Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

9-12-2012

In-text and out-of-text engagement: interactional features in students' academic writing and academic engagement

Florette Press

Follow this and additional works at: https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd

Part of the Higher Education Commons

Let us know how access to this document benefits you - share your thoughts on our feedback form.

Recommended Citation

IN-TEXT AND OUT-OF-TEXT ENGAGEMENT: INTERACTIONAL

FEATURES IN STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING AND

ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT

by
Florette Press

A Thesis

Submitted to the
Department of Educational Services, Administration, and Higher Education
College of Education
In partial fulfillment of the requirement
For the degree of
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration
at
Rowan University
May 30, 2012

Thesis Chair: Burton R. Sisco, Ed. D.

ABSTRACT

Florette Press
IN-TEXT AND OUT-OF-TEXT ENGAGEMENT:
INTERACTIONAL FEATURES IN STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING
AND ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT
2011/12
Burton R. Sisco, Ed. D.
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration

While student engagement theory recognizes writing as an engaging activity, there have been few studies that explore the levels of engagement within college students' academic writing. Analyses of in-text interactions between writers and their imagined reader(s) can uncover writers' attitudes about themselves as writers and as participants in the academic community. This study looked specifically at students' in-text interaction in the context of overall student engagement. Making a connection between interactional features in writing and overall student engagement provided a new perspective by which professors and administrators can evaluate students' academic integration. This study combined text analysis and interviews with seven College Composition I students at a public university to investigate students' out-of-text engagement, in-text engagement, and the relationship between the two. Findings suggested that participants consider themselves engaged student participants, but not writers participating in the academic community. Students' in-text interactions included self-mentions, attitude markers, and reader references, which often reflected participants' reported comfort and confidence within the community.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Rowan University College Composition I instructors, Christine Selko and Kelly Adams, for welcoming me into their classrooms, and the College Composition I students who participated in this study, for their time and insight. I would especially like to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Burton Sisco, for his patience and tireless review of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIXES

LIST OF TABLES

<h1 align="center">Chapter I</h1>

<h2 align="center">Introduction</h2>

Statement of Research Problem

This study seeks to bridge similar concepts from two different fields: writer-reader interaction in discourse studies and interaction in student development theory. Discourse studies, the study of text and talk, has given special attention to the interactions between writers and hypothetical readers in academic writing and how these interactions vary across academic genres, disciplines, and cultures. Student development theory hinges on the interactions between students and their peers, their professors, and their institutions. The two concepts share a social-constructionist base: students and writers construct meaning and become members of particular communities through interactions with others. Few studies have focused on the interactive aspect of students' academic writing within the context of students' overall interactions in college.

This mixed-methods study explores the possible relationship between students' in-text and out-of-text interactions. Analyses of interaction in academic writing have largely been conducted using large corpora of professional writing and published texts to describe the general tendencies of specific academic communities. Students, who are not seen as fully integrated members of the academic community, have received less attention. This study focuses on individual student cases to provide a fuller account of their academic interactions.

Purpose of the Study

Research on student writing seeks to understand the properties of texts and the processes involved in creating texts in order to ultimately inform writing instruction and help developing writers succeed. The direct purpose of this study was to describe one aspect of writing, writer-reader interaction, across undergraduate academic writing assignments and explore the relationship between these written interactions and reported interactions with the college and academic community. The answers to these inquiries have several implications. Such evidence might (a) provide insight into students' understanding of the social nature of academic writing, (b) inform the way composition courses are taught—specifically, whether interactive features are taught—or (c) provide a different perspective from which teachers and administrators can evaluate student writing and student engagement. Drawing a connection between student writing and academic engagement may also assist administrators with integration and retention efforts.

Significance of the Study

In 2008, Writing Program Administrators (WPA), in collaboration with the *National Survey of Student Engagement* (NSSE), created the *Consortium for the Study of Writing*, which sought to better understand student writing practices and how writing practices connect to other desired college outcomes. From this union, a supplemental writing section was born and administered along with the NSSE. NSSE found that the amount of writing students produce was positively correlated with engagement, i.e., the more students wrote, the more they engaged in active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, enriching experiences, and deep learning (NSSE, 2008). In the current study, I looked beyond writing quantity, focusing on a specific aspect of writing,

writer-reader interaction, as it relates to academic engagement. Although large-scale, longitudinal research has much to contribute to the study of student writing, case studies are still valuable in understanding the intersection of personal and social influences on writing.

Operational Definitions

1. Academic Engagement: Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, and Hayek (2007) define student engagement as "participation in educationally effective practices, both inside and outside the classroom, which leads to a range of measurable outcomes" (p. 44). I focus on the academic aspect of engagement: student attention, interest, involvement, and active participation in learning (Trowler, 2010). More specifically, academic engagement will be measured by time spent working on class assignments, participation in academic-related extracurriculars, interaction with faculty, and participation in class, as reported by participants. I use the terms "engagement," "involvement," "integration," and "interaction" interchangeably.

2. Academic Writing: Academic writing in this study refers to all writing assigned in students' courses except for summaries and creative work such as poetry and fiction. Academic writing includes essays, research papers, lab reports, analyses, reflections, opinion pieces, and any form of persuasive and/or critical writing.

3. College Composition I (CCI): The first in a series of two composition courses required for graduation at Rowan University. Students with an SAT writing score of 530 or above may enroll in CCI right away; those with scores below 520 or 450 must first complete Intensive College Composition I or Foundations for College Writing, respectively.

4. In-text Interaction: In this study, in-text interaction refers to students' written, in-text interaction with readers. Interaction consists of features signaling the writer's "stance" and her in-text "engagement" with the reader. "Stance" can be used interchangeably with authorial voice, attitude, or personality. A writer's stance conveys his or her judgments, opinions, and allegiances. Writers can have a strong stance in their texts or a weaker, hidden stance. Throughout the study, when used in the context of writing, "engagement" refers to in-text engagement, different than "academic engagement" explained above. According to Hyland (2005a), engagement is the acknowledgement of and connecting to others in written texts. Writers recognize the presence of their reader(s), acknowledge their uncertainties, include them as participants, and guide their interpretations. I included Hyland's (2005a) typology of words and phrases that mark interactional metadicourse in Appendix F.

Assumptions and Limitations

Text analysis focuses on written products, not processes. Therefore, the analysis cannot capture interactions as they evolve with each draft nor pinpoint at what stage of the writing process interactional features were inserted. Student writing may be influenced by tutors, peer reviews, and/or instructors' wishes throughout the writing process, leading to unrepresentative instances of interaction in the final product. Furthermore, this study did not take into account the effect that teachers, assignment design, and classroom dynamics have on students' motivation, willingness to participate, and academic engagement.

Hyland (2005a) acknowledges that, despite efforts to systematize the analysis of interactional features, there is still room for interpretation on the part of the analyst. A

4

single word, phrase, or sentence might carry more than one purpose. The features of stance and engagement are highly contextual and might escape the analyst if he or she does not share the knowledge or attitudes of a certain community. Because the study involved considerable interpretation, it is also likely that researcher bias factored into the data collection and analysis.

Although case-studies add in-depth descriptions to the study of student writing and academic engagement, the results from seven students lack generalizability. As Thomas (2011) argues, "the validity of the case study cannot derive from its representativeness since it can never legitimately be claimed to form a representative sample from a larger set" (p. 514). Because participation in this study was voluntary and participants conveniently selected, the sample may have offered a skewed representation of college student engagement, considering that those who volunteered were more likely to be engaged. Most information describing participants was self-reported, and much of the self-reported information was estimation. As a result, there were sometimes inconsistencies within a participant's overall narrative.

Research Questions

This mixed-methods study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Do selected undergraduate CCI students consider themselves engaged participants in the academic community?

2. What are selected undergraduate CCI students' academic writing habits and attitudes toward writing in the academic community?

3. In what ways do selected undergraduate CCI students interact with an audience in their academic writing?

5

4. How do selected undergraduate CCI students' in-text interactions compare to their reported interactions in the academic community?

Overview of the Study

Chapter II reviews the literature on theories of student integration, student engagement, discourse communities, and interactional features of discourse.

Chapter III describes the study's context, sample, case study methodology, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

Chapter IV presents findings from interviews and text analysis.

Chapter V concludes with a discussion of the findings, conclusions, recommendations for practice, and recommendations for further research.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Academic Engagement

Overlapping theories of student involvement (Astin, 1984), integration (Tinto, 1988), and engagement (Kuh, 1996) have driven research on college persistence and learning outcomes for the past three decades. Tinto's (1988) interactionist theory, which falls under the larger theoretical perspective of social constructionism, is particularly dominant in student development literature. Tinto postulates that students entering college undergo a period of transition in which they interact with community members, adopt the community's values and behaviors, and eventually become integrated as new members. Students who are socially and academically engaged are more likely to become integrated, while detached, unengaged students are at risk for departure.

The idea behind Kuh's (1996) student engagement theory is simple: the more time and effort a student invests in academic-related activities, the more likely he or she will experience positive educational outcomes, persist through college, and be successful academically. Hu and Kuh (2001) define engagement as "the quality of effort students themselves devote to educationally purposeful activities that contribute directly to desired outcomes" (p. 3). The literature often distinguishes between academic and social engagement, though these are not mutually exclusive. Students are academically engaged when completing course work or participating in class activities. They show enthusiasm, ask questions, and contribute to the learning environment. Of course, active

7

participation in the learning process is not a new concept; it dates back to John Dewey's writing on experiential learning (Graham, Tipp, Seawright, & Joeckel, 2007). Students exhibiting disengagement, on the other hand, put little effort into academic tasks, are bored and apathetic, and may disrupt the learning environment. Academic engagement is often measured by time-on-task, or "engaged time," the amount of time students spend on school-related tasks (Prater, 1992). Research has identified engaging activities that are strongly correlated with positive outcomes, such as student-faculty interaction, cooperation among students, active learning, time-on-task, high expectations, and experiences with diversity (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Tinto, 1988). According to the *National Survey of Student Engagement*, writing is also a "high-impact practice" that engages college students (Kuh, 2007).

Educators, especially those in the writing-to-learn and writing-across-the-curriculum movements, have proposed writing as a remedy for disengagement (Kepler, 2005; Monroe, 2003). Informal writing makes academic challenges more manageable and less anxiety-inducing, and allows for deeper engagement (Gute & Gute, 2008). In effect, writing is central to the goals of higher education (Monroe, 2003). While writing is an important means to engagement, engagement is crucial in order to be a successful writer. The report "Framework for success in post-secondary writing," jointly published by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and the National Writing Project, lists "engagement," or "a sense of investment and involvement in learning" as one of the "habits of mind" critical to student success in writing. Apart from NSSE and its 27-question supplement, there

have been few student engagement studies that focus on student writing, and fewer that focus on specific aspects of writing.

Student Writing from a Social Perspective

The study of writing has been informed over the last few decades by diverse and overlapping movements such as modern sociology, modern composition theory, narrative studies, discursive psychology, sociohistorical psychology, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, situated cognition, and new literacy studies (Gee, 2000). All these movements have in common assumptions about the socially-constructed nature of language. After the 1960s and 70s, the study of writing and literacy shifted focus from cognitive to social aspects. Whereas before research on writing ability applied stage development schemes to describe unskilled writers as cognitively deficient, new research in composition studies showed that their struggles with writing were a matter of inexperience and unfamiliarity with conventions (Martinez & Martinez, 1987; Shaughnessy, 1977). Several studies from the 1980s in the field of anthropology showed that literacy is not a set of independent skills that can be taught the same way to people across communities, but rather can only be understood in a social context (Heath, 1983; Scribner 1984; Street, 1984). Written language is context-specific and socially constructed.

Lea and Street (1997) identified three overlapping perspectives that research on student writing in higher education has since taken: the study skills perspective, which sees academic writing as a set of skills acquired dependent on cognitive abilities; the academic socialization perspective, which sees student writing as representative of the degree to which students are acculturated or inducted into the academic community; and

9

the academic literacies perspective, which focuses on power relations and identity. This study views writing from an academic socialization perspective, which complements Tinto's (1988) interactionist theory and student integration model. College students undergo a period of transition during which they become fully integrated members of the campus community; academic writing is one of many confirmations of membership. Gee (1999, 1992) has viewed students' academic success or non-success in terms of students' ability to become enculturated. From this perspective, improvements in student writing come with integration into academic and professional communities (Swales, 1990) or communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Discourse Communities

The conceptualization of discourse as the language of a particular community that shares knowledge, values, and customs, can be traced back to the writing of Foucault (1972). Nystrand (1982) and Swales (1990) later developed the concept of discourse community. Gee (1999) conceptualizes *Discourse* as an ``identity kit´´ that students have at their disposal. Discourse provides students a set number of language tools to use to perform identity in various situations. Every student brings a unique set of discourses or worldviews shaped by their social interactions, experiences, and personal values to a classroom (Ivanic, 1998; Hollander, 2010). Ivanic (1998) explains that the "autobiographical identities" of students may overlap or not with new classroom discourses and thus be easier or harder to adopt. To be an effective academic writer, students must be immersed in the context of the discourse community, in this case, academic discourse, and take on the role of critical thinkers.

