to participate in member checking where they read a selection of the transcripts of the interviews in order

to verify that I had accurately portrayed their experiences. In terms of limitations, one lies within the very construction of case study methodology, and that is the lack of generalizability of the results. As I mentioned earlier, because the goal of case study research is not to generalize but to be applicable, I think this addresses the limitation that some may see in terms of being able to generalize results and use them for other populations.

Another limitation or ethical consideration that some readers may see is the fact that I have a previous relationship with my participants. I acknowledge that because of my previous status as my participants' professor, some of them may feel that they are not able to be as honest as possible with me when discussing their experiences, especially those that they had in my class. However, the participants who agreed to be in this study benefitted from our relationship in terms of their participation because they felt more comfortable with me as the interviewer and with disclosing their true feelings. In addition, the fact that none of these students had the possibility of having me again for a class should have allowed for them to feel comfortable as well because there would be no repercussions, real or imagined, due to their participation in the research.

The final ethical consideration that I need to discuss is that of participant confidentiality. All identifying information regarding participants has been held in strict confidence. I have only used data for the purpose of this study. When I use the results from this study, which may be published in journals or shared at academic meetings or conferences, I will not include any identifying information of any participants. I have kept each participant's identity confidential by use of a pseudonym. I renamed the educational institution at which the data was collected, and have omitted any other

identifying information for both the participants and the educational institution. All data has been locked in a file cabinet, and all computer files have been secured and password protected. In addition, if a participant ever felt the need to stop a conversation, they let me know. They were also free to withdraw from the study, at any time. The research was committed to keeping identifying characteristics of the participants and the collection site confidential. Cautionary measures have been taken to secure the storage of research-related records and data, and no one other than the researcher has access to this material. All data will be retained for at least three years in compliance with federal regulations.

Chapter Summary

This chapter gave an overview of naturalistic, qualitative research, followed by a discussion of the usefulness and method of case study design. After a short introduction to the prospective participants to this study, I outlined my means of data collection, as well as data analysis. I ended the chapter by addressing the issues of credibility and trustworthiness, as well as the ethical considerations that would impact the collection of data and the subsequent data analysis.

What follows in the next chapter are the participants' experiences and their negotiations and development of their academic literacies, their academic socialization and their academic identities, told through individual narratives. My discussion of the participants' cases provides the reader with an illustration of my research question: How do students from diverse backgrounds develop their academic literacies and academic socialization in the undergraduate context?

CHAPTER FOUR

THE ACADEMIC LIVES OF THREE UNDERGRADUATES

In order to address the research questions of this dissertation, this chapter is devoted to the histories and experiences of three student participants: Will Russo, Nkiruka Adichie, and Drew Kingston. Using data collected primarily from interviews, but also from participants' written documents, I show the participants' experiences in developing their academic literacies and socialization in the undergraduate context by focusing on the following questions:

- How does a student situation him/herself within the academic community?
- How does genre theory/pedagogy play out in a student's development of academic literacies or academic socialization?
- How is academic identity constructed within writing, and how can it contribute to academic literacy development?

The lives of the three participants are told in a narrative style in order to illustrate the rich and complex variety among their experiences, as oft supported by case study methodology (see Yin, 2009).

The purpose of this research is to illustrate the experiences of students from diverse backgrounds regarding their development of academic literacies and socialization in the undergraduate context. Being able to see how these students understand their academic experiences and academic selves may lead to changes within pedagogical practices in terms of academic literacy instruction. What follows, then, are the narratives of three very different individuals and their academic selves.

Will Russo: "My mind isn't very open to new literacy"[23]

Background

Will was a first semester senior at the time of data collection, in the spring of 2011. He was a native English speaking student from central Pennsylvania, and as he said, "[his] family is basically all in education" (Will, Interview 1, February 23, 2011, line 10). Will had an older sister who received her master's degree in higher education administration and worked at a nearby university, and both of his parents worked in education as well. His father was a superintendent in the public school system, and his mother had recently retired from being a high school counselor, though she occasionally returned to the classroom in order to substitute teach.

From our discussions, it seemed as though Will's mom was the most concerned about his literacy development growing up. As he said, "my mom was always very strong on reading, and we would always have to read before I went to sleep. Whether she would read to me or eventually when I had to read, I don't know if it's almost like I was forced to, it's never been something I've enjoyed. EVER" (Will, Interview 1, February 23, 2011, lines 89-91). Although Will saw his mother as most concerned with his literacy growing up, it appeared that other people were more influential to his literacy development. Will had to attend special reading classes in elementary school because of learning disabilities, and he mentioned that this teacher helped him immensely with his reading skills. Then, in seventh grade, his English teacher focused more on writing skills and grammar rather than reading, and Will felt that, "since I got to seventh grade, I've always done pretty good in all my English classes, and I've always kind of liked English. I think it was

[23] Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, line 31

because I like writing but I hate reading" (Will, Interview 1, February 23, 2011, lines 98-100). This English teacher was one who offered him extra help after school, called his home once to check on his progress, and influenced his writing skills and development.

Will entered MPU as a business major in the fall of 2007, but changed to hospitality management during his second year. He chose to attend MPU for one main reason—the connection to the Disney College Program.[24] He felt that the DCP experience would provide him with networking and connections and would serve him long after he had graduated. At the time of data collection, Will was in the first semester of his senior year and taking the following classes: senior synthesis, hospitality law, chemistry, hospitality costing, and hospitality lab.[25]

Within the Academic Community

Each participant in this study submitted a literacy autobiography for the research writing class that they took with me, answering the following prompt: *What types of research, reading, and writing have you done in your student life? What are your experiences doing research and or writing research papers? Who or what has influenced your reading and writing within and beyond your school life? Think about writing this literacy autobiography as a way to explore what you already know about the genres of research and writing.*

[24] The DCP, as discussed in chapter 3, is a program allowing students to maintain full-time student status while interning at one of Disney's many companies.

[25] Will described hospitality costing as a class where you learn about the accounting standpoint of the industry—how much things cost, how to turn a profit, etc. The hospitality lab is when the students run the department's restaurant during the semester. The students are responsible for all aspects of running the restaurant, from menu planning to cooking to waiting tables.

Will re-submitted his paper to me at the beginning of the data collection. In his literacy autobiography, he spoke mostly of his experience with his first college composition course where he completed a long research project about Jeep Wranglers. As he said, "I did a lot of research for that paper to broaden my knowledge, and it was fun to do since it was something I enjoyed" (Will, Literacy Autobiography, January 29, 2010, p. 1). Will felt that it was important to be interested in what he was writing in order to produce good writing. Additionally, he expressed that he was looking forward to researching and writing in our class; as he said, "I love my major and am very much into learning all that I can about it. There is only so much you can learn in the classes; this research will give me the opportunity to look beyond that to topics that most people would not research" (Will, Literacy Autobiography, January 29, 2010, p. 1). This situating of himself within the academy at large is telling of how Will saw his place within the academic community of which he was part.

Another example of how Will saw himself situated within the academy came out of our discussion about why people go to college. He had been asked by one of his professors to give a presentation to second semester freshmen about the importance of interacting and participating in his department,[26] and Will wondered if the professors would actually like what he had prepared to say. He said, "I don't even think grades as much matter as the experiences and everything that you participate in. Working while you're in school I think is really big….because that's other networking that you're doing, or like, skills that you're gaining. You're learning interpersonal skills as much as when you go home and just study all the time" (Will, Interview 4, April 25, 2011, lines 77-83).

[26] Hospitality Management

He was concerned that the professors would think he didn't think grades were important, when in fact, it was important to Will that he express the need for students to not just spend all of their time studying, which was a big difference.

"Doing School"

As a first semester senior, with one more semester of classes remaining, Will was not as confident in himself as I would have expected. He knew what he thought and felt about being a university student, but he didn't think that his literacy abilities where at the level they should have been. When I asked him if he thought there was a certain level of literacy needed to be a successful college student, he said, "yes…I would say a little better than the level I'm at" (Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, lines 26-28). He felt that his reading was still not what it should be, which affected his comprehension. He knew what he should do, but he also knew that it was difficult for him. For example, "my mind isn't very open to new literacy, kind of. So if it's a book I don't want to read, I've already made up my mind…I'd rather buy the movie or something" (Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, lines 31-41). Will actually admitted to a fear of reading that he tries to work through. He knew that reading was important, and he would do it in order to obtain information from his textbooks, but reading was not something he did on his own.

Will believed that his level of literacy had an influence on his performance in classes and that level of literacy had indeed developed throughout his university career. As he discussed,

> I know in high school I would do all that I could to not read a book and still get the information somehow. And, like I would probably spend triple the amount of time it would have taken me to read the book on like googling things, looking at

> other people's summaries of the book, anything I could find. And I don't really do that anymore. I just try and read it…. (Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, lines 55-59)

Because he had figured out that it was more important or necessary to actually read than figure out how not to read, his academic literacy and therefore basic literacy had improved.

Will also had definite ideas on what it meant to be a good student. He viewed being a student as having a job, and professors equaled managers. As he said, "your first step is like professional networking… you need to develop good relationships with your managers and with your professors…. you want to establish good connections with the people in your classes as well and everything, and really try to do all of that. So I would consider myself a good student. Even though my literacy level is below average" (Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, lines 71-86). Will believed that his understanding of what it meant to be a good student, and his ability to be that type of good student, developed from his parents being involved in education. Growing up around other teachers and administrators, Will felt that he learned how to communicate with his parents' colleagues and friends earlier than most students, and that this ability to communicate was what led to being a good student.

While Will gave me many examples of being a good student, mostly through communicating with his professors, being seen in class, inviting professors to attend various functions that he was involved in, etc., he mentioned one particular class—chemistry—where he did things that he considered being a good student but where I would disagree with him. Will's chemistry class was a liberal arts requirement, not a

major requirement; he had stretched out his liberal arts requirements to cover all four years of school rather than getting them out of the way at the beginning like many other students do. Will said that according to Moodle,[27] there were 84 students in his class. However, "I actually took a picture in class the other day cause it was so sad….there was twelve people in class because he doesn't require you to come to class, and there's nothing due, or anything to turn in…he really doesn't do anything in class" (Will, Interview 4, April 25, 2011, lines 259-262). When I asked if the professor lectured, Will admitted that he only went to class once a week: "I go every Tuesday, but this week I'm going both days since the final is next week…. I just go so I'm visually there to him. Which is the only reason I'm going" (Will, Interview 4, April 25, 2011, lines 271-275). Will thought that attending class in order to be visible would be beneficial since the professor didn't "do anything" in class, and that this qualified as being a good student since he actually came to class when many other students did not. Will also had a lab component to his chemistry class, which he always attended. He thought that his attendance and performance in lab, where you "learn everything" would help him with his grade much more than attending the professor's lectures would.

Will believed that while his chemistry class was very hard, it was actually a joke. He felt that the professor did not care about the students, and that the professor did his best to alienate his students; therefore, Will did not feel obligated or motivated to go to class more than once a week. His professor's lack of interest in the students, coupled with the chemistry class not being a requirement for his major, left Will uninterested in doing anything more than what he thought was the bare minimum to get by. In his estimation,

[27] Online course management system

Will thought that the reason he did well in some classes but not others was actually based on whether or not he liked the professor. If he liked the professors, he tried his hardest because he didn't want them to think poorly of him, which, in turn, meant his reading and writing—and his overall performance in the class—were of higher quality than if he didn't worry about impressing the professor.

Academic Writing

Will believed, prior to starting college classes, that writing would be hard and not fun or interesting in any way. He admitted that this stereotype stemmed from his high school classes when he would have to read and respond to certain texts, which he wasn't really interested in. However, after having taken several writing classes and many of his liberal arts and major classes, Will thought that writing wasn't so bad if he was interested in it. He talked at length about his two required English composition courses because both his first year instructor and I let him write about things that were interesting to him. He agreed that writing was much easier if he was allowed to write and research about something that mattered to him personally.

During data collection, Will told me that he was writing mainly in his senior synthesis class.[28] The class he was enrolled in was taught by a professor in the English department, and she focused the class around the idea of how media impacted society's ideas of right and wrong. He gave me copies of eleven reading responses, a book report, and his final project, which involved taking two themes from the class and analyzing them in terms of their prevalence in media today. In addition to the writing from his

[28] According to the Undergraduate Catalog, "This course helps students understand and handle complex intellectual and social issues from multiple perspectives….In order to broaden their experiences, students are encouraged to enroll in synthesis sections taught by instructors outside of the students' major fields" (p. 40).

senior synthesis class, Will also let me have one piece of writing from his hospitality law class. It was a two-page reading response.

In looking at Will's writing, a few things stand out. First, the reading response that he did for his hospitality law class clearly showed that in this instance, Will's writing was very, perhaps too, focused. There was very little introduction, and it was clear that he knew who his audience was. He began with, "this act very much affects guests at hospitality properties…" (Will, hospitality law response, p. 1). By omitting an introduction and leading immediately into his response, he showed that this text was not written for a general audience; Will was clearly writing for the professor since it was a reading response. And, because the professor had read the same thing and had an understanding of the reading, Will added more information that he had found through research, or his own opinion, rather than just summarizing what he had read. For example, after a summary of how the Patriot Act can affect hospitality guests, he said, "doing some research on my own using Google and YouTube, I found a video…the first thing I noticed was…" (Will, hospitality law response, p. 1-2). This addition of his own investigation and understanding of that investigation showed that he thought his writing would be stronger if he added his own research, which is what a reading response often calls for the reader to do.

In contrast, the response papers from his senior synthesis class included quite a bit of summarizing. Will gave me eleven response papers: ten were in response to class readings, and the last was a response to watching the Academy Awards. All of these pieces included a brief introduction as to what Will was going to talk about, followed by summaries interspersed with his own opinions about or responses to the readings. For

example, from his first response, Will began with, "In 'The Power of Cultural Myths,' cultural myths are discussed speaking about how culture influences of life, morals, values, people around us, and how culture in general shapes our lives. In 'The Dream Merchants,' we learn some history…" (Will, senior synthesis response 1, January 25, 2011, p. 1). The next paragraph then provided Will with a chance to discuss his own thoughts: "The first reading is the one I found myself most into since it characterized us as a culture and what we believe important factors of influence are" (Will, senior synthesis response 1, January 25, 2011, p. 1). All of his responses followed this pattern of first summarizing, and then providing his interpretation or opinion. This proved that Will clearly knew how to write a response for this professor. Each piece got slightly longer as Will progressed through the semester, but they did not necessarily increase or decrease in quality. From looking at this type of writing—responses from two very different classes—I can see that Will's academic literacy for this skill was quite highly developed. Will illustrated that he has learned how to do this type of writing successfully.

Will mentioned that "it seems like a lot of the things I write in college are responses to something" (Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, line 461). He felt that most of his writing, with the exception of the research that he did for his two required composition classes, was "worksheet kind of things" where he responded to something he had read or filled in the blanks of an outline (Will, Interview 1, February 23, 2011, line 341). I was surprised to learn from all of my participants that they felt like they weren't doing any (or very much) writing in their classes. I asked Will whether he thought his English composition classes had prepared him for the writing and reading he had done in college—especially after hearing about the type of writing that he was doing for his

classes—and he said, “they’ve definitely prepared the reading and grasping information portion for me” (Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, line 492). Will mentioned several times over the course of the semester that his composition classes helped him the most with reading rather than writing. Perhaps this was because Will felt that his writing skills were stronger than his reading skills; or, perhaps he felt that the writing that he had done in his composition classes benefited him in ways other than preparing him for future classes.