Bizzell (2002) defines academic discourse as the fluid, ever-changing language of the academic community used in colleges, universities, and across academic journals and publications. Within this community, there are alternative discourses among those who have higher and lower status and among academic disciplines. The diversification of faculty and students has brought new ways of writing to the academy, leading to a form of "hybrid academic discourse" (Bizzell, 2002, p. 3). Meaningful interactions within the academic community require knowledge of these academic discourses.

Interaction in Academic Writing

According to student engagement theory, student interactions with faculty and peers in college are indicators of student engagement and result in desirable learning outcomes. Social interaction in general facilitates integration and secures membership in particular discourse communities. Although in-person interactions—students consulting with professors, tutors, and peers—certainly affect students' writing, social interaction takes place within texts when students write alone as well. Writers implicitly understand that readers can accept or reject their arguments; the reader has an active role to play in how the writer writes. In this sense, the writer interacts with a hypothetical reader.

In applied linguistics, writer-reader interaction has been operationalized by an index of interactional metadiscourse features (Hyland, 2005a). The term "metadiscourse" was coined by Zellig Harris in 1959 and its definition was later elaborated by Williams (1981), Vande Kopple (1985), and Crismore (1989) (as cited in Hyland, 2005a). Hyland (2005a) defines metadiscourse as "the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community" (p. 37).

11

Others working in linguistics have described the same phenomena in other terms. For example, Halliday (1994) notes several metafunctions of language, one of which, the "interpersonal metafunction," refers to interactivity within a text. This comprises the writer's attitude, the social distance between writer and reader, and the relative status of the writer to the reader. Martin and White (2005) use the word "engagement" to refer to expressions that position the author with respect to the reader or other points of view, thus "engaging" with other voices.

To demonstrate the social interactions inherent in academic writing, Hyland (2005b) conducted text analyses of 240 published research articles from eight disciplines as well as semi-structured interviews with experienced researchers and writers. From this study, he devised a typology of interactional features, which fell into two categories, stance and engagement. Stance refers to the writer's position on what she is writing about, as revealed by certain markers such as hedges (i.e. "perhaps") and boosters (i.e. "obviously"). Others have described what Hyland calls stance as "evaluation" (Hunston & Thompson, 2000), "attitude" (Halliday, 1994), and "appraisal" (Martin, 2000; White, 2003). Engagement is a reader-oriented feature of in-text interaction. Writers engage their readers by including them as participants (i.e. using the second-person) and guiding their interpretations (i.e. commands such as "Notice…"). Interactional markers are used to build credibility as a writer, show commitment, and establish a relationship with the reader. An analysis of interactional patterns reveals the writer's expectations, interests, norms, and perception of the audience.

Such analysis can also show how writers define or maintain social groups. As Hyland (2005a) writes:

> Metadiscourse research is making it increasingly clear […] that the decisions we make at different points of composing, to open dialogical space or restrict it, to foreground or disguise our involvement, to appeal to community knowledge or spell out assumptions, to stand behind our views or attribute them to others, are all strategic choices. They are part of a repertoire of practices which create relationships that constitute membership of social communities. (p. 203)

Analyses of interactional features have focused on the writing of non-native English speakers (Burke, 2010), differences across cultures (Abdollahzadeh, 2003), differences among genres (Le, 2004), and differences among disciplines, as evidenced by professional writing (Hyland, 2005a). Several studies focus on one feature in particular. Some have looked at the frequency of first-person pronouns (Tang & Suganthi, 1999), evidential and affect (Biber & Finnegan, 1989), and hedging and boosters (Abdollahzadeh, 2003; Giuliana, 2008; Nivales, 2011). Focusing on the academic community, Hyland (2005a) found that the humanities and social sciences use interactional markers more than the hard sciences, and that the author more often inserts him or herself into the text. He found that stance features were more commonly occurring than engagement features; of the stance features, the most commonly occurring features were hedges. This research supports the claim that generic, transferable writing skills only exist to a certain extent (Bizzell, 2003). Academic writing, often regarded as objective, has a clear interpersonal dimension. Whether students are aware of this dimension or not has been given little attention.

Metadiscourse analysis of college students' academic writing has largely focused on students outside the United States writing in English as a second language. Hyland (2009), for instance, conducted text analyses of 64 final-year project reports by undergraduate students from Hong Kong, representing eight disciplinary fields. In these reports, Hyland detected a feature every one or two pages using *WordPilot 2000*. This is nearly half the frequency with which features appear in academic, published research articles. He suspected this was because writer-reader relationships in published research articles are presumed equal, with no social distinctions, whereas the writer-reader relationship in student writing is built around the expectation of assessment; writers must acknowledge readers' greater knowledge of the field. Inclusive first person pronouns and directives were the most common features. When looking specifically at disciplines, "softer" disciplines (the social sciences and the humanities) more frequently deployed questions and inclusive first person pronouns.

Another recent analysis of undergraduate student writing also focused on students outside of the United States. Swee Heng and Tan (2010) analyzed the persuasive texts, written in English, of Malaysian undergraduates and compared them to the British Academic Written Essays (BAWE), a corpus of metadiscourse-proficient essays. They found that the most frequent interactional features in the BAWE were hedges (115/10,000 words) followed by boosters (49/10,000 words). Malaysian undergraduates were more likely to use inclusive first person pronouns and boosters. Malaysian students' writing contained more engagement features than the BAWE, and overall more interactional features than the BAWE, suggesting Malaysian undergraduates were more concerned with building writer-reader relationships than British undergraduates.

Two studies in particular have applied this analysis to undergraduate student writing in the United States. Elkins, Buckingham, and Cochran (2003), working within the framework of interactionist, psychological, and sociolinguistic models of student retention, found in a preliminary study that high rates of first-pronoun use corresponded to difficulties in academic adjustment and suggested that analysis of student writing can help identify at-risk students. In a study on writer-reader interaction in college classroom wikis, Kuteeva (2011) found that students wrote with a higher frequency of engagement markers and were more attentive to the coherence of their argumentative texts when using wikis. They were also generally more aware of readers; 60% considered their audience when using the wiki for writing activities. These studies draw connections between writer-reader interaction and student characteristics and between interaction and learning outcomes.

Summary of the Literature Review

Research on college student engagement has identified writing as a high-impact practice that leads to desirable student outcomes. The NSSE supplemental questions about writing focus on the amount and quality of writing students produce in college. Looking at specific aspects of student writing, such as the writer-reader interaction involved in writing, may provide greater insight into how writing engages students and how writing demonstrates engagement.

Metadiscourse analysis, which has been used to describe differences in textual interaction among academic writers and disciplines, may serve as a tool for understanding student integration in the academic community. The index of interactional features provided by Hyland (2005a) operationalizes in-text interaction, allowing for the

frequency measure of writer-reader interaction. Metadiscourse analysis may provide a description of in-text interactions and may draw differences between individual students and student assignments. Writer-reader interaction—or in-text engagement—may be a more telling sign of academic engagement than length or complexity of student writing.

Apart from NSSE writing supplement, there have been few student engagement studies that focus on student writing, and fewer that focus on specific aspects of writing. Few studies have made the connection between college student engagement theories and engagement within student writing. This mixed-methods study sought to explore this connection.

Chapter III

Methodology

Context of the Study

The study took place at Rowan University, a medium-sized regional public university in southern New Jersey. Originally a normal school, founded in 1923, of less than 300 students, the college became a multipurpose institution under the name Glassboro State College in 1958. The college continued to expand over the next several decades, adding a college of engineering, a college of communications, and the first doctoral program of any of New Jersey's regional public colleges. In 1992, the college received a 100,000,000 dollar gift from industrialist Henry Rowan and his wife Betty Rowan, after whom the college was then named. Rowan College achieved university status in 1997, and currently houses seven colleges: the Rohrer College of Business, the College of Communication, the College of Education, the College of Fine & Performing Arts, the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, the College of Engineering, and the College of Graduate & Continuing Education (Rowan University, 2011).

As of the fall 2011 semester, Rowan University enrolls a total of 11,392 students, 9,918 of them undergraduates, with an average SAT score of 1173 (Rowan University, 2011). Nearly 82% are New Jersey residents and 65% are white (Rowan University Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning).

The College of Communications contains five departments: Communication Studies, Journalism, Public Relations & Advertising, Radio, Television & Film, and

Writing Arts. All Rowan students are required to complete a sequence of composition courses housed in the Writing Arts Department, usually College Composition I (CCI) and College Composition II (CCII). Foundations for College Writing is a non-credit, developmental course, which precedes Intensive College Composition I (ICCI), which precedes College Composition I. Students are placed in writing courses according to their SAT writing scores, but have a reassessment option which requires them to submit writing samples and a personal statement. For this study, I chose to sample students from two CCI classrooms.

Population and Sampling

This study targeted students enrolled in College Composition I during their spring semester, which might mean that students either began their first semester of college in Intensive College Composition I (ICCI), had to retake College Composition I, or transferred to Rowan and therefore started their composition requirements later than other students. Students who scored between 400 and 500 out of 800 on their SAT writing scores were placed into ICCI; those who scored between 500 and 600 were placed in CCI, and those who scored above 600 jumped to CCII. I chose to target CCI students (some of them former ICCI students) because they were either considered unprepared to compose at the college level upon entering college, retaking CCI, or transfer students new to Rowan. These students are thus on the fringe of the academic community. In terms of socialization theories, composition students are undergoing a transition period in which they are academically socialized as new members of the college community. Seven CCI students were conveniently selected from two sections of a spring 2012 CCI course, one taught by the director of the Writing Center and two others by an adjunct

professor.

Case Studies

To provide a fuller account of students' academic interactions, I chose to carry out case studies. Thomas (2011) explains that case studies in education tend to take on an interpretivist frame and are used to study either complex or unique phenomena that require multiple perspectives. Rather than look at a few variables in a large number of cases, case studies are able to capture a complex interaction of many factors; case studies are intensive rather than extensive in nature. Thomas (2011) makes a distinction between the subject and the object of a case study. The subject is the case itself, a "practical, historical unity" (p. 515). The object of a case study is the analytical frame. In this study, the subjects were Rowan University CCI students and the object of study was writer-reader interaction as a form of engagement. As Thomas states, "a case study is not about testing probabilistically stated theories. Rather, it is about discovering or testing tools of explanation" (p. 515).

Thomas (2011) outlines several characteristics that define case studies. First, a case study can have several purposes: an intrinsic, instrumental, or evaluative purpose. These case studies of student writing were instrumental, used to better understand and elaborate interactionist theories. Second, Thomas divides case studies as having either a theoretical or atheoretical approach. If theoretical, is the study theory-seeking or theory-testing? This study was theory-seeking, rather than theory-testing or simply illustrative. Thirdly, case studies may differ in methods. This study was interpretive, and combined mixed methods: text analysis and interviews. The case studies were parallel, that is, conducted at the same time instead of sequentially, and comparative. The case of each

19

student was compared to other students—a cross-case analysis according to Schwandt (2001)—rather than singular in focus (as cited in Thomas, 2011). Lastly, students' academic writing at Rowan University was a local knowledge case, chosen as the subject of study because of the researcher's position in the college writing center and contact with composition students. These were not key cases of writer-reader interaction in student writing, nor peculiar, outlier cases.

Data Collection Procedures

In the fall of 2011, I submitted an application to Rowan University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for review. In December of the same year, I received approval in writing (Appendix A). Data were collected through text analysis and interviews. First, I asked students to submit electronic versions of essays, research papers, lab reports, opinion pieces, and analyses written for courses by e-mail. This did not include summaries or creative writing such as poetry or fiction. Submitted texts were final versions unless the student's professor required him or her to submit drafts. In other words, any text submitted to a professor was also submitted to the researcher. Texts were printed and read twice for Hyland's (2005a, 2009) interactional features.

I conducted two half-hour recorded, semi-structured interviews with students. The first interview was structured in part like a survey with Likert-scale responses, yet allowed for elaboration. The first interview included questions on academic engagement based on those from the 2011 *National Survey of Student Engagement* (NSSE). NSSE's five Benchmarks for Effective Educational Practice—level of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student interaction with faculty members, enriching educational experiences, and supportive campus environment—represent the main areas

that the 42 NSSE questions cover. I drew mainly from questions dealing with interactive

practices—either person-to-person interaction or a student's interaction with written

materials. Thus, I focused on level of academic challenge, active and collaborative

learning, and student interaction with faculty members. The second interview included

clarification questions about submitted writing assignments, questions from the NSSE

27-question writing supplement that would shed light on students' attitudes toward

writing, and questions taken from the Pittam, Elander, Lusher, Fox, and Payne's (2009)

"Student Authorship Questionnaire."