While Will discussed the second class he took with me—research writing—he mentioned that “because we were researching within our major…it really did help me learn how to pick important information out of things, or what I felt was important for what I was writing about….and that like, beyond helped me out, what I ended up researching” (Will, Interview 3, April 4, 2011, lines 193-197 and 203). When Will talked about the writing class helping his reading, he also talked about how the topic he researched helped him with his major and with an internship he had done over the previous summer. So, while the work he did in the research writing class didn’t necessarily, according to Will, help with the writing he was doing in other classes, he definitely felt that his literacy skills had benefitted from the work he did in my class (Will, Interview 3, April 4, 2011).

It was clear in Will’s final project for his senior synthesis class writing that he did not make connections between what he did in his English classes and that particular assignment. The prompt for the project was to choose two themes that they had discussed in class—Will chose revenge and obsession—and find support with articles and films to support and further develop the discussions they had in class about the two themes. It was

my impression that the written portion of the project was not very important for the grade; the main part of the grade was the oral presentation to the class. Will told me repeatedly, when we discussed this class and his writing, that he liked this professor because she didn't care how the students wrote. She didn't want them to be formal—she just wanted them to get their ideas out. This was very evident in the final project write up. It was very conversational in tone, and while I could hear Will's voice perfectly, it also made the writing seem less important because he sounded so relaxed. For example, in the introduction of his final project he said, "it is interesting the situations which people find revenge is worth the outcome and I want to look more into this topic and believe that it might be an interesting topic to cover in class as well" (Will, senior synthesis final project, p. 1). Will also did not properly cite his sources, either in-text or on his Works Cited page. For example, he left "live" hyperlinks in his essay: "He then went on to make a song and music video which I found at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5YGc4zOqozo" (Will, senior synthesis final project, p. 2). Viewing this as a writing teacher, I find these sorts of grammatical and citations errors to be unacceptable. However, when he gave me this piece and we talked about it during our interview, Will told me that the professor didn't care about that sort of thing. This indicated to me that Will really was adapting his writing to suit the task. In his hospitality law response, he was very specific; when he did take something from the text, which only happened once, he correctly attributed the source. In the writing for the senior synthesis class, because the professor wasn't concerned with these aspects of academic writing, neither was Will. He had definitely figured out how to write for his audience, one of the key aspects of developing academic literacies.

Will's Academic Identity

As mentioned earlier, the class that Will did the most writing for, in his estimation, was his senior synthesis class. In this class, there were oftentimes occasions when the students would exchange their work with each other, and the students would write comments on each others' papers. They were not allowed to write anything negative, but even with that, Will felt that he didn't "really like reading other people's work. Maybe it's because I don't like other students reading mine….maybe my writing isn't as good as theirs" (Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, lines 276-277 and 280-281). It turns out that it was a lack of confidence in his own writing that made him feel this way. It was surprising to me that Will was intimidated by his classmates because he was always very confident in my writing class. He was often one of the first to volunteer and answer and to participate in group work. In fact, he acknowledged that he enjoyed doing the peer review in my class, as opposed to his senior synthesis class, because he felt that everyone was on the same level.

The professor for the senior synthesis class had three students whom she designated as mentors in the class. They were enrolled in the class, all English majors, and their responsibility was to help grade and facilitate the class. It was actually these students rather than his other classmates that made Will uncomfortable. As he said, "Their vocabulary must be amazing. Like, even when they talk in class, I'm just amazed by it….And I know they're going to be looking at the papers and stuff. Maybe that's what the unease is with the paper" (Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, lines 300-301 and 319-320). Even though Will was a senior and at the end of his undergraduate career, this statement illustrated to me that he had a lack of belief in his literacy skills which

impacted his academic identity. He felt that he was not equal to these mentors, and, therefore, not as good of a student.

I felt as though there was a disconnection between Will's assertion that he was a good student and his confidence in being a good student. In terms of talking about his major classes, Will was very confident because, as he often said, he had a lot of experience and had done a lot of networking. To him, this exhibited "street smarts," which were more valuable within his major than "book smarts" (Will, Interview 2, March 18, 2011, lines 152-157). However, in terms of his literacy, Will felt that his skills were lacking, which meant that he wasn't as good of a student as he thought he should be. So, while Will felt as though he had the real world experience to help him within his major, he also felt that he could be a better reader and writer in order to help his overall status as a student.

Interpretive Analysis of Will's Academic Literacies Development and Socialization

Will was a very personable and well-liked student. He had many positive relationships with past professors, and he would often invite those professors to events related to his fraternity or departmental work, myself included. The ease with which Will interacted with professors more than likely stemmed from his experiences growing up as the son of a superintendent and a school counselor. He knew how to cultivate relationships with people whom he saw as being able to help him in the future.

My initial impression of Will and his academic literacy was to say that, although he was a senior and nearly done with his undergraduate career, he had not developed his academic literacy and socialization as much as he could have. However, after realizing what Will had been telling me in the interviews, I came to the conclusion that he actually

had a highly developed sense of what it meant to be a student; therefore, his academic literacy and socialization were more developed than I originally thought. Perhaps my original assumptions were based on the fact that Will admits to not having great grades and to struggling with a lot of his non-major classes. When I thought more deeply, though, I acknowledged that his work in my class was very good, and his writing in the senior synthesis class, for which he did the majority of his writing in that semester, were what the professor had asked him to do. Will understood what he needed to do to be a good student, and he did those things most of the time. He was well aware of the expectations different professors had towards writing as well as reading, and although he felt that many times the reading and writing were for naught, he did them anyway.

Through his understanding of what it meant to be a student within the hospitality management department and perhaps through the influence of his liberal arts classes, Will had learned how to successfully negotiate the requirements and expectations of his professors and for the classes which they taught. In this case, there were times when Will was simply "doing school." However, for the most part, Will understood and took away from each class what he needed in terms of establishing successful academic literacy.

His academic literacy and therefore his academic identity were grounded in an approximation of the idea of being rhetorically flexible. Will knew what to do for different classes and different professors, both in terms of his performance in the class as well as his written work. When I asked Will to tell me about his writing, he said, "I'm not too much of a writer….depending on what the paper is about, I can be somewhat formal…or I can be casual, and that's sort of my everyday life kind of" (Will, Interview 4, April 25, 2011, lines 545-549). The very notion of understanding that writing

depended on what the paper was about illustrated to me that he had developed his own style of academic literacy. Many introductory writing students write the same way no matter what they are writing about. They aren't yet aware that writing within the university classroom depends of a variety of things, including context. For Will to have articulated this difference, I believe, shows that he has an understanding of where he fits into the academy, thus illustrating a stronger academic identity than I had originally thought.

Nkiruka Adichie: "Nobody knows I'm an international"[29]

Background

Nkiruka Adichie was a 20-year-old[30] Nigerian born woman who moved to Botswana when she was ten years old. She was the fourth of five children; her three older siblings had all graduated from college while she and her younger brother were both studying for their undergraduate degrees—she at MPU and her brother at a university in Botswana. Her parents were both college professors in Botswana: her mother was an English lecturer, and her father was a library studies lecturer.

She believed that her parents chose to teach their children English as their first language because of their association with education. Her tribal language was Ibo, and she also knew some Setswana from going to school in Botswana, but as Nkiruka said, "English is the only language that I speak" (Nkiruka, Interview 1, January 28, 2011, line 32). Nkiruka felt that the choice to have the children learn English was a good one: "I think the idea is that most of the world speaks English, so I'm not going to be around Ibo

[29] Interview 4, March 18, 2011, line 36

[30] During the time of data collection—Spring 2011.

people for the rest of my life, so I might as well get prepared for the outside world so that I can be able to communicate…" (Nkiruka, Interview 2, February 7, 2011, lines 17-18). In addition, studying in school was always in English, in both Nigeria and Botswana. She took Ibo as a subject in elementary school, in the third grade only, but she never formally studied Setswana.

Nkiruka felt that her mother, more than any of her other family members, really contributed to her literacy development. When her mother came home from work, she would ask the children what they had done that day in school. They knew that they had to know and say something; otherwise they would be in trouble. Nkiruka admitted that it actually still happened, thanks to the internet and being able to video-chat with her parents. "They will still ask me what we're doing in my courses and stuff and I have to sound smart, or sound a little bit smart, so it makes me stay a little more focused and concentrate more" (Nkiruka, Interview 2, February 7, 2011, lines 310-312). This reinforcement by her parents, especially her mother, had been beneficial to Nkiruka throughout school.

As mentioned previously, all of Nkiruka's older siblings had completed, or were in the process of completing, postgraduate education. Her oldest brother was studying in Iowa, in a veterinary medicine doctoral program. Her oldest sister was a general medicine physician in Botswana, and her next oldest sister had recently completed her master's degree, in Wales, where she studied public health. Nkiruka and her younger brother were the only ones still attending undergraduate school, with Nkiruka at the end of her third year and her brother at the end of his first. Because education has been so highly valued in her family, I was not surprised that Nkiruka had plans to achieve her doctoral degree in

the near future. This educational background had greatly impacted her assimilation into the academic community of which she was now a part.

Nkiruka chose to come to the U.S. to study in 2008—she was a double major in human resources management and economics—on the advice of a friend back home who had attended school at MPU as an exchange student. Her friend talked about his experiences and the environment at MPU, and Nkiruka believed that having an American education would be beneficial for her when she returned home to either Nigeria or Botswana. She did not arrive at MPU until her second year of university, and she had already completed one year of schooling at the University of Botswana. However, even though she had already completed her first year, she was required by MPU to take the first English composition course as a first semester sophomore, meaning that the class she took with me was in the second semester of her sophomore year. At the time of data collection, Nkiruka was taking the following classes: safety science, ethics, business law, management, and managerial economics.

Within the Academic Community

As mentioned in Will's narrative, each participant wrote a literacy autobiography during their time in my class. Nkiruka could not find the literacy autobiography that she had submitted for class, so she wrote another one in the first month[31] of the data collection in response to the same prompt. Nkiruka talked about the influences that her first composition course at MPU and the course she took with me had changed the way she looked at researching and writing: "My once amateur skills have been polished and although I would not consider myself an adept researcher, I will say that I can make quite

[31] January 2011

a substantial contribution to the academic conversation" (Nkiruka, Literacy Autobiography, p. 2). She found that the research she did in my course, where she looked at labor unions in Nigeria versus the United States, helped her to see what she "actually wanted to get out of my degree so as to apply the concepts I learned here at MPU in organizations back home" (Nkiruka, Literacy Autobiography, p. 3). She said repeatedly that the reason she wrote, in college, was to be part of the academic conversation; being a university student was also important in order for Nkiruka to go home and make a difference. Being born in a third world country was something that she spoke of in her literacy autobiography, and during our conversations, as another aspect of her literacy development. As she said,

> I am in a position where I am not interested on [sic] doing research on celebrities and their lifestyle or on the new fashion trends that are arising. But now I want to do researches on more pressing matters that actually give back to society, on how to help improve living conditions and better the lives of people (for example women and children), empower civilians etc. (Nkiruka, Literacy Autobiography, p. 3)

I believe that Nkiruka's situating of herself in the larger social context is very telling of how she saw herself in terms of the larger academic community. It was important for Nkiruka to be someone who made a difference, and she saw this as something she should be quite serious about. This dedication to change is part of what it means to be within the academy, and for Nkiruka to understand this idea, puts her academic socialization at a higher level than many other students.

"Doing School"

In my first meeting with Nkiruka, where I explained what my study was about and what I would be asking her to do, she told me that she thought she'd be a good person to talk about "doing school" (without any prompting from me) because now that she was in her 3rd year, she knew a lot about being a student. The idea of "doing school" is just that. Students know how to do what they need to do in order to succeed, often at the expense of learning or seeing the relevance of what they have to study.

In terms of "doing school," here's what Nkiruka had to say: "I think doin' school is more like, you're just trying to get by. And it's enough, but…somebody who actually took the time to study has that one piece of knowledge that they added to their paper that would give them the A grade" (Nkiruka, Interview 1, January 28, 2011, lines 398-400). She often spoke about how this was not an acceptable way for a student to behave, but when pressed about her own practices, Nkiruka was often "doing school" in the traditional definition. As she said, "Fine. Some days, I'll be honest. Some days, I do school….Some classes I'm just doing because I'm not really interested, and some classes, I really, I'm really passionate about, so I put in more. Because I feel that those classes I'm not really interested in…I don't think I'm ever going to use that" (Nkiruka, Interview 1, January 28, 2011, lines 407-408 and 414-418). This admission of "doing school" was interesting because at first Nkiruka didn't want to admit to me that this was what she was doing. She believed that this was not being a good college student, but it was something often done—by everyone—not just herself.

Overall, however, Nkiruka believed that she was a good student because she did what her professors expected her to do. For example, "I go to class and I pay attention. If

I'm battling sleep, I play with my phone every now and then and I get back to what the teacher is saying, but I do the assignment, and I feel like I do my own part as a student" (Nkiruka, Interview 6, April 27, 2011, lines 642-644). She visited professors during their office hours, she did the assignments, and she asked occasional questions in class. She believed that these practices were what professors expected out of good students.

When asked about her reading practices for class, though, she told me that more often than not, even for her classes that she really enjoyed and saw as useful, she took lots of shortcuts. "I would read the questions [before reading the chapter] and try and see what I'm looking for so that I'm just done and I don't have to think about it again. But what I'm supposed to do is sit down, read everything, word for word, analyze, make recommendations, stuff like that….[but] I'm just a student trying to graduate" (Nkiruka, Interview 6, April 27, 2011, lines 611-620). Nkiruka felt the need to continue to give explanations for why she engaged in these behaviors even though she knew that she should do better, and many of these explanations included feeling like the classes were unnecessary or not beneficial for her future. If it wasn't related to her major, she didn't put as much effort in.

Academic Writing

I had six different interviews with this participant, and during each interview, I asked her to discuss and/or give me pieces of writing that she had been doing. Nkiruka gave me a total of three pieces of writing from the semester—two pieces from her ethics class, and one from her management class—and that was all. For Nkiruka, writing equaled what she called serious writing—academic writing. So, the fact that she was doing a project in her safety science class where she had to look at case studies and

analyze them, it wasn't writing. "I don't think it's writing, though, like in 202…as long as you do it you get credit" (Nkiruka, Interview 5, April 5, 2011, lines 419-430). Or, the notes that she would take in her managerial economics class, those definitely didn't count as a form of writing. According to Nkiruka,

> Serious writing is not something you do the night before or something just pieced together. It's more like you have started well in time, and you've done like full blown research, or whatever, on the issue….you've actually gone out of your way to do in-depth research, you've gone to the library, you've gone through books, you've asked, you've talked to the dean, you've talked to your professor, you've talked to people just to get different perspectives. You've done questionnaires, you've done interviews, you've done surveys, observations, whatnot…it's like you are actually dedicated to this thing because you want to, you want a top notch paper. You want a quality paper. You're not just writing to fill up space. (Nkiruka, Interview 2, February 7, 2011, lines 423-430)

When I asked her, near the end of the semester, if she was doing any serious writing, she said no. The last time she had done serious writing was in my English class, a year prior (Nkiruka, Interview 6, April 27, 2011). Nkiruka seemed to greatly dislike that she was having to take these classes that she thought were extraneous to her major, where she was just doing assignments to fill up space, and she believed that students should be allowed to take specialized classes—business ethics, for example—that were for students within particular majors only.

While Nkiruka believed that she'd be better off taking only the classes she wanted to, rather than having a lot of liberal arts requirements, she acknowledged that there were

things that she had learned in some of her classes that were useful to her overall in her university studies, whether that be within her major, or within specific types of classes. As she said,

> The English classes have been helpful to me….[They] have been have been good because I will have to write, you know, as I go through my different levels in college. So that has been helpful because I know what process to go through, what MLA or APA, you know, stuff like that. I'm more familiar with research, and interviews…so, that was good. (Nkiruka, Interview 2, February 7, 2011, lines 512-516)

She spoke primarily of the writing class that she had with me as being beneficial to her now. However, she also mentioned repeatedly that she wasn't doing any writing this semester. So, while she thought her work in different classes could benefit from each other, she admitted that she didn't think this wasn't actually the case in the classes she was taking at the time.

In looking at the writing that Nkiruka submitted to me, I saw a very interesting example of "doing school." As I mention earlier, Nkiruka only gave me three pieces of writing even though she would talk about other things that she had to do within her classes. The first piece I will discuss is an article summary from her management class. This text clearly showed that Nkiruka thought she could "do" summaries. When we talked about this piece, she was happy with it because she knew this was what the professor expected. She believed that she would get full credit, which is one of the reasons she said she was giving it to me. In truth, it had several grammatical and spelling errors, not to mention there was probably more paraphrasing or direct quoting than

summarizing. For example, "all of these countries which hire a lot of employees (in their thousands) and counts on Egypt for a substantial percentage of their total revenue have decided to forgo the financial impact of their shutdowns and have opted instead to put safety and health wellbeing of their employees as the first priority" (Nkiruka, management assignment, p. 1). I have not read the actual article because the summary starts off with "an article on the wall street journal talked about…" instead of identifying the author, title, date, etc., so I cannot be entirely certain as to whether there are sentences directly lifted from the original text (Nkiruka, management assignment, February 2, 2011). As her former writing teacher, I do not recognize Nkiruka's own voice or style in this response, which leads me to believe that she was not able to summarize in her own words.

The next two pieces that Nkiruka gave me were submitted for her ethics class, which was a liberal arts requirement. The first was a response paper based on a class reading. The prompt required the students to think about a question concerning moral judgment and then use the reading to support their argument. The professor only wanted one double-spaced page for the response. Nkiruka originally wrote five and a half pages, double-spaced, before reducing it to the single page that she turned in. Nkiruka gave me both of the ethics texts after they had been graded. So, for the response paper, she received a 3.25 out of 4, which equaled an 81% B. Nkiruka told me when she gave me the paper that she wasn't really sure what she was supposed to do. She felt that the professor did not explain what she wanted from the students, so Nkiruka wrote the way she thought she should. It is clear that Nkiruka could have done more in terms of

development, and from the professors comments, Nkiruka strayed too far from the text she was supposed to be using.

As an outsider viewing this piece of writing, I believe that Nkiruka was trying to engage in more synthesis than the professor actually wanted. I believe that the intention of the assignment was for the students to show that they could summarize the ideas of a philosopher, though I admit that this is just assumption on my part. Nkiruka was trying to show that she could take the philosopher's ideas and apply them to her own understandings and experiences. For example, Nkiruka said, "I do firmly agree that one should not expect to arrive at moral judgments through appeal to popular opinion. Unless of course it has to do with the protection of property or the preserving of life then yes by all means use it as a yardstick to base your actions or judgments" (Nkiruka, ethics response paper, January 27, 2011, p. 1). Out of all the pieces she gave me, I think that this piece was actually the most similar to what she had been asked to write in her English classes. While she didn't do exactly what the professor wanted with this response, she was engaging with the skills she had learned in previous classes such as summarizing, showing a connection to her own self, and then concluding. As she said at the end of her response, "in conclusion, I believe in having strong principles that we can stand firmly on and voice out when necessary…" (Nkiruka, ethics response paper, January 27, 2011, p. 1). These examples showed me that she was trying to make connections from previous writing assignments to this one even though the professor did not necessarily want Nkiruka to address her own opinions. Because she felt like she didn't know what to write, she was accessing her prior writing knowledge to help her create her response.

The second ethics paper was an extra credit assignment. According to Nkiruka, the prompt was as follows: Write about a dilemma you faced in which you made an immoral choice. Talk about two philosophers that you are comfortable with, and explain what their advice would be about the decision you made and how they came to that decision. She received half credit for the assignment, but this didn't seem to bother her because it was for extra points. In fact, Nkiruka did not realize that she had only received half credit when she gave the paper to me. It was clear in our discussion, and as I read through this piece, that she did not care about this assignment. In fact, she made up the dilemma that she talked about. She said she'd never made an immoral choice, so she wanted to think of something interesting—she wrote about cheating on an exam and getting kicked out of school. The text of the response was interesting in that it illustrated a lot of the skills that she would have worked on in her English classes. She opened with a two and a half page narrative about her life and the dilemma she faced. It was very story-like: "For as long as I can remember, I always maintained high grades….With not much time until the penultimate exam, I felt prepared and confident, even though there were certain chapters I still had not studied for" (Nkiruka, ethic extra credit, April 22, 2011, p. 1). After her introductory narrative, she attempted to engage with the ideas of the philosophers she was discussing. She did a nice job of paraphrasing in some places, but she completely ignored the academic conventions for imbedding quotes in a text. In discussing Immanuel Kant, she said, "An action is right only if the maxim behind the action is in accordance with the correct maxims and for the maxim to be correct, it has to be applicable to everybody without contradiction(s)" (Nkiruka, ethics extra credit, April 22, 2011, p. 3). This reads like a textbook, which is what Nkiruka references at the end of

the paper. She simply provided a reference, in MLA format, after the final paragraph, rather than preparing a separate Works Cited page. She then provided a brief conclusion where she says that the philosophers were right, she was wrong, and she should have chosen differently: "In conclusion and in hindsight, after weighing out my options now and having understood Kant and Mill's principles and viewpoints, I would never have made the decision to cheat…" (Nkiruka, ethics extra credit, April 22, 2011, p. 5). From a writing teacher's perspective, the paper would not have received a very high mark based simply on her lack of organization and development and overall disregard for the conventions of academic writing.

I found it curious that Nkiruka chose to give me these three specific pieces of writing, especially since the last one was clearly not very well-written. Her choices in what she submitted illustrated that she didn't think the writing she was doing during the term was very academic. As I discussed earlier, she had very clear views on serious writing and writing just for credit. The serious writing was worth worrying about, and the other simply wasn't.

Nkiruka's Academic Identity

An interesting thing to note, in terms of identity, is that in some of her classes, Nkiruka used an American name rather than her given name. When discussing her ethics class one day, I said, "I see that in philosophy you go by 'Anna.' Why?"

"Because my name has been butchered and severed beyond recognition."

"Do I say it okay?" I asked.

"Yeah. I actually started using Anna in Botswana because, yeah. It used to be all different pronunciations. My godmother gave me the name Anna; it's not on my passport or anything, but…." (Nkiruka, Interview 2, February 7, 2011, lines 546-553)

I believe that this conversation shows that Nkiruka was both trying to assimilate as well as distance herself from her academic identity. By using an Americanized name, Nkiruka was joining the academic community here at MPU because the majority of students had names like "Anna." However, by using a nickname, she was creating another version of herself that didn't really connect to who she was. Her Americanized identity and her status as an international student were often at odds with each other in this way.

Nkiruka believed that many of her professors didn't know that she was an international student: "Nobody knows I'm an international cause I don't (…)[32] everyone assumes I'm African American unless I tell them that I'm not" (Nkiruka, Interview 4, March 18, 2011, lines 36-38). I understand why Nkiruka didn't announce the fact that she was Nigerian; she was relatively shy in my class. She participated in her classes, asking and answering questions, but it seems that people didn't pay attention. "I want to…I don't want to be known as an African American cause I'm not. But I'm not going to say…people just assume that I am….I don't think my professor has picked up on the fact that my accent is slightly different" (Nkiruka, Interview 4, March 18, 2011, lines 45-49). I see this as another disconnect for Nkiruka in terms of her identity. She was repeatedly identified by others as being something that she was not, and she didn't like this label; however, she did nothing to correct the situation.

[32] (…) indicates the passage of time; in this case, Nkiruka was silent for approximately 5 seconds.

Another issue that affected Nkiruka's identity was the treatment that professors gave her when they did find out that she was an international student. "I feel like they give me different expectations. I think for some reason they kind of lower [them]. They don't really expect too much from me and then when I exceed that, they're impressed" (Nkiruka, Interview 4, March 18, 2011, lines 69-71). These lowered expectations may have contributed to Nkiruka's performance as a student. She had mentioned in several of our discussions that she was not doing as well as she would like. I believe that these expectations, influenced by the identity that had been assigned to her, were affecting her performance as a student. Why bother doing more work if no one expects you to do it?

Interpretive Analysis of Nkiruka's Academic Literacies Development and Socialization

Nkiruka had high aspirations for herself. She was a double major in human resources management and economics. She wanted to go to graduate school for both her master's and her doctorate, and then she wanted to return to her birth country to make changes in the labor practices of Nigerian businesses.

When I asked her, several times over the course of our interviews, to explain what academic writing was, she always referred to the Research Writing class that she had with me. She would talk about how important it was to join the academic conversation, to teach the professor or the reader something that they didn't know so that you'd keep their attention and make them want to read more from you.

Nkiruka was definitely in the process of developing her academic literacy. When she first started writing here, she said that she didn't even know how to indent a paragraph on the computer. She would just hit the space bar several times. Of course, it

could be said that this is a computer literacy skill, but it is still important to academic literacy development. She said that she wasn't sure, prior to my research writing class, how to correctly attribute information from other sources. Now, Nkiruka felt that she understood what it means to do "serious" academic writing, what that should look like and why it was important, even if she felt that she wasn't really there yet. So, while Nkiruka was admitting to simply "doing school" many times over the course of the semester, I think that this awareness and understanding also showed her academic literacy development. She understood what she needed to do, even if she hadn't been doing it.

Drew Kingston: "Not going to college wasn't an option"[33]

Background

Drew Kingston was born in eastern Pennsylvania, outside of Philadelphia, and then moved to Tennessee with his family when he was a toddler. When he was in middle school, his father switched careers, and they moved to central Pennsylvania. His mother was a surgical technologist at the local hospital, and his father was a corporate engineer for a large plastics manufacturing company. Drew had an older sister who was an aspiring country music artist, and she also attended college in Tennessee.

I first met Drew in my research writing class the previous spring. One of the first things I noticed about him as a student was his confidence. He was a student athlete—swimming—and very sure of himself both as an athlete and a student. In fact, I remember worrying at the beginning of the semester that he might think the course was too easy and therefore mentally check out of the class. Luckily he was dedicated to his schoolwork and

[33] Drew, Interview 4, April 27, 2011, line 118

his success, and he was one of the best writers in the class. During our interviews, Drew often expressed to me that college wasn't for everyone, and that he was seeing this first hand in his classes. It was something we talked about often, and I will discuss it in more detail later.

Drew remembered learning to read by using "Hooked on Phonics."[34] He and his sister would sit with their mother in the living room using the phonics system to learn to read. He recalled a competition at his elementary school involving reading. They had a list of books, and each book was worth a certain number of points. The more difficult the book was judged to be, the more points it was worth. Drew, being a highly competitive individual, remembered his choice of the Harry Potter series as his way to rack up points. As he said, "where I really started to learn how to read was the first Harry Potter book. I didn't pick it 'cause I thought it was interesting, or because my mind was imaginating [sic] magic, I picked it because it was worth more points than any other book that I could handle at the time" (Drew, Interview 1, February 25, 2011, lines 104-107). Drew attributes this competition and the Harry Potter books to the development of his literacy.

Drew was a second semester junior at the time of data collection. As discussed in chapter three, he was accepted into the 3+3 program at a large nearby university during the middle of the semester. He was the first student from MPU to enter into this program which would allow him, after finishing 3 years at MPU, to begin the law program at the larger university to study for three years. When he finished law school, he would graduate with a Bachelor's degree from MPU and his J.D. from the larger university.

[34] "Hooked on Phonics" is a system that uses the method of phonics to teach reading skills. Phonics is based on learning letters/sounds and letter/sound combinations to understand, and, therefore, read words.

Drew was recruited to swim at MPU, and after a visit, he felt that the campus would be a good fit for him. Originally a business major, Drew would actually be earning his Bachelor's in general studies, due the 3+3 program. In addition to swimming, Drew was also the team leader of the Student Managed Investment Portfolio at MPU. At the time of data collection, Drew was taking four classes: intermediate accounting 2, business law, operations management, and financial statements—all classes within the college of business.

Within the Academic Community

Drew was a confident student and writer; he often expressed his impatience with other students whom he felt were not meant to be attending college. It didn't seem as though Drew thought these students were taking class instruction away from him, necessarily; however, he did seem to feel that they were wasting space: "if someone's ready to give up on themselves, ready to settle for a C?...I feel like they might just want to give up college….If you don't care enough to get a B that you could easily earn, or get an A that's easily achievable, you need to go home. If you're one of my classmates, you're wasting my time" (Drew, Interview 1, February 25, 2011, lines 424-429). Drew's belief in his own abilities as a student and a writer made him feel like those students who weren't trying hard enough, those who weren't good students in his estimation, were bringing down the value of his own degree, making his experience as a student less meaningful.

Being a good student was one of the things, among many, that Drew had a firm opinion about.

> A good student is someone who cares to learn. They're not here because society just steered them in this direction, or their parents or something…. A good student would be someone who interacts with other students, you know, isn't in their own bubble, specifically here for learning only. But to learn, you know, how to socialize, to go to a classroom, interact with professors, to participate. I mean, college isn't just about sitting in the back, saying nothing. (Drew, Interview 2, March 16, 2011, lines 75-80)

It was interesting to hear that Drew's definition of a good student contained being able to manage time and socializing because most people seem to have the impression that to be a good student, you have to study constantly. He was very insistent that students understand that school was school, and that you had to go to class, talk with your professors and do the work along with things like making new friends, building relationships and partying.

Drew appeared to be the quintessential student. He completed all of his work, usually ahead of schedule, and he spoke often about how he would talk to his professors so they would know his name and remember him when grades rolled around. He answered questions often in his classes, sometimes to simply get points, but often to clarify what the professor was saying. He knew that if he had a question about something, usually someone else did too. He wasn't afraid to speak up, and he thought that if he could get something extra out of the class, it was almost like he was getting that something extra for free.