Data Analysis

Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded for themes using Sisco's (1981)

procedures for content analysis (Appendix E). Because participant-researcher interaction

during interviews was itself an indicator of student engagement, my interview notes and

observations also factored into the analysis.   I combined responses from interviews and

observations to create an engagement profile for each participant. Participants' responses

were presented in tables for easy comparison. Themes from content analysis were divided

into two categories: engagement within the academic community and writing attitudes

and habits.

Following analysis of interview data, I analyzed papers submitted by participants

using Hyland's (2005a, 2005b, 2009) interactional metadiscourse typology (Appendix F).

Hard copies of participants' papers were printed and read for interactional features, which

were highlighted and later tallied. Hyland (2005b) defines four markers of stance--self-

mention, attitude markers, hedges, and boosters. Self-mentions usually occur as first

person pronouns that insert the author directly in the text. Attitude markers include

words and phrases such as "unfortunately" and "thankfully;" they establish an author's position and appeal to reader agreement. Hedges are words such as "perhaps" and "sometimes" that downplay the certainty of the author's claims and leave the text open for interpretation. Boosters are the opposite of hedges: words such as "obviously" and "very" that add certainty to the author's stance. Hyland (2005b) defines four markers of engagement--questions, directives, personal asides, and shared knowledge. Questions--rhetorical questions--engage the reader by inviting consideration of the text. Directives are imperative verbs such as "Notice..." or "Remember" that guide the reader's thinking. The author's personal asides are interruptions of the text, side notes that usually come within parentheses or dashes, speak directly to the reader. Finally, shared knowledge refers to the information that an author positions as agreed-upon or shared. For instance, when an author writes "We know that..." or "Researchers have proven...," he or she assumes that the reader will share and agree with this knowledge.

Elkins et al. (2003) measured the rate of features per sentence, which they defined as any independent clause. Hyland (2009) counted interactional features per 10,000 words. In this study, I followed Hyland's approach, counting features per 100 words to determine the rates at which certain features appear in the student's writing. I calculated the rate at which each interactional feature was used on each assignment. I compared the frequency of interactional markers in students' writing to their level of academic engagement, sometimes highlighting specific examples from their papers. I also looked for patterns of interactional features across students' classes and across types of assignments.

Chapter IV

Findings

In this chapter, I first present the results from student interviews to answer Research Question 1: Do selected undergraduate CCI students consider themselves participants in the academic community? and Research Question 2: What are selected undergraduate CCI students' academic writing habits and attitudes toward writing in the academic community? I follow with results from text analysis to answer Research Question 3: In what ways do selected undergraduate CCI students interact with an audience in their academic writing? and Research Question 4: How do selected undergraduate CCI students' in-text interactions compare to their reported interactions in the academic community?

I begin the interview results with a demographic overview of the participants and then profile each participant separately in terms of his or her engagement in the academic community, closing with themes that emerged across interviews. I then present each participant's academic writing habits and attitudes toward academic writing, closing with themes that emerged across interviews.

I present text analysis results in tables, listing interactional features found in each participant's submitted writing. The frequencies with which students used these features revealed their preferred means of interacting with audience and their level of comfort in using various interactional features. I compared these text results to the students' reported interactions and comfort-levels within the academic community.

Demographic Overview

The participants in this study represented the diversity of students taking College

Composition I (CCI) at Rowan University in terms of class year and major (Table 4.1). I

expected my sample to be overwhelmingly first-year students; instead, only three were

first-year students, three were sophomores, and one was a senior late in completing his

graduation requirements. Four were students who had transferred to Rowan. Two had

previously failed the course and were re-taking CCI. Two students were majors in

professional fields, two in social sciences, one in fine arts, one in humanities, and one

was an interdisciplinary major, all representing different fields of study (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1

Participant Demographics

Name	Gender	Age/Class Year	Major	Race/Ethnicity
Jacky	M	18/Fresh	Economics	Asian
Carl	M	22/Senior	English/Finance	White
Anthony	M	20/Soph	Music	White
Hanna	F	19/Soph	Psychology	White
Amanda	F	18/Fresh	Psychology	White
Courtney	F	19/Fresh	Education (Humanities)	White
Terra	F	21/ Soph	Environmental Studies	Mixed

Data Analysis

Research Question 1: Do selected undergraduate CCI students consider

themselves engaged participants in the academic community?

Volunteering to participate in this study was a form of engagement in itself; thus, all participants may be considered engaged participants in the academic community to a certain extent. Based on participants' behavior during the interviews and their responses to interview questions, however, some were more interactive and engaged than others. Tables 4.2 and 4.3 visually compare and contrast participant responses to interview questions adapted from the NSSE. The following profiles describe in more detail each participant's background and engagement on campus and in the classroom.

Terra. Terra, a 21 year old female of mixed race, had sophomore status at Rowan, but it was her first semester at the university. She transferred from Alfred University in New York, and took a year and a half off between schools to work and earn money for college. During her senior year of high school, Terra took Advanced Placement (AP) English. At Alfred University, she placed into a higher-level composition course with her SAT writing scores. Her credits, however, did not transfer to Rowan, and so she started the composition sequence required for graduation with CCI. She began college as a Materials Science and Engineering major, but at Rowan her major was Environmental Studies. In her spring 2012 semester she was taking Cultural Geography, Sociology I, College Composition I, Introduction to Mapping and GIS, and Statistics I.

When I first met Terra, she was eager to talk about her classes. She described herself as "introverted," but spoke candidly, enthusiastically, and confidently during her interviews, articulating the importance of writing and audience, and offering unsolicited explanations. She was one of only two participants (see Table 4.2) who reported often

25

Table 4.2

Out-of-Class Interactions

Name	Discuss Ideas Outside of Class	Personal Books Read This Year	Out-of-School Writing	Learning Community	Relationship w/ Students	Volunteer Work	Job	Extracurriculars
Jacky	Occasionally	1 to 2	Never	No	Friendly	Never	On breaks	Intramurals
Carl	Occasionally	Reads constantly	Never	No	NA	Rarely	1	None
Anthony	All the time	Reads constantly	Notebook	No	Very friendly	Never	0	Collegium, Quartet Psych Alliance, Sociology Club
Hanna	Occasionally	1	Journals	No	Friendly	Rarely	Summer Job	
Amanda	Occasionally	4 to 5	Never	No	Very friendly	Occasionally	Summer Job	None
Courtney	Rarely	1	Never	Yes, at JMU	Friendly	Often	Summer Job	MYMOM, Lacrosse
Terra	Often	1	Never	No	Friendly	Occasionally	0	REAL

Table 4.3

In-class Interactions

Name	Class Participation	Homework	Putting Together Ideas from Classes	Working with Classmates	Drafts	Reading	Papers	Preparing
Jacky	Rarely	Complete most of the time	Often	Occasionally	2 to 3	10-15 pg chapters /week /class	1 medium, 6 short	14-21 hrs/week
Carl	Often	Depends on class	All the time	Rarely	None	30-40 pg chapters /week /class	2 medium, 5 short	10 hrs/week
Anthony	Often	Depends on class	Often	Frequently	1 to 2	20 pgs/week	5 medium, 8-10 short	21 hrs/week
Hanna	Rarely	Completes most of the time	Often	Frequently	Several	5-6 hours/week	15 short	6 hrs/week
Amanda	Occasionally	Almost always completes	Not often	Occasionally	2	10-15 pg chapters /week /class	2 medium, 5-10 short	14 hrs/week
Courtney	Rarely	Always completes	Often	Frequently	None	20-25 pg chapters /week /class	1 medium, 20+ short	14-21 hrs/week
Terra	Often	Almost always completes	Often	Occasionally	1 to 2	20-30 pg chapters /week /class	2 short	40-50 hrs/week

discussing ideas from classes and class readings with others outside of class: "I'm actually really involved in making connections with what I'm reading outside of class […] for me it's one of the ways I get to think about what I read and be able to tell others about it." She did not have much time to read for personal enjoyment beyond class assignments, but had recently started Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar*. She did not write outside of school because of the time constraint. She expressed an effort to participate in volunteer work as much as possible, but could not name any current or recent service projects. Thus far in the semester, she had joined Rowan University's environment club, REAL (Rowan Environmental Action League). Terra was one of three participants who were involved in extracurricular activities related to their field of study (Table 4.2).

Terra was also one of three participants (see Table 4.3) who reported often participating in class discussions: "I try to make sure my voice is known, any ideas or any questions I have, I get them answered […] I'm not shy about making sure I get the most out of my education." This comment demonstrated Terra's agency and active involvement in her education. She reported rarely coming to class without completing reading assignments, which altogether consisted of 4-5 chapters a week, each chapter about 20-30 pages. She reported spending a surprising 40-50 hours a week preparing for class, more than any other participant (Table 4.3). According to Terra, her college courses thus far had emphasized memorizing facts, and had very much emphasized applying theories to practical problems.

By several measures—reported class participation, reported extracurricular involvement, and confidence—the interview data suggested that Terra considered herself a member of the academic community.

28

Jacky. Relative to other participants, Jacky was not as interactive or confident during his interview; he often answered questions without elaboration, seemed uncertain at times, and at times seemed self-conscious. Jacky, an 18 year old Asian male, was a freshmen Economics major at Rowan University. His schedule for the spring 2012 semester consisted of Microeconomics, Macroeconomics, Composition I, Economic Geography, and Sociology of Minorities. A second semester freshmen, Jacky was not retaking CCI or moving up to CCI, but simply starting the composition sequence required for graduation. By the end of the spring semester, Jacky had applied to transfer from Rowan University.

Jacky reported occasionally talking about course subjects outside of class: "sometimes I talk with my friends about what we learned and we exchange ideas." In the past year, he had read one or two books outside of school, but did not write outside of school, "unless you count Facebook." He did not participate in community service or volunteer work. He had a job at home, in Ridgewood, NJ, and continued to work there over breaks. Jacky played intramural sports (basketball) at Rowan and considered rushing for a fraternity.

Jacky did not often ask questions in class, admitting, "I don't like to talk in class." He tried to keep up with his work, though he admitted "last semester was kind of bad." He read a chapter or two per class per week, with each chapter averaging 10-15 pages. He spent an estimated 2-3 hours a day preparing for class. According to Jacky, his college courses had thus far emphasized analysis and applying theories to practical problems.

By several measures—reported class participation, struggles to keep up with the college workload, lack of involvement in service work or school-related extracurriculars,

shaky confidence, and his decision to transfer—the interview data suggested that Jacky

was not an active member in and did not consider himself a member of the academic

community.

Courtney. Relative to other participants, Courtney, like Jacky, was less confident

in her interviews, seeming uncertain at times, and at times self-conscious. Courtney, a 19

year old White female, was a freshman Education major (focused on Humanities/Social

Sciences) at Rowan University. Her schedule for the spring 2012 semester read as

follows: College Composition I, Human Exceptionalities, Health and Wellness (an online

course), History of American Education, and Introduction to Sociology. Like three other

participants, Courtney was a transfer student who started her first year at James Madison

University (JMU) in Virginia.

Courtney rarely discussed ideas from class with others outside of class, read

books outside of class or wrote outside of school for personal enjoyment. Yet Courtney

was one of the most engaged participants outside of class (Table 4.2). She participated in

a learning community at JMU, ROOP, a teaching and learning community. She currently

lived on campus, but had not made many friends at the time of the interview. At JMU,

Courtney participated in community service as part of her learning community, which

required 25 hours of service. She worked with the Special Olympics and Habitat for

Humanity. At the time of the interview, she did not work for pay formally, but usually

had a summer job and sometimes babysat.   At JMU she also participated in a leadership

program called MYMOM (Make Your Mark on Madison). Courtney explained, "I feel

like I did a lot more there than I am here." The only co-curricular activity that Courtney

had signed onto so far at Rowan was Lacrosse, which proved to be a significant time commitment.

Courtney did not usually participate in class discussions: "It really depends on the class…at JMU most of my classes were lectures and in those I didn't talk much….but in my College Comp class I feel I participate a little more since it's smaller. It also depends whether I like the subject or not. It also depends too on the time of day I have it…Intro to Sociology is at 8am and I will not raise my hand in that class." Courtney reported never coming to class without completing readings and assignments, explaining, "I'm kind of a freak about that sort of thing." Courtney considered herself a hard worker, but was not as confident in her ability to contribute to the academic community: "I've always known I was a hard worker…that's my thing, like, I'm not that smart I don't think, but I think I do all the work that I can." Courtney read a chapter per class every week, each chapter 20-25 pages. She reported spending an estimated 2-3 hours preparing for class per day, adding, "but it's usually not strenuous work so I'll multitask that with watching TV." According to Courtney, her college courses had thus far emphasized memorizing facts, synthesizing, and applying theories to practical problems.

The interview data—Courtney's involvement in a learning community and leadership program at JMU, her dedication to a varsity sport, and her hard work in class—indicated that Courtney considered herself a member of the college community. However, her poor self-appraisal, "I'm not that smart I don't think," suggested that she did not consider herself an academic authority or contributor.