"Doing School"

It was true that in my class, Drew was one of the best writers. However, I would not say that he was the best student. Drew's confidence often got in the way of his being a great student. Part of that was the fact that he was really smart and, more than likely, liberal studies classes were too easy for him. The other part of that was he has been told many times that he was a great writer; making Drew aware of something that he should work on with his writing, for example, was very difficult.

In a discussion of a finance class where Drew struggled more than he did in other classes, it was apparent to me that he has strong thoughts on his academic literacy and how he fits into the academy. He was lamenting the fact that he had recently had, what he thought, too many points deducted off of an assignment for one small mistake. He said that the professor was very strict, and everyone within finance knew that he failed a lot of his students. As Drew said, "you can't win 'em all, and you can't fight the system. It's his course, he can do what he wants" (Drew, Interview 2, March 16, 2011, lines 274-275). In the same breath as complaining about this class, he said that he respected this professor because he did fail many students. Drew thought that students shouldn't get credit just for trying; students needed to earn their grades and accept them whether they were As or Fs.

It outraged Drew when he spoke about students who "work the system" (Drew, Interview 2, March 16, 2011, line 293). He also thought, though, that it was human nature for this to happen. "It's going to happen to some extent. But if you just work the system…let's say you're smart, and you're good at cheating. And you just cheat your way through college….You could get a degree that has no merit, and when you go to actually do that job, you get fired" (Drew, Interview 2, March 16, 2011, lines 292-296). It

was these students, Drew thought, who made his degree worth less. He thought the same way about classes that were known as easy As among students because more often than not, those classes weren't easy at all—they simply had the reputation—and students trying to "do school" made it seem as if the classes weren't meaningful.

Academic Writing

Drew explained his writing process to me by first explaining that there were two kinds of writing: "writing to write" and professional writing (Drew, Interview 1, February 25, 2011; Interview 2, March 16, 2011). "Writing to write" had fewer guidelines, and he equated this type of writing with the writing he had done in his English classes, for example. Professional writing was business writing, and it had specific guidelines, specific structure, page limits, etc. As Drew said,

> in business writing you need to be clear, you need to be concise …the writing builds on itself, and it has a purpose, and you're trying to persuade someone or make a point….when you just write to write, you can write about whatever you want….So with that, you can go all over the place in your writing, and as long as you somewhat pull it together at the end, just random paragraphs, that don't flow, pulled together by a conclusion? It works. (Drew, Interview 1, February 25, 2011, lines 649-662)

While Drew had this very specific definition for writing, he was also quite clear about his writing process. For him, if he were writing to write, he would just begin writing and getting things down on paper. If he were doing business writing, he first understood the goal of the paper, and then he planned out what he was going to say. Sometimes he wrote the plan down and sometimes he didn't, but overall, he would always have an outline—"a

game plan''—of the points he wanted to make (Drew, Interview 2, March 16, 2011, line 109).

After getting his ideas down on paper, regardless of the type of writing he was doing, Drew said that he always edited his work. The amount of editing depended on the type of writing and whether or not he thought the professor was actually going to read it, but he always did some kind of editing. It was important for Drew that his work looked and sounded like he put thought into it. He didn't simply edit for misspelled words or missing commas. He said that most of the time, he edited for content, organization, sentence structure, transitions, and voice. Drew said that it was necessary to edit so that your paper looked like you put thought in it. If it looked or sounded bad, you made a bad impression on the instructor, and they were less likely to take you seriously in the future.

While all of my participants were asked to re-submit their literacy autobiographies from the class that they took with me, Drew did not do so. In fact, despite repeated requests for writing, and repeated discussions of writing being done in his classes at the time, Drew only submitted one piece of writing to me—an extra credit assignment from his business law class. This was not due to the fact that Drew didn't take writing seriously. In fact, he mentioned repeatedly to me the importance of caring about your writing so that your professor knew that you cared about your work. Drew was the kind of student who tried to take something out of everything that he did, and whatever the assignment, he tried to learn something from it.

In looking further at the extra credit assignment Drew submitted to me, I can clearly see his voice as a writer. It had an informal tone, and in some of his word choices, I can see his personality very clearly. For example, his opening sentences read, "I found

Warren Buffet's letter written to investors to be very informative and upbeat. The man is obviously brilliant and without a doubt an intellectual giant" (Drew, business law extra credit, p. 1). In addition, by Drew's definition, this was professional writing rather than writing to write because it had clear requirements and business guidelines. It was typed, single spaced, 10-point font, etc. However, I believe that it has more of a writing to write quality because it was very narrative and clearly in response to something that he had read.

Drew clearly responded to individual parts of the original text by first summarizing what he had read and then voicing his own opinion. For example, "I do not know if Mr. Buffet will be able to continue with his goal of beating the returns plus dividends for the S&P500 in the upcoming year. I say this because I foresee the American economy to pickup and grow at an exponential rate this year" (Drew, business law extra credit, p. 1). This shows me that he knew how to successfully produce a written response for this professor. It also showed me that he didn't think the professor would take the time to read it. There were several grammatical errors and a general lack of transitions. About halfway through his response, Drew is talking about taking risks, and then the next paragraph talks about what he found most interesting. There is no transition between the two ideas: "Figure out what a company does and if you like the way the managers of a company plan, operate, and react to the marketplace. [paragraph break] Perhaps the most interesting part of the article was that Mr. Buffet said that he 'has a trigger finger'" (Drew, business law extra credit, p. 1). While he did not effectively transition in several places, he did appear to respond to the text fully. It seems as though Drew knew what the professor was looking for, so that is what he did.

I do not know what kind of grade he received for the assignment, although Drew thought that if he turned it in, he would receive full credit. Drew said, at the end of the text, that he found the reading interesting and useful, and he made connections to his own life and opinions. As he said, "I think that it is good to take away a lesson for the things you learn in life and I believe that this is one of the lessons that should not be forgotten quickly….Overall, I found this article enjoyable and very interesting" (Drew, business law extra credit, p. 2). This illustrates to me that Drew needed to show his professor that he was critically thinking about the reading and engaging with it, trying to get something out of everything that he was asked to do.

Drew once began an interview session complaining about a surprise writing assignment in his accounting class at the very end of the semester. He was annoyed that it wasn't on the syllabus, and that it was something that he had to do while final exams were looming and final projects were being completed. The assignment was to write a chapter review, which Drew interpreted for me as a chapter summary. And he said, "I don't know what you would anticipate, but I would think a 2-3 page, 12-point font, double spaced. Ours is 5-7 pages long, single spaced….For an accounting chapter….and there's no way he can read that many!" (Drew, Interview 4, April 27, 2011, lines 11-29). It was obvious that this assignment irritated Drew, but the more we talked about it, the more he came to think that maybe the assignment wasn't a waste after all. According to Drew, "I guess maybe it wasn't [a waste of time], now that I look back. I originally just pegged it as a waste of time because I didn't want to write that much…but maybe he was right just to show me. Maybe it was a writing assignment!... So maybe it was just to show you that you can write on anything" (Drew, Interview 4, April 27, 2011, lines 455-464).

This was just one example of the many times Drew explained that he always tried to learn from things he was asked to do in order to make his college experience and college classes more meaningful.

As just discussed, Drew was a student who felt that every class he took was meaningful in some way. In terms of the writing class that he took with me—research writing—Drew said the following: "It got you to start writing longer than what I'd been familiar with….I had to restructure the way I did writing, to some degree, adding things….it really developed my writing skills" (Drew, Interview 1, February 25, 2011, 475-484). Drew felt that his writing classes really prepared him to do longer work, both in terms of writing and reading. In addition, Drew felt that his English classes helped him with time and work management as well. He said that those classes, and the kind of work that he had to do in them, helped prepare him for the work he had to do in later classes. As he said, "I'd say in a number of my classes I've had to answer a short answer or something at the end of a test, and they've [English classes] taught you how to get your idea down and out and to the point….I don't think that topic really matters that much, just practice writing about something" (Drew, Interview 2, March 16, 2011, lines 522-532). In fact, Drew felt that writing and practicing good writing were the keys to college.

Drew's Academic Identity

Going back as far as high school, Drew said that after he was able to drive, his parents gave him a lot of freedom and expected him to be responsible, both in and out of school. If he got a speeding ticket, then it was his problem, not theirs. Things were the same for school, as well. If he didn't get his work done, then he dealt with the consequences. Therefore, Drew thought that being a more responsible high school

student led to being a more responsible college student. Drew understood early on that the consequences for not doing something were his responsibility, and his parents were not going to come rescue him.

Because Drew thought he was more responsible, he often felt that some of his classmates were not living up to their potential, which irritated him. As I have mentioned a number of times, Drew is a very confident person and student. It became apparent in our discussions that he thought of himself as the type of student others should emulate. He saw himself as someone who was intelligent, knowledgeable, and understanding of what it meant to be a student. Drew thought that students should ask and answer questions in class, visit professors during office hours, and generally make themselves known to their professors. He also felt that, in terms of writing, that while he had to follow the rules, there were still ways to make his voice heard. As he said, "regardless of exactly what I'm supposed to do…I just take the reins a little bit, and my voice is going to come out in it….you can be restricted, but you're never gonna be fully shut off. It's still you, it's still your words" (Drew, Interview 4, April 27, 2011, lines 508-512). This view of what it meant to be a student and what it meant to write were quite telling of Drew's academic identity and literacy development. In class, he paid attention, did (most) of the readings, asked and answered questions, and completed his work. He understood not only what it meant to exist within the academy, but also what it meant to succeed. I would say that Drew's confidence and success as a student were truly warranted.

Interpretive Analysis of Drew's Academic Literacies Development and Socialization

There is much to say about Drew's experiences that I don't have time for in the scope of this project. He was a very confident, opinionated, enthusiastic, driven

individual who had a lot to say about almost everything. It is no wonder that Drew was accepted early into the law program, and that his intention is to go into corporate law when he graduates.

Drew understood what it meant to be a university student. He had a highly developed academic literacy and he knew that being a student required certain things that were dependent on the type of class that he was in and the kind of professor that he had. I mentioned early in Drew's narrative that he was not the best student because he was almost too smart for the class. However, he "did school" very well. I think that Drew thought of himself as the best kind of student—one who did what he was asked and participated fully in each and every class. And while this might have been what some professors would have liked, I don't know if that made him the best overall student.

Interestingly, at the end of our last interview, Drew decided to summarize what he thought I was looking for in the questions that I had asked him. Of course, I had said repeatedly that the purpose of this project was to figure out what students were doing to develop their academic literacy and what writing had to do with that development. However, because Drew was very opinionated and knowledgeable about most everything, he wanted me to know what he thought this project was all about. As Drew said, "What you've been getting at is the idea of college. It's about you, who needs to go, and what is it….And specifically, the writing aspect of it" (Drew, Interview 4, April 27, 2011, lines 592-594). I think that his statement, and his desire to summarize for me what I was looking for, summed Drew up very well. And, he was more or less right. This project is about college, in a way. Not necessarily what Drew thought I was getting at in terms of who needs to attend, but about the academic literacy of the students.

Chapter Summary

The three participants who were involved in this study were as different as their narratives, and hopefully their stories expressed the diverse experiences that they each have had as undergraduate students. While they all have had different experiences, there were some similarities that arose from their narratives. For example, Nkiruka and Will, many times, felt as though they could be better students than they were currently being. Nkiruka and Drew both discussed how there were students that were wasting time in their classes, making their own experiences less valuable. In addition, Drew and Will talked about how their English classes helped them with reading and workloads. Finally, all of the participants talked about the importance of doing well, being in school, and being a good student.

From the student narratives, the following themes are discussed in Chapter Five: (a) challenging the undergraduate liberal arts curricula; (b) privileging English courses in the liberal arts curricula; (c) constructing good student versus "doing school" identities; and (d) perceiving written work as writing or non-writing. The themes are discussed in terms of their impact on academic literacies development and academic socialization for undergraduate students, and pedagogical, curricular, and professional development implications are discussed relevant to the themese. Chapter 5 concludes with considerations for further research as well as a final reflection of this research.

CHAPTER FIVE

UNDERSTANDING THREE ACADEMIC LIVES

My interest in this study stemmed from experiences in my own classroom and my desire to understand how my students see themselves and their experiences within the academy. These students' understandings of their academic lives are important to the fields of both composition studies and TESOL. Examining what students think about and how they negotiate their identities and socialization within the academy will aid in the development of writing and TESOL pedagogies which take advantage of and assist students with navigating the academic community.

Revisiting the Purpose of the Study

The specific purpose of this study was to understand how three unique, linguistically diverse undergraduates have developed their academic literacies and academic socialization after having completed the English courses which are part of the liberal arts requirement at MPU. The available literature in both composition studies and TESOL illustrated a gap in the research that this study hoped to begin to address. Looking at the students' experiences after they have completed introductory courses shows a level of student that is rarely discussed—that of the post-freshman experience. A review of the data yielded four primary themes: challenging the undergraduate liberal arts curricula, privileging English courses in the liberal arts curricula, constructing good student versus "doing school" identities, and perceiving written work as writing or non-writing. Even though these themes emerged from my reading and understanding of the data obtained from the three participants, it is not my intention to generalize the experiences of all undergraduate students. As with all qualitative research, my

interpretations of the participants' negotiations with academic literacies development are just some of the possible conclusions that could be reached. This illustrates one of the goals of case study research: allowing the researcher to create meaning out of the data collected so the reader can begin to understand the contexts and experiences of the individual cases (Yin, 2009). Each of the themes will be discussed below in order to further understand the possible implications in terms of the classroom, the undergraduate curriculum, and teaching pedagogies. Following the discussion of the themes and possible implications are discussions of further research and final reflections.

Discussion of the Themes

Theme One: Challenging the Undergraduate Liberal Arts Curricula

Within the participants' narratives, I discovered the first theme: challenging the undergraduate liberal arts curricula. This theme was especially evident in Nkiruka's narrative, but also present in Will's and Drew's, as well. Nkiruka was unhappy with having to take classes that she felt weren't related to her major. In fact, she would have been happier if she had only been required to take courses within her major because she would have had more time to take electives, within her field, which she otherwise was not going to have to time to take. She acknowledged the importance of taking classes such as English, but she also thought that if English classes—in other words, writing classes—were more tailored to her major, she would have been better off. I believe that Nkiruka also felt that being in classes with students who didn't share her major sometimes was a waste of her time. She was not interested in learning about chemistry or fashion design, so why take classes with these students? She obviously thought that

everyone would benefit more if the liberal arts classes were designed to fit within the majors—writing for human resources management, for example, or ethics for economics.

Will was not as vocal in his distaste for the liberal arts classes as Nkiruka was, but there were some ways in which Will was challenging the liberal arts curricula as well. It is expected that most students take their liberal arts classes within the first 3-4 semesters of their undergraduate career, combining them with introductory major classes to make up roughly the first two years of study. Will, however, had spread his liberal arts requirements over the course of his academic career, having scheduled two required liberal arts classes for his final semester of study. Will felt that spreading the required classes out over four years was like taking a break in his studies. Will thought that the required classes, while not necessarily easy, were easier than his major classes; however, in the same discussion, Will admitted to struggling more with non-major classes. So, while he thought these classes were a break, he also spread them out in order to keep his GPA and status as a student higher.

Drew firmly believed in taking classes outside of his major, and he thought that every class he took taught him something. However, Drew challenged the undergraduate curriculum by applying for the 3 + 3 program, into which he was accepted. This program let Drew construct his own degree. While this program is an excellent opportunity for Drew to begin his law studies early, it does impact the idea that he will receive a liberal arts education. Drew met with the professor in charge of creating degrees and matter-of-factly told that professor that he had taken enough classes and had enough of a variety, so there should be enough on his transcript in order to create the degree. Drew will end up

getting a bachelor's degree from MPU in general education at the end of his third year in law school, all while never having taken a single education class.

These examples of Nkiruka, Will, and Drew challenging the curricula support the work done by Parkinson (2000). Parkinson had success in teaching a science-based language course at the tertiary level where she taught her students about the genre of science writing, so they could be aware of what this type of writing needed to look like. As supported by the experiences of Nkiruka and Will, Parkinson believed that language courses need to be specific rather than general in order to facilitate genre awareness. In addition, these students were more successful because they saw the relevance of this type of writing to their own majors. I think that the success that my own participants had in their English classes was due to the fact that they were able to write about things that interested them—topics associated with their major—thus leading me to suggest that students write better and have more success if they see a correlation between what they are writing and their major interests. And, since there is such variety in the writing that students are asked to do throughout their career, as Parkinson (2000) confirms, there seems to be a need among undergraduate students for writing classes that are quite specific in their approach and design.

Other than the work done by Parkinson (2000), there is very little in the previous research that indicates scholars addressing this idea. I think this theme and the participants' experiences illustrate a need for further understanding of how and why students continue to challenge the undergraduate curricula and what, if anything, should be done about it.

Theme Two: Privileging English Courses in the Liberal Arts Curricula

I believe that the second theme—privileging English courses over other required courses—is directly related to the first. Overall, the participants felt that the English courses they had taken were more useful to their overall studies than other required liberal arts classes. Will felt that the English classes that he had taken had helped him with reading and understanding information, and he used these skills in the rest of his classes. In addition, Will felt that the research he did in my class was very helpful to him in his internship that he had completed. As far as his thoughts on the liberal arts required classes, Will thought that with the exception of the English classes, they weren't really useful to him and his future career. He thought that people in some majors might benefit, but not him personally.

Nkiruka believed that her English classes helped her in contributing to the academic conversation, which she felt was very important. She mentioned that learning to properly research and write about research were the most valuable skills she learned in her required English classes, which she often stated were the best of all of her required liberal arts classes. She was particularly unhappy with the introductory history class that she had taken—she did not see any value in this class at all. Nkiruka also doesn't do her best work when she is in the required liberal arts classes; she doesn't feel the need to put in as much effort to extraneous classes.

Drew believed that his English classes were some of the most beneficial liberal arts classes he had taken. They prepared him to do longer, more detailed work, and they also helped with his time management. Because Drew believed writing was a key to success in college, he found writing classes to be useful in most other classes as well.

Unlike Will and Nkiruka, Drew did not feel that the liberal arts classes were extraneous, and as I have mentioned several times before, he tried to get something out of every class that he took. He felt this idea was particularly important in the required liberal arts classes. Drew felt that in many of those classes, especially those that were heavily populated, he had to make the class work for him because the professor didn't have time to care about the students individually.

The experiences by Will, Nkiruka, and Drew illustrate the importance that these three students put on writing for and within the academic community. Not only limited to the class that they took from me, Will, Nkiruka, and Drew all described moments from other English classes where they saw the connection to their major, or understood how writing fit into the bigger academic picture. This idea is supported by the research of Jones (2000), Davis and Shadle (2000) and James (2010). These researchers found that, for their participants, transfer of skills does occur (James, 2010), and that students learn and understand the importance of writing in particular ways in order to fit into the academy (Davis & Shadle, 2000; Jones, 2000).

In connection with these ideas, Will, Nkiruka, and Drew also showed me that their complex academic identities were partly constructed by the majors that they had chosen. This link between their major identity and the classes that they privileged supported the recommendations by Ortmeier-Hooper (2008). Understanding our students' identity constructions and associations allows for a more in-depth connection between the students and the writing that they are doing. I think that Will, Nkiruka, and Drew all privileged their English classes because they were allowed to write about things that were important and were an integral part to their academic student identity.

A particular aspect of privileging English classes over other liberal arts classes is most clearly seen in Nkiruka's narrative when she discusses how important it is to be part of the academic community. She clearly sees the English class that she took with me as one which showed her how to be more "rhetorically flexible" (Johns, 2009) and how to fit her writing into the larger scope of the academy. Johns (2009), Negretti and Kuteeva (2011), Sengupta (1999) and Spycher (2007) all support Nkiruka's experience in developing her academic literacy and identity to be part of the academic conversation and community. Like the participants in those studies, Nkiruka has illustrated the ability to transfer skills learned in class to other types of writing; in addition, she can discuss how she sees those skills being beneficial to her academic literacy and to her work in other classes.

Theme Three: Constructing Good Student versus "Doing School" Identities

The third theme, how students constructed student identities, is the most interesting to me because of my initial impressions and expectations of my participants. I originally expected my participants to either "do school" or to not "do school." What I discovered was an intricate balance between the good student identity and the "doing school" identity of each participant.

I think that Will had the most complex and well developed academic identity out of the three participants. This may have been due to the fact that his parents both worked in education, and he had very specific memories and understandings of what it meant to be part of an education family. Will spoke often of the expectations for him to be a good student and how he thought there were many times when he did not meet those expectations the way everyone thought he should. He felt that this might have been due to

the fact that being a student wasn't easy for him—for example, he didn't really like reading, and it was a struggle for him. However, while he didn't like reading, he did it anyway, knowing that there was value in it, and it was something he was expected to do.

Will had a very clear definition, as did all of the participants, as to what it meant to be a good student. As discussed in his narrative, Will saw being a student as equal to having a job, and he saw professors as managers—students needed to do what professor wanted if they expected to do well. For Will, the key to being a good student was communication, and if he communicated—written or verbally—with his professors, whether he was doing well in terms of grades or not, that communication would in turn improve his standing as a good student. Will knew what professors expected of him, and he did what was expected. He also knew that these expectations varied depending on the professor and on the field that they were in. This was clearly evident in the writing that Will submitted to me. There was quite a bit of variety in something as simple as a reading response depending on which class it was being written for. Will didn't have a lot of confidence in himself as a student, but he was very sure of who he was and what he wanted out of school and life. This confidence allowed him to succeed at being a student when his abilities in the particular class might not. I think that Will's good student and "doing school" identities worked together very well, and he successfully negotiated these two aspects of his identity in order to be an effective student.

Nkiruka "did school" the most out of the three participants, and if I told her this, I'm sure it would come as no surprise. She admitted that she was often "doing school," even in the classes that she liked, was interested in, and were important to her major. Like Will, Nkiruka believed that she was a good student; however, she would, more often than

not, describe situations where she was "doing school" rather than being a good student. Her reading practices, for example, are a prime example of "doing school." She skips to the end of the chapter, reads the questions, and then skims for the answers so that she doesn't have to read all of the information. In terms of her writing, the article summary that she wrote for her management class was a clear example of "doing school," as discussed in chapter four. Nkiruka thought it was a good piece of writing because she was doing what was expected, not because she learned anything or further developed her own thinking about the topic.

With strong beliefs on what it means to be a good student, as well as what it means to "do school," Nkiruka may have been a victim of her international student status. Professors expected less of her, so she felt no need to surpass those expectations. Part of this was due to the fact that she was generally a shy student in class and didn't want a lot of attention. Another part, I think, was due to the fact that she wanted people to recognize her otherness without being told. In addition, Nkiruka was away from her family, and she admitted that she, like most students, could get caught up in the peer pressure and culture that exists at the undergraduate university level. Nkiruka made lots of excuses for why she was "doing school," and she wholeheartedly disapproved of students who engaged in this type of student behavior; however, she "did school" more often than not. Nkiruka's "doing school" identity usually surpassed her good student identity, resulting in a student who knew what she should do to succeed in her classes but often did not do things that way.

As mentioned in Drew's narrative, he was a student with extremely high levels of confidence—both as a person and as a student. Like all of the participants, Drew had

specific theories on what it meant to be a good student, and what it meant for a good student to succeed. In actuality, Drew was probably "doing school" a lot more than he thought he was. I believe that this was due to Drew's confidence as a student. He knew he was a good student and that he was intelligent; therefore, there were times when he thought the activities and readings he was asked to do for class were unnecessary. An example would be the extra credit chapter summary that he had to do for his accounting class, which he initially thought was a waste of his time. Even though he thought them unnecessary, he did them anyway. However, Drew would manage to do things his way. This was clearly evident in my class when Drew successfully convinced me that while everyone else was writing about a topic related to their field of study, he should be writing about how to construct an off-road Jeep. Drew wrote a good research paper, and as we talked several times during data collection, there were parts of the process that he learned a good deal from. Drew was "doing school" in this instance because he worked hard at getting his own way instead of writing the assignment as it was given. Ultimately, I think that while Drew sometimes did school, his good student identity meshed well with his "doing school" identity, thus creating an effective student identity.

Will, Nkiruka, and Drew all constructed their academic identities by combining "doing school" with being a good student. My participants closely resemble those of Pope (2001) when she looked at the academic socialization of high school students, and those of Newman et al. (2003) who looked at three groups of undergraduates. This study confirms what Pope (2001) and Newman et al. (2003) found, but expands on it as well. Pope's participants were all considered good students—as were mine—but they had not yet developed themselves enough in their academic identities and socialization in order to

have a balance between their "doing school" identity and their good student identity. In the case of Will and Drew, their "doing school" identities augment their good student identities. Nkiruka, unfortunately, most closely resembles Pope's (2001) students who did school all the time and the students of the study by Newman et al. (2003) who put in minimal effort in order to get by. Nkiruka knew what she should be doing, but she wasn't doing it, much to her own dismay.

The work of Barron (2003) is somewhat mirrored in Will's experiences with being the son of two educators. Will is by no means a Latino student struggling with staying in school and overcoming Latino/Chicano stereotypes; however, Will was working against the stereotypes associated with having a father who was a principal and then superintendent, a mother who was a school counselor, and an older sister who had always enjoyed academic success. Will managed to create his own unique academic identity in spite of these things, much like Barron's (2003) suggestions for her own participants.

In terms of another feature of identity that can be impacted by expectations and stereotypes, Starfield (2002) wrote about students in post-apartheid South Africa. She found that one of the participants, a black student who spoke English as a third language, was limited in his success as a student by the resources that he brought with him to the classroom. This was the case for my own participant, Nkiruka, as well. I mentioned earlier that I thought her academic identity was hampered by the lowered expectations of professors who knew she was an international student. Being an international student should be a resource that someone utilizes in their studies. However, Nkiruka was often limited by this aspect of herself when she should actually celebrate her difference and

unique understandings and experiences of her student life (Faez, 2011; Nelson & Temples, 2011; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008; Oulette, 2008; Starfield, 2002).

Theme Four: Perceiving Written Work as Writing or Non-Writing

This theme resulted out of the discussions my participants and I had about what writing was—or was not. Will was the participant that submitted the most pieces of writing to me from the semester. However, he only submitted writing from one class: senior synthesis. Will felt that most of the writing he was doing in his university career were worksheets and responses, which he did not think qualified as writing. I could not get him to discuss writing that he was doing in his major classes, though I got the impression there wasn't much writing involved since hospitality management is more service oriented. Will was taking other classes in which he had to do writing—chemistry, senior synthesis. He had a lab component with his chemistry lecture which involved completing lab reports, but he did not consider these to be writing, and, therefore, did not submit any of them to me. Will was generally intimidated by his non-major classes, even though he enjoyed writing. This idea of writing versus non-writing was something that carried throughout all three participants.

Nkiruka was very opinionated about writing. For her, academic writing—what she called serious writing—was research. Everything else that she was doing was just to fill up space. She didn't consider the space-filling to be real writing because if she completed the assignment, she received credit. Nkiruka gave me a few pieces of writing, three in total, but there were many types of writing that she didn't think I needed to look at. She was doing a case study project for her safety science class; she had to write about certain cases and her opinions of them, but she did not consider that to be writing. The

notes that she took in her ethics class—those were not considered writing either. Nkiruka liked to do serious writing, but she felt that the last time she had done any was in my class, which was a year prior to the data collection.

Drew had two types of writing that he discussed: writing to write and professional writing. For Drew, professional writing was writing that he did in business related classes. Writing to write had looser requirements and was not as important; sort of like Nkiruka's idea that if you wrote, then you received credit. Drew told me about a few times when he was doing some writing for his classes, but he only submitted one extra credit assignment for my review. One of the last discussions we had was about a writing assignment for his accounting class where he had to do a chapter summary. I would have classified this as an assignment just to receive credit, but Drew thought this was serious writing because it had business-like requirements. Drew thought that it was important to care about writing because to him, writing and practicing writing were the keys to college. However, I also got the impression that Drew thought anyone could do writing—especially the writing to write type of work that he mentioned.

The perception that all three participants had about what they considered to be writing and what they didn't consider to be writing illustrated their socialization into the academy. Nkiruka, for example, had learned that professors didn't think as much of writing that just got the grade, so it was less important. Even though I would argue that this type of writing serves many purposes—from critical thinking to the practice or development of an idea—she would disagree and say it wasn't writing at all. Based on her experiences in different classes, she had learned that writing has differing levels of importance, which illustrates the suggestions made by Davis and Shadle (2000). They

proposed a multi-genre approach to the teaching of research writing in order to show students that there is more variety in academic writing than what is normally thought. Their suggestions of more than a decade ago, while good, seem to not be apparent in the experiences of the participants of this study. I taught my research writing class with the idea that students could have more freedom in what they wrote about, in order to expand their interests and understandings of academic writing (Cheng, 2011). However, the experiences that the participants had after leaving my class do not seem to support this continued idea of expanding what it means to write in the academy.

Thinking more about my participants' understanding of the writing they were doing leads me to discuss Haneda (2005), Jackson, Meyer, and Parkinson (2006), and Mauk (2003). Haneda (2005) and Mauk (2003) both showed that students have different reasons for being invested in their writing and discussed the importance of understanding what communities of practice students belong to in order to understand their connection and motivation to write. Jackson et al. (2006) found a disconnect between what students were asked to do and what they were reading or seeing in class. This is most clearly illustrated in the example of Will, who, as a hospitality management major, did not seem to do much writing. Therefore, it wasn't surprising to hear from Will that he had different understandings of and reasons for writing, which led him to think about writing and his writing classes in a different way.