Carl. During his interview, Carl spoke confidently and candidly. Carl, a 22 year old White male, was a senior Finance major. Like three other participants, he had

transferred to Rowan University. Carl had attended Salisbury University in Maryland for his first semester of college, but transferred because he "just didn't like it." When asked if he liked it better here, he replied "yeah...and it's just nice being home, too." He started at Rowan as an English major, but switched to Finance in his second year. When asked why he switched majors, he responded, "I kind of wanted something that was going to give me a job when I graduated…it worked out though, I love accounting and finance…it's fun." His course schedule during the 2012 spring semester consisted of Business Policy, Computing Environments, College Composition I, Intermediate Accounting II, Law for Accountants, and Concepts in Federal Taxation. Carl was taking College Comp I as a senior because Rowan accepted his transferred composition credit as "CCII" rather than "CCI and CCII." In order to graduate, Carl needed to complete CCI.

Carl was one of three participants (see Table 4.2) who read often outside of class: "I read constantly…I always have something that I'm reading." At the time of the interview, he was reading Kurt Vonnegut's *Breakfast of Champions*. However, he never wrote outside of school: "I don't really have a need to…sometimes I'll comment on stuff on the internet, but it's not that serious…obviously Facebook." He described his relationship with other students as friendly, but admitted, "I don't really have a lot of time to make many friends though, I kind of just come to school and go home…I commute and then I have a job…it's hard to get involved on campus when you commute." Carl lived on campus his freshman and sophomore years. He worked three jobs off-campus; two were seasonal, but he kept one year-round. Carl had not participated in co-curricular activities since high school. He reported relaxing and

socializing almost every day: "I'm still friends with a lot of people I knew from high school, and we all go to college around here, so we hang out all the time."

Carl was the most engaged participant in class, reporting involvement in the most categories (Table 4.3). Carl was an active participant in class discussions, explaining, "I try to [contribute] as much as I can…if I don't I'll fall asleep." Carl did not often come to class without completing assignments, but explained, "It depends on the class…like Computing Environments, I didn't buy a book for that class this semester because I know I'm not going to read it…but for the classes in my major, and my 400-level classes, I always read everything and come prepared." Of all participants, Carl reported reading the most for school (see Table 4.3), approximately 7-8 chapters a week, each chapter about 30-40 pages each, with diagrams. Carl spent an estimated 10 hours per week preparing for class. According to Carl, his courses senior year had emphasized memorizing facts and ideas, analyzing, and applying theories to practical problems.

As a commuting senior, Carl admitted that he was not strongly connected to the campus community. In fact, though he reported spending time with friends from high school, he did not mention Rowan friends. Although Carl might not have considered himself a member of the Rowan community, the interview data suggested that he considered himself an active participant in his studies, was comfortable in the classroom, and was confident in his abilities.

Amanda. Amanda was engaging during her interviews, speaking with enthusiasm and offering unsolicited explanations. Amanda, an 18 year old White female, was a freshman Psychology major at Rowan University. She was also a transfer student. Amanda transferred after her first semester at Towson University, explaining, "mostly

33

because...well I just didn't really love being there, it was just a lot further from home than I planned on going, but, I thought it was my dream school and I was going to be so happy there, but then, no not really, so I just wanted to be closer to home...here I can go home every couple of weeks if I want to." In her spring 2012 semester, she was taking College Composition I, Sociology, Biology, Philosophy, and Contemporary Math.

Every time Amanda did CCI homework, she claimed, "I usually text someone or call someone [in her class]" She was one of three participants (see Table 4.2) who reported reading with any frequency outside of school for personal enjoyment this past year, and added, "I used to read a lot more." She did not write outside of school. Amanda used to participate in community service a lot in high school, specifically with Big Brothers Big Sisters and Challenger Basketball, but she had not participated since coming to college. Amanda lifeguarded in the summer, but did not work during the school year. She did not yet participate in co-curricular activities: "I don't want to sound completely uninvolved, but yea, not yet." Amanda was one of only two participants who described very friendly relationships with peers (Table 4.2).

Amanda occasionally contributed to class discussion: "It depends…but I usually don't participate that often." She rarely came to class without completing assignments. She reported often working harder than she thought she could to meet instructors' expectations, explaining, "I was in public speaking last year…and I'm really not good with that…and I got an A+ in the course…I practiced really hard…yea, it was hard." When asked about weekly readings, Amanda responded, "I have a lot of reading each week…more so than at Towson…'cause I know for philosophy I have to read…it's hard stuff to read, too…I probably read a chapter for each of my classes." The chapters were

approximately 10-15 pages each. She spent about 2 hours per day preparing for class. During this past year, her courses had emphasized analyzing, making judgments and applying theories to practical problems.

The interview data suggested that Amanda was not as confident as a member of the academic community, several times citing struggles with coursework and little participation in class. At the time of the interview, Amanda was not tied to campus by any extracurricular activity, job, or volunteer work, and was taking advantage of the proximity of her home to visit family on weekends. Her interactions with peers seemed to be her main tie to the campus.

Hanna. Hanna, a 19 year old White female, was a sophomore Psychology major at Rowan. In the spring 2012 semester her courses were Self and Society, Sensation and Perception, College Composition I, which she was retaking, and Biology; she was also participating in an independent study, conducting research in Applied Behavioral Analysis with a professor, making her one of only two participants who interacted extensively with faculty outside of class.

Hanna was the only participant who inquired further about my study, requesting the transcript of our interviews and asking for a copy of the typology of interactional features. I took her curiosity to be one more sign of engagement. During the interviews, Hanna responded to questions thoughtfully, sometimes pausing for reflection, and candidly. Hanna read at least one book outside of school this past year for personal enjoyment: "I wish I read more actually, but, time…" She was one of only two participants (see Table 4.2) who wrote outside of school— traditional paper and pen journal entries about her observations and experiences. She did not often participate in

community service: "I'll have to once the resume becomes very important…but I have been looking into it and I'm going to try." She worked during the summer, and last semester worked at a preschool. Hanna was one of three participants (see Table 4.2) involved in extracurricular activities related to their field of study. She joined the Psych Alliance and became a member of the Sociology Club last semester, which met 2-4 times per semester and required a service project.

Hanna reported occasionally participating in class: "I try not to ask too many questions, but I'll contribute when, you know, I feel I can…I don't try to take over the classroom, but I do want the teacher to notice my participation." Hanna was candid about her laid-back approach to academics; she reported coming to class without having completed the reading about 20% of the time, "I try to [come prepared], but there's so much work, you know, it's impossible to come with all the readings done…and sometimes it's unnecessary…" Nevertheless, she expressed genuine interest in Psychology, her specific field of study. The past few semesters, Hanna had read a lot: "I've come to notice sometimes there's too much reading, where a lot of the reading is unnecessary, and, so this semester, I'm trying to just focus in class, really absorb the information, so that way I have more time for other things…I'm going about my studies differently." She explained how her reading and effort varied among classes: "I've definitely read thoroughly my Social Psychology textbook because that's very interesting, along with my Abnormal Psych textbook…I read the first chapter of *Human Exceptionalities* and that was the end of that book…I read here and there my Religions textbook…there are some assigned readings from Comp to read..." She spent approximately 5-6 hours a week just reading for class. According to Hanna, her courses

this past year had emphasized memorizing, making judgments, and applying theories to practical problems.

Hanna showed interest in my study and expressed interest in her studies. In fact, unlike the other participants, she was involved in the creation of knowledge by working with a faculty member on research. The data suggested that Hanna considered herself a member of the academic community. Moreover, she expressed in the interview an evolution in how she approached her studies, suggesting that she had learned how to navigate college academics. However, Hanna was one of only two participants retaking Composition I, which indicated a struggle in gaining membership to the college writing community, or to other communities outside her specific field of study.

Anthony. Anthony was very engaged and confident during his interviews, speaking with enthusiasm, articulating the importance of his studies, and offering unsolicited explanations. Anthony, a 20 year old White male, was a sophomore Music major at Rowan University. In the spring 2012 semester, he was taking College Composition I, Music Styles I, Oral Theory I, Applied Professional Lessons, a Guitar Master Class, and Statesmen Choir. He planned to take his general education requirements over the summer at a community college. Like Hanna, this was Anthony's second time taking College Composition I, which he failed his first semester in college.

Anthony was one of the most engaged participants outside of class (Table 4.2). Anthony discussed ideas from his courses outside of class "all the time" with friends from the department; they would sit around, listen to, and discuss music: "we'll pick it apart and talk about what's going on, what they're doing." During the interview, he went on to explain to me the difference between Eastern (Indian) and Western harmonies.

37

Anthony read frequently outside of class--mostly science fiction, fiction, and historical fiction--and wrote occasionally, but not often, in a notebook. He described his academic department as "tight-knit" and had a supportive relationship with other students in his major. He also had friends outside of his major; but did not associate with students in his dormitory except for his neighbors across the hall. He never participated in community service. He planned to get a job in the coming month, but currently did not work for pay on or off campus. His extracurricular activities included the Renaissance Ensemble, Collegium, and a quartet.

Anthony was very active in his music classes. In his CCI class, however, he regularly skipped homework, or completed it while in class. Anthony invested a lot of time in practicing his instrument. He recalled his freshman year: "I bit down and started practicing more than I ever did before...I put in the time...the level of what you're expected to do drastically changes...you get to the point where if you looked at yourself a year ago, you'd think 'I could never do that'." Anthony generally read half a chapter from his Music History textbook every week, 15-20 pages. He sometimes spent up to five hours per day practicing his instrument for class. His courses emphasized memorizing, analyzing, and applying theories to practical situations.

Anthony was the only participant who fairly often communicated with an instructor over e-mail: "a lot of the time I can find my instructors around Wilson Hall, too." He rarely discussed grades or career plans, but often discussed assignments with his Guitar professor. He often discussed ideas with faculty outside of class, and was on a first-name basis with most professors: "pretty much whenever you can go to Joe's office and sight read with him." When describing his interactions with a professor outside of

his major, Anthony said, "I got along well with the professor, and I occasionally ran into her outside and talked about ideas from class….I thought she was a good teacher but there was no personal relationship there." He had more meaningful relationships with professors in his department. Anthony explained, "Joe's having the studio class come over Friday evening for a party at his house...and my oral theory professor is coming over break to tune the piano at my house."

Anthony considered himself a rooted member of the academic community, at least within his field of study. The data suggested Anthony has extensive interactions with his peers and faculty members as well as deep engagement with his subject of study.

Engagement Themes

Although students had diverse academic backgrounds, the students revealed several similarities in their interviews as regards engagement. For example, most participants did not write extensively outside of school, but all participants read outside of school for personal enjoyment (Table 4.2). Most did not work during the semester and were not heavily involved in community service and extracurricular activities (Table 4.2). Most participants only occasionally discussed ideas from class with others outside of class, but most everyone reported often putting together ideas from different classes (Table 4.2). Participants regularly completed homework and estimated reading approximately one chapter per week per class (Table 4.3). No one reported feeling alienated from his or her peers (Table 4.2). Two particularly consistent themes that emerged across interviews include interest as a factor in engagement and lack of student-faculty interaction.

Interest as a factor in academic interactions. The participants named several factors that affect their engagement, both in-class and in writing assignments, including class size, class time, professors' expectations, whether the course is a general education requirement or a course in their major field of study, and whether the course is seen as easy or challenging. One of the most often mentioned factors, however, was interest. If participants were interested in, enjoyed, and cared about what they were talking or writing about, they were more engaged and put in more effort. For instance, when explaining her preference for writing research papers, Terra said: "I learn a lot, don't find them to be exorbitantly challenging, and I find them *fun*." Recalling a research paper from high school, she repeated, "it was so much *fun* to write." Jacky is not satisfied with his writing when writing about uninteresting topics, "some topics I don't really *like* to write about." Whether or not Courtney participates in class depends, she said, "whether I *like* the subject or not." She attributes her academic success this semester to the fact that she's taking courses she's interested in: "I'm better with sociology and psych and writing...I don't have any math and science classes and those are what I struggle with." Carl only shares ideas from class with others outside of class "as often as they're *interesting* enough to share." Likewise, Hanna explained, "if I hear something *interesting* I'll bring it [ideas from class] up [to others outside of class]." Hanna also chooses which assigned readings to read based on interest: "I've definitely read thoroughly my social psychology textbook because that's very *interesting*...I read the first chapter of Human Exceptionalities and that was the end of that book." Anthony writes differently for courses, he said, "depending on how *interested* I am in the

40

subject...sometimes I'll just write what the professor wants me to write, and other times I'll write what I think about something."

Lack of faculty interaction. With the exception of Anthony, participants reported little to no interaction with faculty and campus administrators. No participant regularly communicated with professors over e-mail. They rarely discussed grades and assignments, career plans, or ideas from readings with professors. Participants had no interaction with administrators, and not enough interaction with faculty to firmly describe his or her relationship with them. Terra gave a typical response, describing her relationship with faculty as "most definitely friendly, I really would say neither here nor there because it hasn't gotten to that point…" Courtney interacted with some faculty outside of class at JMU while in the leadership program, but here at Rowan she only named her Lacrosse coach. Still, Courtney described her relationship with faculty thus far as friendly, compared to JMU: "The faculty here know my name more, some of them ask where I'm from…"

Research Question 2: What are selected undergraduate CCI students' academic writing habits and attitudes toward writing in the academic community?

In the second interview, students were asked specifically about writing. Their responses revealed to what extent they saw themselves as members of the academic community—specifically, what practices they shared or did not share with expert writers, their familiarity with terminology, and their confidence in writing. Table 4.4 visually compares and contrasts participants' writing habits and attitudes toward academic writing.

Terra as academic writer. Terra had not written any papers over five pages in the last year. When she was at Alfred University, her writing consisted of labs of three to four pages, including charts and graphs. When she did write papers, she generally wrote one or two drafts before turning in an assignment. If Terra was having trouble with a paper, she explained, she might have sent it to her cousin, who is the same age as she, or had her roommates look over it "to see if it makes sense."

Terra was one of three participants (see Table 4.4) who acknowledged that audience is a strong factor in how and what one writes: "If you write to a kindergartener, you won't be writing the same way as for a graduate student...the bar is different...you have to have the right vocab...you're talking to them so they understand...you want to keep in mind who your audience is." When the audience was unspecified, she tried to make her writing accessible for the average person: "I'm kinda writing for myself, and it's like ok, do I understand this?...I'm kind of the average person, so if I can understand this, it's like ok, the average person can understand this." When asked whether she writes in the styles or formats specific to certain fields, she compared her composition papers to her engineering labs: "just comparing the comp papers to the labs, the labs are very different...it's technical vs. analytical."

Terra reported feeling confident when turning in an assignment. She explained that her father was an English teacher, so she made an extra effort to write correctly: "I feel like I have a strong written command of the English language...I can write something and it will be coherent...I have the ability to edit myself very easily, you know, oh! a period needs to go there, oh! a comma needs to go there." For the first two years of high school, Terra was in honors English classes. Her junior year, she gave herself a break by

Table 4.4

Attitudes Toward Writing

Name	Is Audience Strong Factor?	Difference Between Courses?	Writing Specific to Field?	Should there be WAC?	Confident in Writing?	College vs. High School Writing?	Preferred Writing
Jacky	No	Vocabulary	No	No	Sometimes	Same	Research Papers
Carl	Yes	Effort	Focus on Sources vs. Explanation	Not Math and Science	Yes	No More 5 Para. Essay	Opinion Pieces
Anthony	No	Content vs. Form	No	No	Yes	Same	Research/Opinion
Hanna	Sometimes	Many factors	Experiential vs. Scientific	Yes	Yes	Higher expectations	Opinion Pieces
Amanda	Yes	Content vs. Form	No	Yes	Sometimes	More and Longer Papers	Narratives
Courtney	No	No Difference	No	Yes	Yes	Same	Persuasive
Terra	Yes	Style	Technical vs. Analytical	Yes	Yes	Lower Expectations	Research Papers

taking a Regular English course: "it was horrible because it was just so simple...it felt like a remedial class...I was able to sleep every day, write the papers in 20 minutes...and still get an A! It was so frustrating!" Her senior year, she took AP English... "that was a whole lot harder but the caliber that I was writing at, because the expectations were so much higher, was so much better...I look back on my writing there, and it's like, how is this even the same person?" Terra was the only participant (see Table 4.4) who felt that college writing was less challenging than high school writing, explaining that CCI expectations were "slightly lower than the AP class."

Although Terra had perhaps written the least in college of any participant, the confidence she expressed with regards to writing matched her confidence in the previous interview. In another sign of confidence, she expressed an appreciation for rigor and high expectations in her courses. She practiced the habits of writing process taught in college composition—drafting and having drafts peer reviewed. She was familiar with terminology, using the rubric-like phrase "strong written command of the English language" and recognizing the rhetorical importance of "audience." Her desire to write for the average person revealed a commitment to understanding and clarifying the subject of her writing. These data again suggested that Terra considered herself a member of the academic community who shared the practices and language of academic writing. On the other hand, Terra's membership was mitigated by her student status. Her definition of rigor was based on how easily she could earn an "A", and she cited command over mechanical conventions—a low order concern—when explaining the root of her confidence in writing.

44

Jacky as academic writer. In the last year, Jacky remembered writing only one paper exceeding five pages. He generally wrote two to three drafts before turning in an assignment. Jacky explained to what extent he wrote differently for different courses: "If I wrote a personal essay in Comp class, I wouldn't really use a lot of vocabulary...if I was trying to write a philosophy paper I think I'd use a more advanced vocabulary." When asked whether he followed a format of writing specific to an academic field he responded, "I don't think so." He approached writing in different disciplines more or less the same. Audience did not seem a strong factor in how or what Jacky wrote: "Right now it's not a strong factor, but I hope it might be in the future...again, I usually just focus on the professor, but I guess I should try to learn to focus my writing on other audiences." Jacky seemed self-conscious on this point, as if he thought he was not doing what he was supposed to be doing. He also wanted to revise the papers he had since written for CCI before submitting to me, another sign of shaky confidence.

Jacky was one of only two participants (see Table 4.4) who "sometimes" felt confident when turning in writing assignments: "some topics I don't really like to write about, or I'm not too sure about...like the comp essay we did, I don't think that was my best work..." He thought his Sociology papers his first semester in college were "pretty solid." Jacky agreed with the statement "writing is all about making an argument based on my own thoughts" more than "writing an assignment is all about finding sources and arranging them in the form of an essay," but offered his own interpretation, a combination of the two: writing is more about "having an idea and finding sources to back it up." Jacky did not see college writing as very different from high school writing: "I think my high school prepared me well for college writing..." His favorite type of

writing assignment was "possibly...research papers...because it's just facts, and you know, you just kinda explain it."

Although satisfied with his writing for a Sociology course, Jacky was less confident than other participants with regards to writing in general, hesitant to submit writing without first revising and prefacing an afterthought with "I guess I should…" Jacky reported following certain writing habits typical of academic writers, such as drafting and supporting ideas with sources, but did not adhere to disciplinary conventions when he wrote, nor did he consider an audience other than the professor when writing, though he was familiar with the term "audience" and its significance among academic writers. He acknowledged differences in his writing across the curriculum, but explained these differences rather simplistically in terms of advanced and non-advanced vocabulary. While Jacky seemed aware of certain writing habits typical of the academic community, he separated himself from the community.

Courtney as academic writer. In the last year, Courtney had only written one paper exceeding five pages. She explained: "I really haven't had to write that much this year…my classes have been fairly simple." She normally did not write any drafts: "I normally go with my gut, which I know is bad…sometimes I'll go over it a little bit, but not really." She did not feel college writing was very different from high school: "I think high school prepared you well for college...so it wasn't a big adjustment at all...I can knock out papers pretty simply."

Courtney did not believe she wrote differently for different courses: "I don't think so....I for the most part use the same style." She usually did not think of an audience unless she was given a scenario. She agreed that writing was more about making an

argument based on her own thoughts, rather than piecing sources together. She reported feeling confident when turning in writing assignments.

Courtney's evaluation of her courses as "simple" and her confidence in "knocking out" papers suggested that she considered herself a capable college student. However, she did not report following certain habits of academic writers, such as writing drafts, nor did she articulate any sensitivity to disciplinary differences, different audiences, or differences between high school writing and college writing. Like Jacky, she seemed aware that she did not do as members of the academic community do, particularly when she said "I know [going with my gut] is bad…" This suggested that Courtney, too, separated herself from the academic community.

Carl as academic writer. In the past year, Carl remembered writing a couple papers exceeding five pages, and wrote papers less than five pages often, about once a week. He recalled writing even more often as an English major. Like Courtney, he did not write drafts, but rather revised as he went. Writing came easily to Carl: "I usually get carried away and write 10-20 pages when they only ask for eight."

Carl acknowledged the importance of audience in his writing: "when I write stuff on Facebook or in an e-mail it's obviously different than when I write stuff for a professor...and if I'm just answering an essay question on a test that's different from writing an essay." Carl generally imagined the professor as his audience when writing a paper. In speaking about entering in dialogue with sources, Carl explained:

> Well, here's how I think about it...there's a topic, and then there's the
> conversation about the topic and all the sources, and everyone who's ever written
> about it is kinda part of that conversation, and...when you write you kinda want to

47

add to that conversation, but it's like...I usually don't get that far, I don't usually say anything new because I'm still in college and there's just...it's outside of the scope of it...but yea, I do feel like it's a conversation.

Carl reported writing differently for different courses: "My British Lit course...I really had to concentrate…that was a hard course for writing...um, like art appreciation, I just started half an hour before class...I'd just put something down." He also made a distinction between his Legal and Business courses and his English courses. The former were more about putting sources together, the latter had "a lot more explaining in it, and a lot less focus on sources."

Carl reported feeling comfortable writing various types of papers; he claimed "I can write either [research papers or opinion papers], I don't have any problem writing either of those...[Research papers] are probably easier to write...when you have to put in your own opinion it's more difficult." Carl reported feeling confident when turning in writing assignments (and said so confidently as well). Carl explained that college writing was "definitely" different than high school writing. He was one of only two participants (see Table 4.4) who reported college writing to be more challenging than high school writing. High school writing was all about the five paragraph essay, Carl said, and he had not once written a five paragraph essay in college. His favorite type of writing assignment was opinion pieces: "I do like writing opinions...I like a good argument, too, that's something I enjoy."

As a senior and former English major, Carl had written more in college than any other participant. He was confident in his abilities as a writer, and comfortable switching between genres. He was familiar with the issue of audience and recognized differences

in writing among disciplines and assignments. Still, he attributed the difference in writing between two of his courses to the challenge of the course and his own efforts, which suggested that he considered himself a student, separate from academic writers in that field of study. He explicitly referred to his non-membership when he said, "I usually don't get that far, I don't usually say anything new because I'm still in college…" Carl made a distinction, then, between being a student member of the community and a full, authoritative member.

Amanda as academic writer. In the last year, Amanda recalled writing a couple of papers exceeding five pages. For Amanda, audience was important: "if I'm writing a letter to a friend, it's going to be a lot different than something I'm writing for school." When writing herself, Amanda usually imagines she is writing to classmates.   She generally wrote about two drafts before turning in an assignment.   When asked whether writing was more a matter of piecing together sources or coming up with new ideas, she replied: "I know a lot of papers, like research papers, it's all about finding sources and using the information...it depends on the paper...some papers are just from your mind and what you're thinking."

Amanda "definitely" wrote differently for different courses.   She was not sure if she wrote differently in Philosophy, but could draw a distinction between Sociology and Composition.   Her Sociology teacher "cares more about information than writing; she just wants factual stuff...whereas in Comp our writing has to flow and sound nice."

Amanda was one of only two participants (see Table 4.4) who reported only sometimes feeling confident: she was "usually" confident turning in assignments, depending on the class (not so confident in Philosophy, more confident in Sociology).

49

Amanda was in advanced English her junior and senior years. She explained college

writing was "definitely" different from high school writing: "our longest paper was five

or six pages and that was a big deal...here I'm writing double that...and we have less time

for each paper because we're writing more of them."   Amanda was the only participant

(see Table 4.4) who reported a preference for writing personal narratives: "I hate research

papers...I like writing my own thoughts, so I like writing narratives, personal stories."

Like Terra, Amanda imagined writing to the average person—her classmates.

This suggested a commitment to making sense of the subject, rather than writing for the

professor's approval—which may or may not be the same thing. She also had the habit

of writing drafts, typical of academic writers. She was familiar with issues of audience

and different types of assignments, but not necessarily with differences among writing in

different disciplines. Her explanation that writing for Sociology required more attention

to content and factual information whereas Composition required attention to form was a

simplistic comparison. Confident in her responses, many of which started with

"definitely," Amanda was not as confident in her writing; she expressed struggling with

writing for certain classes and overwhelmed with the length of papers. The interview

data suggested that, though Amanda used a process approach to writing and was familiar

with certain terms, she was still on the margins of the academic community.

Hanna as academic writer. Hanna did not remember writing any papers

exceeding five pages this past year, but recalled many papers less than five pages. She

generally wrote several drafts before turning in an assignment: "well for example my

comp class, we have to write a draft to bring in, and I probably had three drafts before

that one draft. I'll write something and I'll keep revising it until I feel I can hand it in…at

least two or three times." She wrote differently for different courses: for Biology, writing was more "laid back and more detailed....for Comp, more expressive...for Self and Society, more rushed...depending on the difficulty, what the class requires, and if I know how the teacher grades, those are factors that determine my writing."