Tang and John (1999), Dressen-Hammouda (2008), and Yasuda (2011) also discuss motivation for writing, but in a slightly different way. The research by Tang and John (1999) led them to say that students who do not feel empowered enough by their instructors to belong to the academic community do not give any importance to writing.

Dressen-Hammouda (2008) and Yasuda (2011) found that students need to be taught not only how to write, but what to write and when. Without this explicit instruction, students are not motivated to write, nor do they see the importance of writing. The experiences of both Nkiruka and Drew support these ideas. Nkiruka didn't think that writing just for a grade was worth anything because she had been taught by her instructors that this type of writing wasn't read or graded—even though it may have been—so it wasn't important. Drew only thought writing that had specific guidelines and limits was important. This supports the ideas of Dressen-Hammouda (2008), who suggested that students need explicit instruction in order to see the importance; however, this also illustrates a flaw in that reasoning. Drew didn't think other types of writing, non-business writing, were very important simply because they didn't have as many guidelines or restrictions. What we should be teaching our students is that all writing is important, and there are many ways to go about doing those different types of writing.

These four themes—challenging the undergraduate liberal arts curricula, privileging English courses in the liberal arts curricula, developing good student versus "doing school" identities, and perceiving written work as writing or non-writing—all work together to illustrate the experiences that these three participants had in developing their academic literacies, socialization, and identities. With these three in-depth cases, it is important that I acknowledge that my goal here is not to generalize, by any means, the unique experiences of these three participants as being the same as other undergraduate students. My understandings are part of many possible knowledge constructions that are the results of my analysis and interpretation of the data, along with my classroom experiences. Our students are complicated, and the narratives of the participants in this

study prove that this is true. The experiences and insights of these participants can raise our sensitivity to issues that may result from working with multilingual learners in both composition and ESL classrooms. These insights could assist teachers, administrators, and writing coordinators with understanding their students and their negotiations within the academic community. There are issues that can and need to be considered in terms of pedagogy, curriculum and the professional development of instructors regarding how students develop their academic literacies, socialization, and identities, which I address in the next section.

Implications for Teaching, Curricular Development and Professional Development

One of the implications of this study in the area of teaching shows a need to introduce a variety of genres in writing. For instance, in the spirit of Hyland's (2007) call for bringing genre pedagogies together coupled with Hall's (2009) request for collaboration between different departments and disciplines, it would be useful for undergraduate writing teachers to introduce disciplinary writing models and prompts as a way for students to see the range of writings available in the academy. This was particularly poignant in Nkiruka's narrative when she commented that she would like to have classes devoted to her major (e.g., business ethics or writing for human resources) since she felt that many of her classes were not relevant to her future. Nkiruka needed writing in her classes to be authentic and useful for her. With such cross-disciplinary associations, students would have a broader understanding of how writing is done in other disciplines and how writing is important regardless of the field. It would also allow students to see and practice the different genres that they might do in the various classes that they are required to take.

Related to the idea of having teachers introduce a range of writing, the next implication involves addressing the writing curriculum in the university. Writing is not simply the responsibility of the freshman writing program or the English department. Students come into the university with unique backgrounds, experiences, understandings, and perspectives. We cannot expect all students to develop their academic literacies and socialization in the same way, nor can we expect them to have the same understanding of academic writing after just one or two semesters of a writing class. Therefore, it is important for writing and writing instruction to be done across the curriculum and across disciplines. As Kumaravadivelu (2001) discussed, instruction needs to be practical, possible and particular—not only for teachers but also for students. Instruction needs to be practical so everyone involved sees how it relates and works beyond theory. It needs to be possible for both instructors and students to create a pedagogy that is the result of individual situations and needs; this possibility allows for both instructors and students to be empowered by learning rather than stifled. Instruction needs to be particular in that it addresses a particular group at a particular time with a particular goal in mind. Writing in a variety of ways at different levels of instruction would ensure that students would see writing as authentic, and relevant to their lives, their academic careers, and their futures (see also Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

The last implication I will discuss is in terms of the professional development of composition teachers. The themes I discussed earlier can be considered by the individual teacher in her individual classroom; however, it is also important to share this information with each other (see also Hall, 2009). I propose professional development workshops where teachers share and learn about the academic socialization and academic

identity development of their students. This professional training would serve the purpose of allowing teachers to learn more about their students' understanding of academic socialization, as well as encouraging them to explore new pedagogical ideas to help facilitate classes where academic socialization and academic identity development could be better promoted. In turn, this type of professional development—where the teachers are responsible for understanding and creating their classrooms—would address the issues of practicality, possibility, and particularity that I discussed earlier vis-à-vis Kumaravadivelu (2001, 2003).

All of the implications I discuss are towards a more complex understanding of what it means to be teachers and administrators who are more aware of what students need in terms of their academic literacies, socialization, and identities development. I will next consider future research directions that resulted from this study.

Future Research Directions

Based on the findings of this study, I delineate the following research directions:

- Due to the limited number of participants in this study, one of the follow-up and/or extended studies would be to explore undergraduate students in research writing courses that come from a variety of majors. The participants in this study were in the following fields: general education, hospitality management, and human resources and economics; the humanities, education, sciences, nursing, etc., were not represented. Being able to compare the experiences of the three participants to students from other majors would be useful to understanding how other undergraduate students understood their academic socialization and identity development.

- Methodologically speaking, given the nature of how writing develops in one's academic journey and how students can be socialized differently in a variety of disciplines, it would be beneficial to follow the three students and/or begin a longitudinal study that encompasses the students' four years in their undergraduate careers.
- Given the suggestion of institutional professional development workshops for composition teachers, another area of future research would be to document the experiences and the emergent pedagogical ideas of teachers participating in those professional development workshops.
- Based on this research, I have identified several possible academic journals to which I can submit. I would first like to focus one article on the story of Nkiruka and her "doing school" identity. Secondly, I want to further discuss the idea of writing across the curriculum and how this idea can impact the development of students' academic literacies. Thirdly, I want to elaborate on the idea that these students, who have non-English majors, value their English courses above all liberal arts requirements. Finally, I would like to write an article calling attention to World Englishes and the impact that academic literacy development and genre awareness has on WE speakers.

Reflections of a Teacher-Scholar

Students may still need to learn how to do particular things for particular professors, but it is more important that students understand what it means to belong to the university community and to utilize what they are learning throughout their academic careers.[35]

[35] Original discussion found on p. 5 of chapter one.

I begin my final reflections with this brief snapshot from chapter one in order to return to my own pedagogical development and discuss what I learned from this research experience. Developing this study and the subsequent writing was long, complex, and a continually evolving process—much like the academic experiences of Will, Nkiruka, and Drew. My purpose was to explore and understand the experiences of these three undergraduate learners as they negotiated and developed their academic literacies and socialization. What I now understand about academic identity construction and academic socialization is that it is as individual and complex as the student. When I think about my own teaching and what I have observed in others' classrooms, I know that there are things that can be done to make it easier for students to develop their academic literacies and identities in ways that they will see as useful and relevant for their own lives.

My own pedagogy and teaching philosophy has shifted after completing this study and understanding how my participants were developing their academic socialization and identities. I am now even more focused on the idea of helping my students develop rhetorical flexibility and understanding what it means to belong to the academic community. I begin all writing classes by explaining that writing at the university level is never an isolated experience. The skills that the students develop in all levels of writing classes—whether a freshman composition, ESL writing, or upper level writing intensive course—will be useful in other aspects of their academic careers. I believe that students need to understand that writing is everywhere, and learning how to do writing well will lead to more developed academic literacies. And, hopefully, more developed academic literacies will lead to better engagement and understanding of the academic community. This is not guaranteed, by any means, but I think that it is

important to begin a class with explaining how this understanding of the academic community will be beneficial for their academic careers.

I am now teaching[36] an ESP (English for Specific Purposes) course at my current institution. The course consists of 24 Middle Eastern students who have been conditionally admitted to the engineering program. The students are struggling with completing the ESL program and achieving the test scores that they need to fully matriculate into the university. The administration, along with the students' scholarship program, has decided that it would be beneficial for the students to take a writing class geared towards their field of engineering. The purpose of the course, then, is to help the students develop their academic literacy skills within engineering. The students will engage with authentic readings and writings where they will be expected to learn and understand the writing conventions found within that field. In other words, my task, as their teacher, is to help them understand and develop the rhetorical flexibility and genre awareness needed to succeed at the various writing tasks they will be asked to do as engineering majors. I have coordinated this class along with time in the engineering writing center so that the students can fully understand what it means to read, write, and participate in this disciplinary field.

This class on academic writing for engineering students is just one small example of how my understanding of my own teaching has shifted. Instead of thinking about my class as something unique and individual, I now think about my class as part of the larger academic community. I also understand that my class, while not necessarily unique, is still important to the larger picture of academic success and socialization that I want my

[36] Fall 2012

students to achieve. Writing is done across all disciplines, through note-taking, worksheets, essays, research projects, case studies, chapter summaries, poster presentations, Power Points, and many other forms. Understanding what students think and experience in the writing classroom will help the academy develop, and in turn, will help the development of academic literacies and identities of our students as well.

I am indebted to the participants of this study for sharing their understandings, experiences, and negotiations with developing their academic selves, and for helping me think about my own teaching in terms of how I can help my students better understand and develop within the academy. At the time of writing, Will had graduated from MPU and returned to his hometown. He works full-time for a high-end limousine service, which combines his love of automobiles with his love of the hospitality industry. He hopes to one day work as a manager at an exclusive resort somewhere warm. Nkiruka is in her last semester of classes at MPU. She still doesn't enjoy every class that she has to take, but she says that she is working hard to be successful. She still aspires to go to graduate school for both her Master's and her Ph.D. and return to her home country to improve the lives of those living there. Drew has left MPU and finished his first year of law school. He feels that he made a great decision to enter the 3+3 program and leave MPU early. In less than two years, he will receive his bachelor's and J.D., and he hopes to eventually be working in a large metropolitan city.

This study was designed in order to help one teacher-scholar better understand the experiences of her students in the hopes of making her classroom instruction that much better. I am optimistic that the insights found in the participants' narratives and my interpretations of those experiences will allow others to think about how they construct

and create writing classes in ways that honor the unique lives and experiences of students, regardless of whether they are in a writing class or not.

REFERENCES

Barclay-McLaughlin, G., Kershaw, C., & Roberts, D. (2007). Cultural autobiographies and oral histories. *Theory into Practice, 46*(3), 222-229.

Barron, N.G. (2003). Dear saints, dear Stella: Letters examining the messy lines of expectations, stereotypes, and identity in higher education. *College Composition and Communication, 55*(1), 11-37.

Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In Mike Rose (ed.), *When a writer can't write: Studies in writer's block and other composing-process problems* (pp. 134-165). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies*. London, England: Routledge Press.

Bawarshi, A. (2006). Taking up language difference in composition. *College English, 68*(6), 652-656.

Behrens, L. (1980). Meditations, reminiscences, polemics: Composition readers and the service course. *College English, 41*(5), 561-570.

Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Bizzell, P. (1999). Hybrid academic discourses: What, why, how. *Composition Studies, 27*(2), 7-21.

Blanton, L. (2005). Student, interrupted: A tale of two would-be writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(2), 105-121.

Bolton, K. (2005). Where WE stands: Approaches, issues, and debate in world Englishes. *World Englishes, 24*(1), 69-83.

Canagarajah, A.S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Canagarajah, A.S. (2006a). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication, 57*(4), 586-620.

Canagarajah, A.S. (2006b). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English, 68*(6), 589-604.

Carter, B. (2008). Teacher-learners' voices: Not the same old song. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 2*(1), 33-46.

Chandrasegaran, A. (2008). NNS students' arguments in English: Observations in formal and informal contexts. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(4), 237-254.

Cheng, A. (2007). Transferring generic features and recontextualizing genre awareness: Understanding writing performance in the ESP genre-based literacy framework. *English for Specific Purposes, 26*, 287-307.

Cheng, A. (2008a). Analyzing genre exemplars in preparation for writing: The case of an L2 graduate student in the ESP genre-based instructional framework of academic literacy. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(1), 50-71.

Cheng, A. (2008b). Individualized engagement with genre in academic literacy tasks. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(4), 387-411.

Cheng, A. (2011). Language features as the pathways to genre: Students' attention to non-prototypical features and its implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*(1), 69-82.

Cooper, M.M. (1989). The ecology of writing. In M. Cooper & M. Holzman (Eds.), *Writing as social action* (p. 1-13). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton.

Creswell, J.W. (2006). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crosby, C.R. (2007). *The academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners: How three Generation 1.5 learners negotiated various academic literacies contexts in their first year of university study* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses database. (AAT 3273218)

Curtis, M., & Herrington, A. (2003). Writing development in the college years: By whose definition? *College Composition and Communication, 55*(1), 69-90.

Davis, R., & Shadle, M. (2000). "Building a mystery": Alternative research writing and the academic act of seeking. *College Composition and Communication, 51*(3), 417-446.

Dean, D. (2008). *Genre theory: Teaching, writing, and being*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N.K.Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Disney college program informational sessions (2011, March 14). *Indiana University of Pennsylvania Student Organizations*. Retrieved March 25, 2011, from http://www.iup.edu/newsItem.aspx?id=106921&blogid=17212

Dobrin, S., & Weisser, C.R. (2002). Breaking ground in ecocomposition: Exploring relationships between discourse and environment. *College English, 64*(5), 566-589.

Dressen-Hammouda, D. (2008). From novice to disciplinary expert: Disciplinary identity and genre mastery. *English for Specific Purposes, 27*(2), 233-252.

Elbow, P. (1991). Reflections on academic discourse: How it relates to freshmen and colleagues. *College English 53*(2), 135-155.

Erlandson, D.A., Harris, E.L., Skipper, B.L., & Allen, S.D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Facts about IUP. (2010). *Indiana University of Pennsylvania*. Retrieved March 25, 2011, from http://www.iup.edu/about/default.aspx

Faez, F. (2011). Reconceptualizing the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 10*(4), 63-82.

Florio-Ruane, S. (2001). *Teacher education and the cultural imagination: Autobiography, conversation, and narrative*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Flowerdew, J. (2002). *Academic discourse*. New York, NY: Longman.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2011). Case study. In N.K.Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 301-316). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106-116.

Gebhard, M., Demers, J., & Castillo-Rosenthal, Z. (2008). Teachers as critical text analysts: L2 literacies and teachers' working ht e context of high-stakes school reform. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(4), 274-291.

Goen, S., Porter, P., Swanson, D., & Vandommelen, D. (2002). Generation 1.5. *The CATESOL Journal, 14*(1), 103-105.

Goldschmidt, M., & Ousey, D. (2006). Jump start to resolving developmental immigrant students' misconceptions about college. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 22*(2), 16-30.

Graff, G. (1992). *Beyond the culture wars: How teaching the conflicts can revitalize American education*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Hall, J. (2009). WAC/WID in the next America: Redefining professional identity in the age of multilingual majority. *The WAC Journal, 20*, 33-49.

Haneda, M. (2005). Investing in foreign-language writing: A study of two multicultural learners. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 4*(4), 269-290.