Hanna acknowledged differences in writing among different fields: "when it comes to writing, Self and Society is more relatable to the self...when explaining ideas, normally you bring your own experiences to the paper...Psychology is more terminology, more theoretical, I would say more scientific because there's research, not just theories." Hanna alluded to CCI and diary writing when explaining the importance of audience, but admitted she did not always think of audience when writing an academic paper. She explained how her approach to writing has evolved: she used to piece together sources, but now she writes her own thoughts first and then checks other sources. She seemed very aware of her writing process. Hanna reported feeling confident when turning in writing assignments. She referred to high school writing as "definitely much easier...college level is more...they analyze the structure more. I always did great with writing in high school, and honestly my dedication for doing work hasn't really changed...it's hard to say because I'm still trying to reach higher expectations...the expectations are different." Hanna enjoyed writing about social issues in opinion pieces.

Hanna was one of two participants who had previously failed CCI and were currently re-taking the course. Hanna herself admitted that she was "still trying to reach higher expectations." This alone suggested that Hanna had not been accepted into the community of college-level writers. She described differences in her writing for different courses using adjectives like "laid back" and "rushed," and cited "difficulty" and "how

51

the teacher grades" as factors that determine her writing, all of which indicated a student's preoccupation with meeting requirements. Nevertheless, Hanna's reported confidence in her writing suggests that she considered herself capable of membership.

Anthony as academic writer. Anthony had written a handful of papers between 5 and 19 pages, and 8-10 papers fewer than five pages over his freshman and sophomore years. He generally wrote one draft before turning in an assignment, and revised after getting feedback from the professor. Anthony wrote differently for different courses, "depending on how interested I am in the subject, sometimes I'll just write what the professor wants me to write, and other times I'll write what I think about something...for Comp right now, I'm just trying to get the material in rather than write anything interesting myself." He added, "the tone itself changes, not necessarily according to the course, but according to the assignment...of course certain courses lend themselves to certain types of assignments." He grouped History course papers and Music course papers together: "it's not so much that the writing is specific to the field, but these are more informal in that it's not about my writing, it's about the content....the teacher wants a good paper but they want to see that you know what you're talking about." Contrastingly, in Composition class, Anthony believed his writing required "bullshitting." In Composition class, he said, "I have to be more aware of the style that I'm writing in...that's what we're studying."

Audience was a strong factor in how and what Anthony wrote. When an audience was not specified, he generally pictured having a conversation with someone who was "culturally literate," "who is going to be able to understand what I'm saying." Anthony reportedly felt confident in his writing. He did not think college writing was very

52

different from high school writing: "I think that you're held to a higher standard...but it's on a similar track...it could just be that I had a very good English teacher my junior and senior year in high school." His high school teachers also asked him to think about tone and audience and had given him similar feedback. Anthony enjoyed the writing assignments in History because "we had to show we knew what we were talking about, but we also had to put in our own views...[I prefer] a paper where I'm putting my own opinion in, but it's not so much a structured argument."

Anthony was one of two participants who previously failed CCI and who were currently retaking the course. The opposite of Terra and Amanda, who wrote for the average person, Anthony assumed his audience had prior knowledge. Like other participants, Anthony was aware of his student status, and often wrote simply to please his professor or meet professors' expectations. He did not consider himself an authority or a member of the community of academic writers and knowledge creators.

Writing Themes

The participants were split on whether audience was a strong factor in their writing (Table 4.4). Most participants cited differences in their writing for different classes, but not as many could specify disciplinary differences or writing styles specific to certain fields (Table 4.4). Five out of seven participants reported feeling confident when turning in a written assignment (Table 4.4). Other themes that emerged across interviews include minimal writing across the curriculum, positive attitudes toward writing, and writing to make the grade.

Minimal writing across the curriculum. One of the assumptions when designing this study was that college students would be writing across the curriculum,

and would have a wide range of formal papers and informal writing assignments. This

was not always the case. The dearth of writing might be expected from students with a

course load heavy in math and science, but all participants, with the exception of Carl,

had a well-rounded spring semester course load with at least one "soft" subject other than

Composition. However, only Amanda reported feeling challenged by the amount of

writing in college. Aside from submitting fewer writing assignments than expected for

analysis, some participants made mention of the little writing required of them. Terra had

not written any papers over five pages in the last year. At Alfred University, as a

prospective Engineering major, her writing consisted of three to four page lab reports.

This semester, she had only written papers for her CCI course: "I haven't encountered

that many courses where I've had to write a copious amount." Similarly, Jacky had so far

in the semester only written papers for his CCI course. Most of Courtney's college

papers were less than five pages; she explained, "I really haven't had to write that much

this year…my classes have been fairly simple." Carl recalls writing more often as an

English major. He has since switched to a Finance major, and admitted, "this year has

not been very writing intensive for me." Hanna, a sophomore, did not recall writing any

papers above five pages in college. Moreover, the only participants who wrote regularly

outside of school were Hanna and Anthony, who wrote in journals and notebooks,

respectively.

      Positive attitudes toward writing. Despite the scarcity of writing and writing-

intensive courses, most students expressed positive attitudes toward writing. When asked

whether writing should be incorporated across the curriculum, five out of seven students

responded "yes." Some of these students saw writing as a necessary requirement for

daily living. For example, Terra answered that writing should "most definitely" be incorporated across the curriculum: "I feel like...you want to hire someone who has the ability to communicate in writing, especially e-mails...e-mails are becoming the official form of communication across the board, so if you can't write a good e-mail, you're not going to be able to get your point across, which is eventually going to get up to your boss." Amanda also answered "definitely:" "writing is so important; being a good writer can get you...even with buying houses...you have to be a good writer to do things throughout your life." Carl also spoke of writing as a basic skill: "you should write in a lot of classes...there's nothing worse than when someone sends you an e-mail and it looks like something a third grader would write...that just doesn't look good." Courtney, with less certainty, responded, "I think writing makes you intellectually...I don't know...it just fits in everything." Other participants articulated more easily what Courtney began to say, speaking about writing in terms of thinking and intellectual development. Hanna explained: "writing involves critical thinking, allows the person to open up the view of the topic, and when you talk about an idea, think over an idea, write about the idea, you become more involved with it...in the process of writing you can discover new views and ideas...the person becomes really in-touch with what they're writing...if the person is actually engaged in the assignment." Likewise, Anthony answered: "it [writing across the curriculum] could be a very good thing because that's a way to organize your thoughts and prove that you get the concepts...a lot of the time I've seen people pass classes and know that they don't understand the concepts." No matter the reason students viewed writing positively, it seems clear that they have either previously considered the importance of writing, or that the importance of writing has long been drilled into them

by educators.

The only dissenting voices to this positive view of writing across the curriculum were those of Jacky and Anthony. Jacky proposed, "maybe some people...their strengths aren't in writing, so they should focus on other things to express themselves." Similarly, Anthony submitted, "It's hard to say [whether writing should be incorporated across the curriculum] because if someone is naturally not a strong writer, that can affect them."

Writing to make the grade. Despite any positive views about writing, several students expressed a desire to write what the professor wants to get a good grade rather than write to deeply engage oneself in a subject. When asked about audience, Carl, Courtney, and Hanna reported that they mainly write for their professor. When asked who he normally imagines as his audience when writing, Jacky responded, "usually I target the professor because they're the ones who determine my grade." He also described his confidence when turning in an assignment in terms of grades: "[on some papers] I feel like I should get an A, and I do get an A, so I feel good about that." When talking about how his high school English teachers prepared him well for college, he said "all our English teachers were always on our butts." After Jacky handed in his philosophy paper, he received feedback: "my philosophy professor ripped it apart." Hanna seemed to suggest that much of her engagement is motivated by making the grade. When asked if she participates in community service, she responded, "I'll have to once the resume becomes very important." Likewise, when discussing how often she participates in class, she said, "I do want the teacher to notice my participation." When talking about her writing, Hanna explained, "depending on the difficulty, what the class requires, and if I know how the teacher grades, those are factors that determine my

56

writing." She described hoping for a good grade: "I know that I have the potential to work very hard… I'll surprise myself with the end result a lot of the time…I'll hope for the best, but I don't get my hopes up too high, so I'll be surprised either way." Terra explained: "The professors usually put out what they expect right out front, like, this is what I expect from you…in my old school it was a bit more often…I was a freshman going into engineering, I didn't really know what was going to happen. But at this point I'm kind of expecting appropriately professor's expectations." Several students seemed especially conscious of the fact that they were being graded and meeting expectations rather than writing for the sake of writing.

Research Question 3: In what ways do selected undergraduate CCI students interact with an audience in their academic writing?

Stance and engagement features in each participant's assignments were tallied and presented in tables. Rates of features were also calculated for comparison. The frequencies and rates of interactional features describe the ways in which undergraduate CCI students interact with an audience in their academic writing, answering Research Question 2. The frequencies of interactional features in participants' writing revealed to what extent participants felt comfortable taking stances in their writing and engaging with readers.

Terra's in-text interaction. Terra submitted a total of five papers; three from engineering courses and two from her CCI course (Table 4.5). Her engineering papers consisted of lab reports, one of which was geared towards a mainstream audience. Her composition papers consisted of one personal reflection and personal responses to readings.

Table 4.5

Terra's In-text Interaction

	Frequency # (rate %)				
	Lab Recipe	Lab Report/Letter	Lap Report	Reflection: Reading	Personal Response
Word Count	222	1514	506	834	3400
Course	ENGR	ENGR	CEMS	Comp I	Comp I
Engagement (Total)	**11 (5.0)**	**1 (0.1)**	**0**	**10 (1.2)**	**12 (0.4)**
Directives	10 (4.5)	0	0	0	0
Reader Reference	0	1 (0.1)	0	3 (0.4)	10 (0.3)
Questions	0	0	0	6 (0.7)	0
Shared Knowledge	1 (0.5)	0	0	1 (0.1)	2 (0.1)
Personal Asides	0	0	0	0	0
Stance (Total)	**11 (5.0)**	**29 (1.9)**	**5 (1.0)**	**73 (8.8)**	**143 (4.2)**
Attitude Markers	7 (3.2)	9 (0.6)	1 (0.2)	16 (1.9)	61 (1.8)
Boosters	1 (0.5)	5 (0.3)	2 (0.4)	5 (0.6)	26 (0.8)
Hedges	3 (1.4)	14 (0.9)	2 (0.4)	1 (0.1)	16 (0.5)
Self-Mention	0	1 (0.1)	0	51 (6.1)	40 (1.2)

Overall, Terra demonstrated more in-text engagement in her composition papers (Table 4.5). Terra's paper with the highest rate of engagement, however, was the lab recipe written for a mainstream audience, with a rate of 5.0 features per 100 words, almost all of them directives. Terra did not engage her reader(s) when writing for engineering courses, then, unless the assignment emphasized or specified an audience. The most common engagement features among her composition papers were reader references, followed by shared knowledge features.

Across all assignments, Terra more frequently demonstrated stance features than engagement features (Table 4.5). In fact, she used at least one of each stance feature in

every assignment, except for self-mentions in two lab reports. She had higher rates of stance features in her composition papers, the most common being attitude markers and self-mentions. The rate of self-mentions can be explained by the self-reflective nature of the assignments. Terra used hedges more frequently than or equally frequently to boosters on her engineering assignments. The opposite was true for her composition papers, in which she more frequently used boosters than hedges.

Jacky's in-text interaction. Jacky submitted four papers; a communications paper, a CCI paper, a sociology paper, and a philosophy paper (Table 4.6). The papers were two personal responses, a self-reflective paper, and a traditional essay, respectively.

Table 4.6

Jacky's In-text Interaction

	Frequency # (rate %)			
	Personal Response	Personal Response	Reflection	Essay of Reasoning
Word Count	1461	140	1418	1723
Course	Communications	Comp I	Sociology	Philosophy
Engagement (Total)	**29 (2.0)**	**1 (0.7)**	**10 (0.7)**	**2 (0)**
Directives	0	0	1 (0.1)	0
Reader Reference	26 (1.8)	1 (0.7)	1 (0.1)	1 (0)
Questions	0	0	2 (0.1)	1 (0)
Shared Knowledge	1 (0.1)	0	3 (0.2)	0
Personal Asides	2 (0.1)	0	3 (0.2)	0
Stance (Total)	**84 (5.7)**	**15 (10.7)**	**150 (10.6)**	**62 (3.6)**
Attitude Markers	55 (3.8)	9 (6.4)	38 (2.7)	39 (2.3)
Boosters	9 (0.6)	0	22 (1.6)	8 (0.5)
Hedges	10 (0.7)	3 (2.1)	19 (1.3)	14 (0.8)
Self-Mention	10 (0.7)	3 (2.1)	71 (5.0)	1 (0)

Overall, Jacky used more stance features than engagement features in his writing. Jacky's communications paper had the highest engagement rate, 2.0 features per 100 words, due in large part to the rate of reader references, 1.8 per 100 words (Table 4.6).

Jacky used at least one reader reference in every submitted assignment. The sociology paper contained the most varied engagement, with at least one of each feature listed. The philosophy and composition papers had little engagement.

Jacky exhibited strong stances throughout his papers, inserting himself frequently in the writing, mostly through attitude markers. His rates of attitude markers ranged from 2.3 to 6.4 per 100 words (Table 4.6). Jacky nearly always used more hedges than boosters in his papers, which reflects the practice of expert academic writers as described by Hyland (2005b).

Courtney's in-text interaction. Courtney submitted a total of 12 papers; nine of these were from a psychology course, two from history, and one from CCI (Table 4.7). One history paper was a research paper, the other, an essay; the composition paper was a short personal response; and the psychology papers were reflections, opinion pieces, scenarios, and reports.

Overall, Courtney wrote with greater stance than engagement. Her rate of engagement features only exceeded her rate of stance features in her personal response for CCI. Among Courtney's psychology papers, the engagement rates were similar, ranging from 0.2 to 0.7 features per 100 words, except the counseling scenario, for which Courtney had a specified audience, with an engagement rate of 3.8 features per 100 words (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7

Courtney's In-text Interaction

	Frequency # (Rate %)						
	Personal Response	French Revolution Essay	Reflection #4	Opinion Piece: Junk Food	Opinion Piece:Nintendo	Reflection #6	Reflection #5
Word Count	298	971	833	715	709	684	695
Course	Comp I	History	Psychology	Psychology	Pyschology	Psychology	Psychology
Engagement							
(Total)	**16 (5.4)**	**1 (0.1)**	**2 (0.2)**	**4 (0.6)**	**5 (0.7)**	**4 (0.6)**	**3 (0.4)**
Directives	1 (0.3)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reader Reference	13 (4.4)	0	1 (0.1)	2 (0.3)	4 (0.6)	1 (0.1)	2 (0.3)
Questions	1 (0.3)	0	0	1 (0.1)	0	0	0
Shared Knowledge	1 (0.3)	0	0	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2)
Personal Asides	0	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	0	0	1 (0.1)	0
Stance (Total)	**15 (5.0)**	**14 (1.4)**	**58 (7.0)**	**27 (3.8)**	**24 (3.4)**	**73 (10.7)**	**64 (9.2)**
Attitude Markers	6 (2.0)	6 (0.6)	2 (0.2)	8 (1.1)	7 (1.0)	6 (0.9)	6 (0.9)
Boosters	4 (1.3)	6 (0.6)	15 (1.8)	10 (1.4)	8 (1.1)	13 (1.9)	12 (1.7)
Hedges	4 (1.3)	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	8 (1.1)	9 (1.3)	4 (0.6)	1 (0.2)
Self-Mention	1 (0.3)	0	39 (4.7)	1 (0.1)	0	50 (7.3)	45 (6.5)

Table 4.7 (continued)

Courtney's In-text Interaction

	Frequency # (Rate %)				
	Reflection #9	Counseling Scenario	Report: Lifespan	Essay	Report: Social Work
Word Count	912	743	792	953	713
Course	Psychology	Psychology	Psychology	History	Psychology
Engagement (Total)	**6 (0.7)**	**28 (3.8)**	**0**	**6 (0.6)**	**4 (0.6)**
Directives	0	2 (0.3)	0	0	0
Reader Reference	6 (0.7)	25 (3.4)	0	2 (0.2)	0
Questions	0	0	0	0	3 (0.4)
Shared Knowledge	0	0	0	2 (0.2)	1 (0.1)
Personal Asides	0	1 (0.1)	0	2 (0.2)	0
Stance (Total)	**105 (11.5)**	**30 (4.0)**	**14 (1.8)**	**25 (2.6)**	**40 (5.6)**
Attitude Markers	20 (2.2)	7 (0.9)	3 (0.4)	8 (0.8)	8 (1.1)
Boosters	9 (1.0)	8 (1.1)	2 (0.3)	14 (1.4)	6 (0.8)
Hedges	9 (1.0)	12 (1.6)	9 (1.1)	3 (0.3)	18 (2.5)
Self-Mention	67 (7.3)	3 (0.4)	0	0	8 (1.1)

The differences among assignment types are reflected in the rate of stance features. For example, the self-reflective psychology assignments have high rates of stance features thanks to high rates of self-mentions, ranging from 4.7 to 7.3 self-mentions per 100 words. Across her papers, Courtney consistently had lower rates of attitude markers than other participants, ranging from 0.2 to 2.0 attitude markers per 100 words. She generally wrote with more boosters than hedges, though there was no clear disciplinary or assignment pattern.

Carl's in-text interaction. Carl submitted 12 papers; 10 of these were papers for English courses, one for art appreciation, and one for a business course. Altogether the assignments consisted of six reader responses, two essays, two analyses, and one literature review. Carl's highest overall rate of engagement occurred in two reader responses written for English courses, 1.5 features per 100 words in each. His in-text engagement across English courses was not consistent, ranging from 0.1 to 1.5 features per 100 words. His engagement in the business essay was similar to the essay and other papers written for English courses. Unlike other participants whose primary engagement feature was reader reference, Carl more consistently used personal asides across his papers, including at least one personal aside in 10 of 12 submitted assignments (Table 4.8), suggesting Carl was comfortable establishing a familiar writer-reader relationship, interrupting the formal flow of his text with parenthetical asides to the reader.

Overall, Carl more frequently used stance features than engagement features in his writing. Like other participants, attitude markers made up the bulk of Carl's stance features, ranging from 2.0 to 4.4 attitude markers per 100 words. Carl's rates of overall stance features were also fairly consistent across all assignments and courses. Carl rarely

63

Table 4.8

Carl's In-text Interaction

	Frequency # (rate %)								
	Essay	Reader Response	Reader Response	Analysis	Essay	Critique	Reader Response	Reader Response	Reader Response
Word Count	2399	587	810	828	1644	1336	634	686	628
Course	Business	English	English	English	English	Art	English	English	English
Engagement (Total)	**9 (0.4)**	**9 (1.5)**	**12 (1.5)**	**1 (0.1)**	**10 (0.6)**	**10 (0.7)**	**4 (0.6)**	**4 (0.6)**	**7 (1.1)**
Directives	0	0	1 (0.1)	0	1 (0.1)	0	0	1 (0.1)	1 (0.2)
Reader Reference	0	3 (0.5)	4 (0.5)	0	0	10 (0.7)	0	0	5 (0.8)
Questions	0	0	1 (0.1)	0	1 (0.1)	0	0	0	0
Shared Knowledge	4 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	2 (0.1)	0	1 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	0
Personal Asides	5 (0.2)	5 (0.9)	5 (0.6)	0	6 (0.4)	0	3 (0.5)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2)
Stance (Total)	**84 (3.5)**	**26 (4.4)**	**61 (7.5)**	**43 (5.2)**	**82 (5.0)**	**54 (4.0)**	**30 (4.7)**	**38 (5.5)**	**29 (4.6)**
Attitude Markers	62 (2.6)	16 (2.7)	26 (3.2)	33 (4.0)	68 (4.1)	43 (3.2)	16 (2.5)	30 (4.4)	21 (3.3)
Boosters	15 (0.6)	4 (0.7)	15 (1.9)	8 (1.0)	11 (0.7)	8 (0.6)	11 (1.7)	4 (0.6)	5 (0.8)
Hedges	7 (0.3)	6 (1.0)	6 (0.7)	2 (0.2)	3 (0.2)	3 (0.2)	3 (0.5)	4 (0.6)	3 (0.5)
Self-Mention	0	0	14 (1.7)	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.8 (continued)

Carl's In-text Interaction

Frequency # (rate %)		
Literature Review	Analysis	Reader Response
661	1775	718
English	English	English
4 (0.6)	**22 (1.2)**	**4 (0.6)**
0	0	0
0	5 (0.3)	0
0	6 (0.3)	0
0	5 (0.3)	0
4 (0.6)	6 (0.3)	4 (0.6)
23 (3.5)	**69 (3.9)**	**51 (7.1)**
13 (2.0)	47 (2.6)	31 (4.3)
8 (1.2)	10 (0.6)	9 (1.3)
2 (0.3)	9 (0.5)	10 (1.4)
0	3 (0.2)	1 (0.1)

inserted himself directly into the text; he had zero self-mentions in all papers except two English reader responses and one English analysis (Table 4.8).

Amanda's in-text interaction. Amanda submitted a total of four papers; two from a freshmen topic seminar, one from a mass communications course, and one from a public speaking course (Table 4.9). Of these, two were essays, one was a journal entry, and one was a detailed outline for a persuasive speech.

Like most participants, Amanda used more stance features than engagement features across all her papers. Rates of engagement features ranged from 0.4 to 4.8 per 100 words, while rates of stance ranged from 3.9 to 12.9 per 100 words. Of the

Table 4.9

Amanda's In-text Interaction

	Frequency # (rate %)			
	Music Piracy Essay	Journal Entry	Technology Essay	Persuasive Speech
Word Count	1417	403	484	806
Course	TSEM	Intro to Mass Communication	TSEM	Public Speaking
Engagement (Total)	**5 (0.4)**	**5 (1.2)**	**6 (1.2)**	**39 (4.8)**
Directives	0	0	0	13 (1.6)
Reader Reference	1 (0.1)	2 (0.5)	5 (1.0)	22 (2.7)
Questions	0	0	0	2 (0.2)
Shared Knowledge	0	1 (0.2)	0	0
Personal Asides	4 (0.3)	2 (0.5)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.2)
Stance (Total)	**83 (5.9)**	**52 (12.9)**	**19 (3.9)**	**44 (5.5)**
Attitude Markers	25 (1.8)	12 (3.0)	4 (0.8)	17 (2.1)
Boosters	30 (2.1)	13 (3.2)	10 (2.1)	11 (1.4)
Hedges	22 (1.6)	2 (0.5)	2 (0.4)	12 (1.5)
Self-Mention	6 (0.4)	25 (6.2)	3 (0.5)	4 (0.5)

engagement features Amanda used, reader references were the most common, followed by personal asides, both of which she used at least once in every submitted paper.

The differences in assignment type are reflected in the rates of interactional features. For example, the outline for Amanda's persuasive speech has the greatest rate of engagement, at 4.8 features per 100 words. This is to be expected, as Amanda had a concrete audience in mind that she was instructed to address. Likewise, the persuasive speech was the only assignment in which Amanda used directives to guide her audience.

The journal entry had the highest rate of stance features, 12.9 per 100 words, in large part due to the number of self-mentions, 6.2 self-mentions per 100 words. Amanda was one of two participants who used at least one self-mention in every submitted assignment. Again, frequent self-mentions in a journal entry dealing with the author's own experiences are not unusual. Another feature that stands out among Amanda's interactional features is boosters. Amanda used comparably higher rates of boosters than other participants in all her papers except the written copy of a persuasive speech, in which she used just as many hedges.

Hanna's in-text interaction. Hanna submitted a total of five papers; four were papers she wrote in her CCI course, and one from an art appreciation course (Table 4.10). Of these, three were opinion papers, one self-reflective, and one descriptive.

Like most participants, Hanna's stance was stronger than her engagement across all papers. Across all CCI papers, reader-reference was the highest counted engagement feature. One paper stands out as having the highest overall rate of engagement features, 4.2 per 100 words, as well as the highest rate of stance features, 5.8 per 100 words, among the opinion papers: the paper entitled, "Google." Hanna used at least one directive

in three out of five submitted assignments, more than any other participant, and a question in four out of five assignments.

Table 4.10

Hanna's In-text Interaction

	Frequency # (rate %)				
	Self-Reflective Essay	Opinion: PGD	Opinion: Google	Opinion: Disney	Descriptive
Word Count	1094	1008	805	801	618
Course	Comp I	Comp I	Comp I	Comp I	Art Appreciation
Engagement (Total)	**11 (1.0)**	**19 (1.9)**	**34 (4.2)**	**5 (0.6)**	**3 (0.5)**
Directives	0	2 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	0
Reader Reference	9 (0.8)	8 (0.8)	31 (3.9)	1 (0.1)	0
Questions	2 (0.2)	5 (0.5)	1 (0.1)	2 (0.2)	0
Shared					
Knowledge	0	4 (0.4)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.2)
Personal Asides	0	0	1 (0.1)	0	2 (0.3)
Stance (Total)	**126 (11.5)**	**36 (3.6)**	**47 (5.8)**	**32 (4.0)**	**10 (1.6)**
Attitude Markers	34 (3.1)	27 (2.7)	13 (1.6)	21 (2.6)	7 (1.1)
Boosters	13 (1.2)	6 (0.6)	13 (1.6)	7 (0.9)	1 (0.2)
Hedges	2 (0.2)	3 (0.3)	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	2 (0.3)
Self-Mention	77 (7.0)	0	19 (2.4)	2 (0.2)	0

Some differences in genre or type of assignment were reflected in the rates of interactional features. For example, Hanna's self-reflective paper had the highest rate of features indicating stance, at 11.5 features per 100 words. This high rate can be accounted for by the rates (also the highest of all her papers) of attitude markers (3.1 per 100 words) and self-mentions (7.0 per 100 words). As expected, Hanna inserted herself as the author in a self-reflective piece as opposed to a descriptive piece, for which she has

zero self-mentions and a rate of only 1.6 stance features per 100 words. Hanna's opinion papers fell somewhere in-between, varying in rates of overall stance from 3.6 to 5.8 features per 100 words. Hanna used more boosters than hedges on all but her descriptive assignment.