Hansen-Thomas, H. (2009). Reform-oriented mathematics in three 6th grade classes: How teachers draw in ELLs to academic discourse. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 8*(2/3), 88-106.

Hawisher, G.E., Selfe, C.L., Guo, Y.H., & Liu, L. (2006). Globalization and agency: Designing and redesigning the literacies of cyberspace. *College English, 68*(6), 619-636.

Heath, S. B. (1986). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and at school. In B.B.Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language and socialization across cultures*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Herrington, A., & Moran, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Genre across the curriculum.* Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication, 53*(4), 594-631.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. New York, NY: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2002). Specificity revisited: How far should we go now? *English for Specific Purposes, 21*(4), 385-395.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(1), 17-29.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania. (2010-2011). *Undergraduate catalog*. Indiana, PA: Author.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.

Jackson, L., Meyer, W., & Parkinson, J. (2006). A study of the writing tasks and reading assigned to undergraduate science students at a South African university. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(3), 260-281.

James, M.A. (2010). An investigation of learning transfer in English-for-general-academic-purposes writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(4), 183-206.

Johns, A.M. (2009). Situated invention and genres: Assisting generation 1.5 students in developing rhetorical flexibility. In M. Roberge et al. (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 203-220). New York, NY: Routledge.

Jones, D.C. (2000). Engaging students in the conflict: Academic discourse, its variations, and its instruction. *Composition Studies, 28*(1), 95-113.

Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong, HK: Hong Kong University Press.

Kill, M. (2006). Acknowledging the rough edges of the resistance: Negotiation of identities for first-year composition. *College Composition and Communication, 58*(2), 213-235.

Kouritzin, S. (2000). Immigrant mothers redefine access to ESL classes: Contradiction and ambivalence. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *21*(1), 14-32.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(4), 537-560.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). A postmethod perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes, 22*(4), 539-550.

Kyles, C.R., & Olafson, L. (2008). Uncovering preservice teacher's beliefs about diversity through reflective writing. *Urban Education, 43*(5), 500-518.

Lea, M. (2004). Academic literacies: A pedagogy for course design. *Studies in Higher Education, 29*, 739-756.

Lea, M.R., & Street, B.V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*, 157-172.

Lea, M.R., & Street, B.V. (1999). Writing as academic literacies: Understanding textual practices in higher education. In C.N. Candlin & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: Texts, processes, and practices* (pp. 62-81). London, UK: Longman.

Lea, M.R., & Street, B.V. (2006). The "academic literacies" model: Theory and applications. *Theory into Practice, 45*(4), 368-377.

Leki, I. (2003). Living through college literacy: Nursing in a second language. *Written Communication, 20*, 81-98.

Lemke, J.L. (1989). Social semiotics: A new model for literacy education. In D. Bloome (Ed.), *Classrooms and literacy* (pp. 289-309). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealized native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 543-575.

MacDonald, S.P. (1987). Problem definition in academic writing. *College English 49*(3), 315-331.

MacDonald, S.P. (2010). *Professional academic writing in the humanities and social sciences*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Matsuda, P.K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English, 68*(6), 637-651.

Mauk, J. (2003). Location, location, location: The "real" (e)states of being, writing, and thinking in composition. *College English, 65*(4), 368-388.

Maxwell, J.A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McArthur, T. (1998). *The English languages*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Negretti, R. & Kuteeva, M. (2011). Fostering metacognitive genre awareness in L2 academic reading and writing: A case study of pre-service English teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*(2), 95-110.

Nelson, G., & Temples, A.L. (2011). Identity construction as nexus of multimembership: Attempts at reconciliation through an online intercultural communications course. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 10*(2), 63-82.

Newman, M., Trenchs-Parera, M., & Pujol M. (2003). Core academic literacy principles versus culture-specific practices: A multi-case study of academic achievement. *English for Specific Purposes 22*(1), 45-71.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change.* Essex, UK: Pearson.

Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). "English may be my second language, but I'm not 'ESL.'" *College Composition and Communication, 59*(3), 389-420.

Oulette, M.A. (2008). Weaving strands of writer identity: Self as author and the NNES "plagiarist." *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(4), 255-273.

Owens, D. (2001). *Composition and sustainability: Teaching for a threatened generation*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Park, H. (2009). *Framing academic socialization of international undergraduates in an American university: A critical ethnographic study* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses database. (AAT 3375896)

Parkinson, J. (2000). Acquiring scientific literacy through content and genre: a theme-based language course for science students. *English for Specific Purposes, 19*(4), 369-387.

Pavlenko, A. (2004). Gender and sexuality in foreign and second language education: Critical and feminist approaches. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 53-71). Cambridge, UK: The Cambridge University Press.

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(2), 201-230.

Peräkylä, A., & Ruusuvuori, J. (2011). Analyzing talk and text. In N.K.Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 529-544). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pope, D.C. (2001). *"Doing school": How we are creating a generation of stressed out, materialistic, and miseducated students*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ramsey, B.L.S. (2008). *Composition programs and practices in Sweden: Possibilities for cross-fertilization with the United States* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses database. (AAT 3326719)

Richardson, E. (2002). "To protect and serve": African American female literacies. *College Composition and Communication, 53*(4), 675-704.

Rubin, H.J., & Rubin, I.S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Russell, D. (1995). Activity theory and its implications for writing instruction. In J. Petraglia (Ed.), *Reconceiving writing, rethinking writing instruction* (pp. 51-77). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schwandt, T.A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Seloni, L. (2008). *Reconceptualization of academic literacy socialization in an intercultural space: A microethnographic inquiry of first year multilingual doctoral students in the U.S.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses database. (AAT 3375431)

Seloni, L. (2012). Academic literacy socialization of first year doctoral students in US: A micro-ethnographic perspective. *English for Specific Purposes, 31*(1), 47-59.

Sengupta, S. (1999). Rhetorical consciousness raising in the L2 reading classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 291-319.

Spycher, P. (2007). Academic writing of adolescent English learners: Learning to use "although." *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(4), 238-254.

Starfield, S. (2002). "I'm a second-language English speaker": Negotiating writer identity and authority in sociology one. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 1*(2), 121-140.

Steinman, L. (2007). Literacy autobiographies in a university ESL class. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 64*(4), 653-673.

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. (1993). *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B.V. (1995*). Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy development, ethnography, and education*. London, UK: Longman.

Street, B. (2000). Literacy event and literacy practices: Theory and practice in the new literacy studies. In M. Martin-Jones & K. Jones (Eds.), *Multilingual literacies:*

Reading and writing different worlds (pp. 17-29). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.

Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The 'I' in identity: exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*(supplement 1), S23-S39.

Valentine, K. (2006). Plagiarism as literacy practice: Recognizing and rethinking ethical binaries. *College Composition and Communication,* 58(1), 89-109.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Wardle, E. (2007). Understanding ''transfer'' from FYC: Preliminary results of a longitudinal study. *Writing Program Administration, 31*, 65–85.

Wardle, E. (2009). 'Mutt genres' and the goal of FYC: Can we help students write the genres of the university? *College Composition and Communication, 60*, 765–789.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Yasuda, S. (2011). Genre-based tasks in foreign language writing: Developing writers' genre awareness, linguistic knowledge, and writing competence. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*(2), 111-133.

Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*, (4th ed) [Kindle version]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com/Case-Study-Research-Methods-Applied/dp/1412960991/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1300650866&sr=1-1-spell#_

Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (1998). *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Appendix A—Syllabus for Research Writing Class

EN 202: Research Writing
Literacies in the Academy
Spring 2010

Instructor: Whitney Tudor Sarver
Class: EN 202-002
Location: Smith 214
Day/Time: MWF 9:05—9:55 am
E-mail: w.a.tudor@MPU.edu
Office: Ballard 406 **Office Phone:** 724-357-7969
Office Hours: MWF 10:10-11:00 am, 12:20-1:10 pm or by appointment. Please contact me if you need to schedule an alternate time to meet.

Catalog Description and Purpose:
Research Writing teaches students to read, analyze, and evaluate nonfiction sources and to present the results of their analysis in clear, organized, carefully documented research papers. The focus of reading and research in each section will be determined by the instructor. The purpose of this course is to provide you with a step by step explanation of the research writing process to equip you with the skills essential to building knowledge in all disciplines throughout your curriculum.

Specific Course Description:
Our Research Writing course is designed around the concept of doing research. Research is a concept that most students are wary of—do you have to go sit in the basement of the library for days without seeing the sun? Of course not. There are many ways to do research, and we're going to work through and practice those ways in our class.

Research writing is a special genre of academic writing and is something that you will be expected to do well within your major classes. There are many types of research, and different fields require different kinds of research. Your tasks throughout this semester will be to identify the type(s) of research that is best suited to your field and understand how you can join the academic conversation within your major. These ideas may seem daunting now, but we will discuss genres, rhetorical patterns, the academy, research, writing, and many other ideas as we proceed through the semester. Ultimately, you will have a better understanding of what it means to research and write within your field by the time you complete this class, and this understanding will allow you to better situate yourself within the academy.

Specific Course Objectives:
Students in this course will develop their abilities to:
1. Identify genres and rhetorical patterns within reading/writing;
2. Use the library and other sources to conduct research;
3. Identify what good sources are and how to use them;
4. Correctly cite sources both in-text and as bibliographical entries;

5. Write using their own knowledge and information they have gathered;
6. Research and write according to the specific genre/rhetorical patterns found within their specific fields.

Required Textbook(s) and Supplies:

Ballenger, B. (2009). *The curious researcher: A guide to writing research papers*. 6th ed. New York: Longman. (abbreviated as CR on the daily schedule)

Satrapi, M. (2003). *The complete Persepolis*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Course readings from e-reserve, paper and pencil/pen, money for copies, device for saving computer work, notebook or folder for research journal, notebook or folder for other materials

E-Reserve: http://www.iup.edu/library

We have some readings on e-reserve. They are marked in the syllabus with an asterisk (*****). In order to access the e-reserve readings, go to the website listed above, click on "Library Services," then click on "E-reserve." You will need to search for our class; the easiest way is by professor's last name (Tudor). Then you will be asked for a password, which is: tudengl202. This will give you access to all of the readings on e-reserve for our class.

Bergmann, L. S. (2010). "Adapting writing for professional audiences." *Academic research and writing*. Boston: Longman. 141-155.

Bergmann, L. S. (2010). "Moving from summary to synthesis." *Academic research and writing.* Boston: Longman. 117-119.

Bergmann, L. S. (2010). "Using sources effectively." *Academic research and writing*. Boston: Longman. 101-111.

Bergmann, L. S. (2010). "Writing an annotated bibliography." *Academic research and writing*. Boston: Longman. 111-117.

Lamott, A. (1994). "Shitty first drafts." *Bird by bird: Some instructions on writing and life*. New York: Anchor Books Random House. Pp. 21-27.

Course Policies and Procedures:

Attendance

Attendance in this course is mandatory. This is IUP's policy and also my policy. If you do not attend class, you do not do as well in the course as if you do attend. However, there are some cases where students are perhaps unable or unwilling to come to class. If you miss more than three days of class, then your grade will suffer.

You can miss up to three days without any negative consequences, as long as you let me know that you are going to miss class prior to our class meeting time. This would be the

equivalent of personal/sick days if you were on the job. If you are going to use one of your three personal/sick days, you MUST let me know prior to the beginning of class. You can either e-mail me or call my office. You don't have to give me an excuse; simply say that you are using one of your personal/sick days. This is what you have to do when you are working a job, so that is what you will do in our class. If you have not contacted me prior to your being absent, then you cannot take a personal/sick day; those will be considered unexcused absences and will affect your final grade.

Attendance will be taken at the beginning of each lesson, and students who arrive late will be marked tardy. (You are considered late if you arrive after I begin taking attendance.) Two tardies are the equivalent of one absence.

Anything more than your three absences is excessive. After three absences, your final grade will go down. Penalties for missed classes are as follows: if a student misses more than three days of class meetings for a course in one semester, his/her final grade will be lowered by 5%. For each additional class missed, the grade will be lowered by the same amount again. For example, an 87% average will be lowered to a grade of 82% for four days missed. If the student misses five days of class, their grade will be lowered from an 87% to a 77%. This penalty is in addition to any penalty you might receive for missing or late work. In addition, if you miss more than 11 classes (25%), you will automatically fail this class.

If you have extenuating circumstances, such as the death of an immediate family member, severe medical problems, court appearances, etc, then these could be considered exceptions to the above attendance policy. These will be determined on a case-by-case basis, and I reserve the right to pass judgment on such cases.

Missed Class Work: If you miss class, even for personal/sick days, you are unable to make up daily work that is completed in class. You are also responsible for finding out homework assignments from classmates, the syllabus and/or your instructor. You are expected to complete those assignments and turn them in when they are due.

Late Assignments: Late assignments will not be accepted, regardless of excuse.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is submitting someone else's work as your own (including material from classmates, books, newspapers, magazines, the internet, etc.). **Do not do it.** Plagiarism is a serious academic offense and could result in expulsion from the university. Please see the English Department website (http://www.english.iup.edu/liberalstudies/plagiarism.htm) for more information on the university's official plagiarism policy.

Classroom Conduct: You should conduct yourself in a courteous and respectful manner, both in terms of how you address your instructor and how you address your fellow classmates. You are an adult and are expected to act as an adult. This means no cell phones ringing, no texting, etc. You must also respect the opinions and questions of your classmates; it is fine to disagree but not fine to disrespect what someone has to say. If

you are doing any of these activities during class, you will not receive your participation points for the day; it will be as if you weren't in class at all.

Course Grading: Percentages which determine final grades are as follows:

Daily Work/Participation	20%
Research Journal	10%
Quizzes	5%
Portfolio	5%
Individual Conferences	5%
Unit 1	
Response Papers	15%
Interview Write-up	5%
Unit 2	
Proposal	5%
Annotated bibliography 5%	
First draft	5%
Second draft	15%
Cover letter	5%

Letter grade equivalents in percentages are as follows:

A 100–90%; B 89–80%; C 79–70%; D 69–60%; F 59% and below

Course Components and Assignments:

All assignments (except research journal entries) must be typed, double-spaced, with one inch margins, in Times New Roman 12-point font. Multiple pages must be stapled, not paper clipped or loose. All assignments must be handed in on paper unless otherwise requested. All of the assignments I describe below will be covered in much greater detail in class. And don't worry; I will give you plenty of information to help you decide what exactly you will need to do, including information on how each assignment will be graded, well in advance of the deadlines.

Daily Work/Participation: Participation is more than just coming to class. You must be prepared, do the readings, do the assignments, do in-class writing activities, and be engaged in all classroom activities. This component is 20% of your final grade.

Research Journal: We will write in class every day. You will write these entries in your Research Journal, which can be either a spiral bound notebook, a folder or a small binder. You will turn in your journal to me for evaluation 3 times during the semester. I will let you know the class before when I intend to collect them. Most often, I will allow you time to complete your writing in class. However, there may be times that I ask you to reflect outside of class as well. These entries may be in the form of freewriting, guided responses, and/or exercises from our book. Keeping a research journal will give you a chance to think about and reflect on the readings, your writing, our discussions, and the projects that you are working on. Your Research Journal is worth 10% of your final grade.

Quizzes: I will give short quizzes on the readings that we are doing for class. These will be unannounced, and given at the beginning of class. They cannot be made up. Quizzes are worth 5% of your final grade.

Portfolio: You are required by the English department to complete a portfolio for assessment purposes. Not only does it help the department see what type of writing students are completing, but it is also useful for helping you evaluate your own writing and researching processes. Your portfolio will contain what is called a 'research process set,' as well as a reflective cover letter. Because you will not make a decision about what to include in your portfolio until the end of the semester, I recommend that you keep all of your work. Your portfolio will be due during the final exam period (listed below in the schedule). I will not accept portfolios at any other time except the final exam period, no exceptions. The portfolio is worth 5% of your final grade.

Individual Conferences: As part of this class, I require all students to either meet with me for a conference outside of class time or visit the Writing Center once during the semester. Either way, you must bring something that you would like to discuss/work on. This will allow us to discuss issues that are specific to your research and writing process. This conference/WC visit must occur prior to week 14 (April 23). The individual conference/WC visit is worth 5% of your final grade.

Unit 1: What is research and writing in the academy?

This unit is geared towards helping each individual student understand the genre of research writing within their specific field. We will be looking at different types of readings/writing, and you will be using those to determine criteria for what research and, in turn, what research writing is for your field. In addition to these specialized academic readings, we will be reading the graphic novel, *The Complete Persepolis*. This text will help us discuss research, personal writing, paraphrasing, summarizing, and quoting and will serve as an example of individualized research.

Response Papers: Your response papers will be 2-3 typed pages in length, in reaction to the specific prompts below. The due dates for these response papers are listed in the schedule. These response papers will be worth 15% of your final grade.

Response Paper 1: What types of research, reading and writing have you done in your student life? What are your experiences doing research and or writing research papers? Who or what has influenced your reading and writing within and beyond your school life? Think about writing this literacy autobiography as a way to explore what you already know about the genres of research and writing.

Response Paper 2: What is your major, why have you chosen it, and what can you do with that degree? How will this class and your time at MPU help you achieve your goals?

Response Paper 3: What does research mean to your field? What kind of research do people do? What kind of books/articles do scholars write? What are the standards for research within your field?

Response Paper 4: Choose 1 academic, peer-reviewed article and evaluate it according to the criteria that we have developed in class. Use specific examples from the text to support your discussion.

Response Paper 5: How has Marjane Satrapi contributed to the academy by writing her graphic novel, *The Complete Persepolis*? Use specific examples from the text to support your discussion.

Interview Write-Up: In addition to the response papers for unit 1, you will also interview someone within your field. You will then write up a 2-3 page discussion of the interview and the interviewing process. This interview write-up is worth 5% of your final grade.

Unit 2: Joining the academic conversation

This unit is designed to help you put into practice the skills that we worked on in unit 1. Everyone will be researching and writing about something specific and unique to his/her own field and interests. Think about a topic of interest within your major or field of interest. For example, if you are majoring in biology, what is a topic of interest to you? Would you like to know more about wildlife preservation in western Pennsylvania? That's a fine topic, then. This paper will be 8-10 pages in length and involve a variety of research and writing activities.

Proposal: This is a 1-2 page description of what you want to write about and how you will go about researching it. Your proposal must be accepted by me before you can go on to the other steps in unit 2. The proposal is worth 5% of your final grade.

Annotated Bibliography: You will complete a 4-5 page annotated bibliography of research that you have gathered about your question/topic. This will prove valuable as you write your paper; in addition, it will give you a chance to situate yourself within your academic community. The annotated bibliography is worth 5% of your final grade.

First draft: Prepare a draft of your paper (minimum 6 pages), following the rhetorical patterns for writing within your field/major. You should follow the standards that you developed during the first part of the semester to help you as you write. You need to bring a copy of your paper with you to class on the due date in order to complete peer review. The first draft must also include a Works Cited/References page and proper in-text citations. The first draft is worth 5% of your final grade.

Second draft with cover letter: This will be a re-written, re-searched, re-edited version of your paper. It must be 8-10 pages in length, with appropriate in-text citations and a Works Cited/References page(s). The second draft is worth 15% of your final grade. You will also submit a cover letter reflecting on your researching and writing processes with this draft (more information on this later). The cover letter is worth 5% of your final grade.

Other Useful Information:
Important Dates:
March 22: Mid-term grades available for viewing
April 5: Deadline for individual class withdrawal
April 9: Deadline for total semester withdrawal
May 14: Final grades available for viewing

The Writing Center: http://www.iup.edu/writingcenter
The Writing Center is located on the second floor of Eicher Hall (next to the smokestacks). It is open for tutoring Monday through Thursday 9 am-5 pm and 6 pm-9 pm, and Fridays 9 am-3 pm. **Course Schedule:** The following schedule is tentative and may change according to the class' needs and progress. Students will be informed of changes in class.

Week	Date	Readings and Major Assignments
1	1/18	Martin Luther King, Jr. Day—NO CLASSES
	1/20	Introduction to the class
	1/22	**Begin unit 1: What is research and writing in the academy?** Read: *CR* (*The Curious Researcher*) Introduction
2	1/25	Discussion of research and writing in the academy, continued Read: *Persepolis* introduction and p. 3-53
	1/27	Interviewing Read: CR p. 99-113
	1/29	Read: *Persepolis* p. 54-154 **Response Paper #1 is due**
3	2/1	Reading effectively Read: *Persepolis* p. 155-257
	2/3	Using Sources Effectively Read: *****"Using Sources Effectively"
	2/5	Practicing Skills for Academic Inquiry **Response Paper #2 is due**
	2/8	Synthesizing what you are reading

4		Read: *****"Moving from Summary to Synthesis"
	2/10	Synthesis discussion, continued
	2/12	Synthesis discussion, continued **Response Paper #3 is due**
5	2/15	Writing in the Profession Read: *****"Adapting Writing for Professional Audiences"
	2/17	Continued discussion of writing in the profession
	2/19	Discussion of article analysis **Response Paper #4 is due**
6	2/22	Watch *Persepolis* film
	2/24	Watch *Persepolis* film
	2/26	*Persepolis* discussion: novel, film, research **Response Paper #5 is due**
7	3/1	**Begin unit 2: Joining the academic conversation** **Interview Write-Up due**
7	3/3	Discussion of the importance of working knowledge and the proposal Read: CR Chapter 1
	3/5	Proposal presentations (short 1-2 minute summary of your proposal) **Proposal due**
8	3/8 3/10 3/12	**Spring Break—NO CLASSES**
9	3/15	Introduction to the annotated bibliography Read: ***** "Writing an Annotated Bibliography"
Week	**Date**	**Readings and Major Assignments**
9	3/17	Research Strategies

		Read: CR Chapter 2 (up to p. 99)
	3/19	**WORKDAY:** Whitney out of town for Conference
10	3/22	Research Strategies, continued
	3/24	Read: CR Chapter 3 **Annotated Bibliography due**
	3/26	Review of summary, paraphrasing and quoting
11	3/29	Understanding and avoiding plagiarism
	3/31	Review of summary to synthesis
	4/2	Writing the Draft Read: CR Chapter 4
12	4/5	Writing the draft, continued
	4/7	Peer Review **First draft due**
	4/9	Citing Sources Read: CR Appendix A
13	4/12	Citing Sources, continued Read: CR Appendix B
	4/14	Drafting discussion Read: ***** "Shitty First Drafts"
	4/16	Preparing the second draft: remembering audience, voice, and the profession
14	4/19	Revising for Purpose (bring draft to class) Read: CR Chapter 5
	4/21	Revising for information (bring draft to class)
	4/23	Revising for language (bring draft to class)
	4/26	Introduction to the Portfolio

15		**Unit 2 second draft with cover letter due**
	4/28	Reflective Letters **Research Process Set selection due**
	4/30	Peer Review **Portfolio Reflective Letter draft due**
16	5/3	Portfolio workday, cover letters returned
	5/5	**Final Exam: Leonard 214, 8:00 am—10:00 am** **PORTFOLIO DUE**

Appendix B—Initial Email Message Regarding Participation

Hello _____,

I hope that this message finds you doing well and enjoying your semester. I am contacting you because I would like to talk with you about participating in my dissertation research. Because of your work in my English 202 class, I am interested in talking with you more about the idea of academic literacy, and how students learn how to "do" school.

Your participation in my study would last for one semester (spring), and would include things such as interviews, a little writing, and letting me look at any writing you might be doing in other classes. Of course, you are under no obligation to participate in the study. Your participation will have no bearing on your performance at IUP, and there is no monetary benefit for participating. However, your participation would contribute to the academy's understanding of academic literacy, research literacy, and "doing" school, as well as contributing to my dissertation research.

If you are interested in learning more about my research and/or would like to participate, please let me know. I hope you have a great day and that I hear from you soon.

Thanks!
Whitney Tudor Sarver

Appendix C—Informed Consent Form

I am inviting you to participate in a research study. I will give you information to help you make an informed decision about whether or not you want to participate. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask. You are eligible to participate because you are an undergraduate student who has completed introductory English courses at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) and you are over the age of eighteen.

The purpose of this study is to find out how undergraduate students of different language backgrounds develop their academic literacies and academic identities. I will be asking you to share your writing with me. I will also interview you and ask you to participate in a blog. I want to look at your literacy experiences in order to better understand how you learn how to "do" school.

It is important for you to understand that the purpose of this study is not to evaluate your performance as a student, or to evaluate your writing. Instead, the information that you share with me may bring a better understanding of how students learn how to develop their academic literacies and academic identities.

Your participation in this project will involve participation in the following activities: (1) literacy autobiography; (2) in-depth individual interviews; (3) virtual writing (blog entries); (4) submission of class writing; (5) casual conversations and e-mail exchanges.

(1) You will be asked to write a 2-3 page autobiographical account of your experiences, as a student, with reading, writing, and research, both in and out of formal school situations. You may already have one that we can use.

(2) Four interviews will be carried out from December 2010 to August 2011. Each interview will be approximately 40-60 minutes. With your permission, the interview will be audiotaped and transcribed in order to maintain an accurate record of the discussion.

(3) You will be asked reflect to on what types of writing you are working on in your classes during the course of the semester in an online writing space.

(4) You will be asked to submit writing that you are currently doing in the classes you are taking as well as the syllabi for those classes. You will also be asked to submit various documents from your time in your introductory writing course, such as research papers, research journals, portfolios, etc, if they are still in your possession.

(5) Because of the nature of the interviews, there may be times when I contact you either in-person or via e-mail, in order to further clarify your experiences.

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

There is to be no compensation provided for your participation in this research.

One of the benefits of participating in this study is that you will have the opportunity to reflect on your experiences, specifically in terms of your academic literacies and academic identity development. This understanding of your experiences could influence your future academic career.

Your participation in this study is <u>voluntary</u>. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with me or IUP. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time by sending an e-mail to me or to Dr. Park, my faculty sponsor. At that time, I will be ask your data up to that point can be used, or if you would prefer to have all of it destroyed.

If you choose to participate, all of your personal information will be held in strict confidence and will have no bearing on your academic standing or services you receive from the University. The information obtained in the study may be published in academic journals or presented at academic meetings, but your identity will always be kept strictly confidential.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please sign the statement below and return it to me. Take the extra unsigned copy with you. If you choose not to participate, return all unsigned copies to me.

If at any time you have questions about the research or your participation, you can contact me, or Dr. Park, and we will answer your questions. If at any time you have comments or concerns regarding the conduct of the research or questions about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Institutional Review Board at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Researcher:

Whitney Tudor Sarver
IUP Doctoral Candidate
e-mail: w.a.tudor@iup.edu
110 Leonard Hall
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA 15705
724-357-2261

Co-Investigator:

Dr. Gloria Park
Graduate Studies in Composition and TESOL
e-mail: gloria.park@iup.edu
346 Sutton Hall
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA, 15705
Phone: 724-357-3095

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

Appendix D—Voluntary Consent Form

VOLUNTARY CONSENT FORM:

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a subject in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. I have received an unsigned copy of this informed Consent Form to keep in my possession.

Name (PLEASE PRINT):
Signature:
Date:
Phone number or location where you can be reached:
Best days and times to reach you:

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

Date	Investigator's Signature

Appendix E—Sample Interview Questions

I will be asking questions during the interviews similar to those listed below.

1. When you were younger, what kind of reading and writing did you do?
2. As you went through school, what kind of writing did you like best/worst?
3. In your literacy autobiography, you mentioned _____. Could you expand on that more?
4. Before you came to college, what kinds of writing did you do?
5. Before you came to college, what kinds of writing did you think you would have to do once you got here?
6. Have you been surprised by any writing assignments that you've had to do in college?
7. Before taking research writing, what kinds of writing had you done so far in college?
8. Since taking research writing, what kinds of writing have you had to do in your other classes?
9. What do you think is easiest/most difficult in terms of taking college classes?
10. What do you think is easiest/most difficult for you in terms of writing in college?

Appendix F—Blog Prompts

Prompt 1: Think about and then describe the kinds of writing that you are currently doing in your classes.

Prompt 2: Who are you? How would you describe your identity both in school and out of school?

Prompt 3: Thinking about our discussion of academic literacy, what do you think the definition of academic literacy is? Are you an academically literate person? How does someone learn academic literacy?

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
www.iup.edu

Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Stright Hall. Room 113
210 South lentil Street
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15705-1048

724-357-7730
F724-357-2715
irb-research@illp.edu
www.iup.edlilirb

December 17, 2010

Whitney Tudor Sarver
2316 Byron Court
Indiana, PA 15701

Dear Ms. Sarver:

Your proposed research project, "'Doing School' Right: How University Students from Diverse Backgrounds Construct Their Academic Literacies and Academic Identities," (Log No. 10-118) has been reviewed by the IRB and is approved as an expedited review for the period of December 17, 2010 to December 17, 2011.

It is also important for you to note that IUP adheres strictly to Federal Policy that requires you to notify the IRB promptly regarding;

1. any additions or changes in procedures you might wish for your study (additions or changes must be approved by the IRB before they are implemented),
2. any events that affect the safety or well-being of subjects, and
3. any modifications of your study or other responses that are necessitated by any events reported in (2).

Should you need to continue your research beyond December 17,2011 you will need to file additional information for continuing review. Please contact the IRB office at (724) 357-7730 or come to Room 113, Stright Hall for further information.

Although your human subjects review process is complete, the School of Graduate Studies and Research requires submission and approval of a Research Topic Approval Form (RTAF) before you can begin your research. If you have not yet submitted your RTAF, the form can be found at http:Uwww.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=91683 .

This letter indicates the IRB's approval of your protocol. IRB approval does not supersede or obviate compliance with any other University policies, including, but not limited to, policies regarding program enrollment, topic approval, and conduct of university-affiliated activities.

I wish you success as you pursue this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

John A. Mills, Ph.D., ABPP

Chairperson, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects Professor of Psychology

JAM:jeb
xc: Dr. Gloria Park, Dissertation Advisor
Ms. Beverly Obitz, Thesis and Dissertation Secretary