Anthony's in-text interaction. Anthony submitted a total of nine papers; six were history papers and three were CCI papers (Table 4.11). Of the history papers, four were research papers and two were opinion pieces. Of the composition papers, one was a personal narrative, one an opinion piece, and one a letter. Anthony's composition papers contained low rates of engagement features, except for one opinion paper that had a high rate of reader references, and an overall engagement rate of 3.3 features per 100 words. Similarly, Anthony's history papers show few engagement features except for one opinion paper with a rate of 3.0 reader references per 100 words (Table 4.11).

Across history and composition papers, Anthony showed a consistently high rate of stance features, ranging from 5.8 to 14.6 features per 100 words. He only used self-mentions, however, in a personal narrative and letter. Attitude markers consistently accounted for the bulk of stance features, ranging from 3.8 to 8.4 attitude markers per 100 words. He used more boosters than hedges on all but three assignments: a letter and two opinion pieces.

Table 4.11

Anthony's In-text Interaction

	Frequency # (rate %)								
	Industrial Research Paper	French Research Paper	Literary Narrative	Opinion: Overrated	Napoleon Research Paper	WWI Research Paper	Opinion: Underrated	Opinion: Technology	Letter to Editor
Word Count	452	568	990	312	499	653	232	675	210
Course	History	History	Comp I	History	History	History	History	Comp I	Comp I
Engagement									
(Total)	**1 (0.2)**	**3 (0.5)**	**9 (1.0)**	**2 (0.6)**	**3 (0.6)**	**0**	**7 (3.0)**	**22 (3.3)**	**2 (1.0)**
Directives	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reader Reference	1 (0.2)	0	3 (0.3)	0	2 (0.4)	0	7 (3.0)	20 (3.0)	2 (1.0)
Questions	0	0	0	0	1 (0.2)	0	0	0	0
Shared									
Knowledge	0	2 (0.3)	0	1 (0.3)	0	0	0	2 (0.3)	0
Personal Asides	0	1 (0.2)	6 (0.6)	1 (0.3)	0	0	0	0	0
Stance (Total)	**30 (6.6)**	**53 (9.3)**	**145 (14.6)**	**29 (9.3)**	**48 (9.6)**	**50 (7.7)**	**22 (9.5)**	**39 (5.8)**	**22 (10.5)**
Attitude Markers	17 (3.8)	31 (5.5)	70 (7.1)	23 (7.4)	42 (8.4)	39 (6.0)	14 (6.0)	29 (4.3)	15 (7.1)
Boosters	8 (1.8)	12 (2.1)	15 (1.5)	0	6 (1.2)	6 (1.0)	7 (3.0)	5 (0.7)	1 (0.5)
Hedges	5 (1.1)	10 (1.8)	10 (1.0)	6 (1.9)	0	5 (0.8)	1 (0.4)	5 (0.7)	2 (1.0)
Self-Mention	0	0	50 (5.0)	0	0	0	0	0	4 (2.0)

Research Question 4: How do selected undergraduate CCI students' in-text interactions compare to their reported interactions in the academic community?

The final research question that guided this study required comparing data from interviews and text analysis and therefore provides an appropriate transition to the discussion of findings in the next chapter. Under each participant's name are distilled versions of previous data, set side by side for easy comparison, considered with respect to one another. Students' in-text interactions became confirmations or contradictions of students' confidence during interviews and reported engagement. Where appropriate, examples were taken directly from student texts to demonstrate the particular nature of students' interactions with their readers.

Terra. Terra spoke confidently during her interviews, recounted developing her voice in class, and reported discussing ideas with others outside of class. When writing papers, Terra had roommates look over her writing for clarity; she aimed to make her writing accessible for the average reader. She reported feeling confident when turning in writing assignments.

Terra's frequent use of reader references and shared knowledge markers suggested she acknowledged her audience directly and sought to build affinity, positioning her audience on common, uncontested ground. Her reader references and shared knowledge features, however, consistent with her effort to write for the average person, appealed to more widely-accepted, general knowledge rather than specialist understandings. For example, she appealed to the widely-held notion that some books stay with us, "Some [books] *you* meet and move on, others will irritate *you*, but then there

are the select few that stay with *you*." She did not appeal to contestable knowledge that the reader may or may not share.

Terra's use of attitude markers suggested she was comfortable expressing a position and pulling readers into agreement. Terra's rate of boosters across all assignments was consistent with the confidence she exhibited during interviews (often through spoken boosters) and her reported confidence in writing.

Jacky. In his interviews, Jacky reported academic struggles in his first year of college, little class participation, and little to no involvement in school-related extracurricular activities or community service. Yet the amount of writing Jacky completed and his in-text interactions were similar to other participants who reported greater engagement with the academic community. Although he volunteered to participate in the study, Jacky seemed less confident than other participants during the interview and in his self-appraisals. Yet the frequencies with which he used stance and engagement features in his writing assignments suggested confidence as an author and comfort with academic metadiscourse.

Jacky did not believe audience to be a strong factor in his writing and reported writing primarily with his professor in mind. Nevertheless, his consistent use of reader references suggested that he acknowledged his audience and sought to build affinity, positioning his audience on common, uncontested ground. Jacky exhibited strong stances throughout his papers, inserting himself frequently in the writing, mostly through attitude markers. Yet he reported only sometimes feeling confident when turning in assignments, particularly when turning in his Sociology assignments. While his Sociology assignment displayed the most varied use of interactional features, his Communications assignment

72

was not far off. Jacky generally used more hedges than boosters in his papers; his higher

rate of boosters in his sociology reflection was perhaps consistent with his reported

confidence in his writing for Sociology, which he described in the interview as "pretty

solid." Jacky's philosophy paper had the overall lowest rate of stance and engagement

features, consistent with Jacky's reported uncertainty and therefore cautiousness in that

subject.

      Courtney. During her interviews, Courtney was often hesitant and uncertain in

her explanations, more so than other participants. In one response, she cautiously used

the phrase "it depends" several times. Yet she did not consistently use the same

cautiousness in her writing, with only four out of 12 assignments containing more hedges

than boosters. While Courtney downplayed her school smarts, she confidently played up

her work ethic and reported confidence when turning in a written assignment. However,

she was not necessarily confident *in* her writing the way others were confident;

Courtney's comparably low rate of attitude markers across assignments suggested that

she was not as comfortable expressing a position and pulling readers into agreement as

other participants.

      Courtney did not believe she wrote differently for different courses and did not

consider audiences unless specifically asked to do so. Her in-text interactions both

confirm and contradict these claims. One of the only two assignments with engagement

rates above 1%, was indeed an assignment in which audience was specified by the

instructor; the other, however, was a personal response. The assignment with the lowest

combined rates of engagement and stance was an essay written for History. Both

Courtney's History essays overall had fewer in-text interactions than her Psychology

assignments, suggesting that, contrary to her belief, she did write differently for different courses. However, there was not enough consistency among in-text interactions in her nine Psychology assignments to suggest that there are patterns of interaction particular to Psychology writing, at least not the Psychology writing of students. Courtney showed greater consistency among similar types of assignment. For instance, there was a clear consistency among reflections and among opinion pieces written for her Psychology course.

Carl. Carl spoke comfortably and confidently during his interviews and expressed confidence in his writing. He reported putting forth greater or lesser effort depending on the class. Carl considered audience an important factor in writing, and articulated the goal of entering and adding to scholarly conversations. Yet he generally imagined only the professor when writing an academic paper, and never felt that he had added to a scholarly conversation.

Carl's use of personal asides is consistent with his comfort and confidence during interviews as well as his reported confidence with his writing. However, Carl's personal asides mostly reflect the cautiousness of undergraduate student writing. Most of Carl's personal asides simply clarified information, "(i.e.—the use of full body scanners and aggressive pat down procedures)," or, in the case of poem analyses, recalled lines from the poem for the reader, "(become 'scientifically interesting')." Some personal asides, however, were meant to sway audience interpretation: "(three of which were more than a decade old)." He consistently used more boosters than he did hedges, demonstrating the confidence he professed in interviews.

Amanda. Amanda spoke with enthusiasm during her interview, even when

noting the challenge of much of her coursework. Like Jacky, Amanda reported feeling

confident when turning in writing assignments for certain classes, such as Sociology, and

not so confident when turning in writing assignments for other classes, such as

Philosophy.

She recognized the importance of audience and generally wrote with classmates

in mind, making sure her writing would be understood by non-experts. Amanda's

frequent use of reader references and personal asides supported her claims, suggesting

she acknowledged an audience and tried to build affinity with the average reader. Her

personal asides were mostly informational, "…pirates (people who download mass

amounts of music in order to sell for a profit)," but she was also at times very personable:

"(I won't give away the ending, in case you ever decide to read it, which I highly

recommend you do!)" Amanda used boosters consistently throughout her papers, at

higher rates than most participants, ranging from 1.4 to 3.2 per 100 words, suggesting an

enthusiasm and confidence in what she wrote.

Hanna. Hanna spoke thoughtfully and candidly during interviews. Her

participation in, and inquiries about the present study were signs of interest and

engagement. She expressed a strong interest in her field of study, Psychology, but did

not submit any writing assignments from her Psychology classes. Three out of four

submitted pieces of writing were from her College Composition course, which she was

retaking after failing to pass—a sign that she had not yet mastered academic writing and

was not yet an accepted member. Nevertheless, Hanna reported feeling confident when

turning in writing assignments. Her varied use of interactional features in her College Composition writing demonstrated this confidence.

Hanna recognized the importance of audience, but admitted she did always consider audience when writing an academic paper. Hanna's use of directives suggested that she was aware of her audience, tried to manage her audience, and conveyed a certain authority. For example, the directive "Let's not underestimate our reading abilities" assumed control of the reader's thinking. The directive in this case did not simply help the reader navigate the text. Some of Hanna's questions, a feature which she included at least once in four out of five assignments, were also provocative, "Would we not have used simple tools or fire, a major technological innovation in its day, because it would change the way we think?" While her question invited reader participation, it also established authority over the reader, as if the writer had the answer to the question while the reader was left pondering.

Anthony. Anthony was engaging and confident during his interviews. He described the extensive discussions about ideas he had outside of class with his peers. These discussions perhaps influenced Anthony's writing, as he conversationally engages his reader using reader references when writing opinion papers. Audience was a reportedly strong factor in Anthony's academic writing, and he reported writing conversationally with someone who had some background knowledge.

Anthony reported feeling confident when turning in writing assignments, and his strong stances across all papers—more than five stance features per 100 words on every assignment—confirmed his confidence in what he wrote, as did his frequent use of

boosters and attitude markers. Frequent attitude markers suggested that Anthony was comfortable taking a position in his writing and pulling an audience towards agreement.

In an interview, Anthony commented on changes in one's writing that occurred "not necessarily according to the course, but according to the assignment...of course certain courses lend themselves to certain types of assignments." The variation among his writing assignments in History confirmed his point: there was greater consistency in the rates of engagement and stance among his research papers and among his opinion pieces.

Chapter V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary of the Study

These case studies sought to explore college students' interaction with the academic community and within academic writing, and compare these out-of-text and in-text interactions. Four research questions guided the study: Do selected undergraduate CCI students consider themselves engaged participants in the academic community? What are selected undergraduate CCI students' academic writing habits and attitudes toward writing in the academic community? In what ways do selected undergraduate CCI students interact with an audience in their academic writing? How do selected undergraduate CCI students' in-text interactions compare to their reported interactions in the academic community?

Seven participants were conveniently sampled from two College Composition I courses at Rowan University in New Jersey. Participants included four females and three males of different class years and majors. Their voluntary participation in this study, their interactions with the researcher and comportment during the interviews, and their responses to interview questions about in-class, out-of-class, and in-text interactions revealed how comfortable students felt as members of the college community. Participants met with me for two semi-structured interviews and submitted a total of 51 papers they had written thus far in their college careers. Interviews consisted of questions adapted from the *National Survey of Student Engagement* and focused on in-

class interactions and out-of-class interactions with faculty, peers, and course materials, and academic writing habits and attitudes. An analysis of interactional features in participants' academic writing, conducted using Hyland's (2005a) typology of interactional features, revealed to what extent interaction in student writing reflects the engagement and sense of membership expressed in interviews.

Discussion of the Findings

All seven CCI participants were in some way on the margins of the Rowan community: four were transfer students starting the composition sequence required for graduation, one decided to transfer from Rowan midway through the spring 2012 semester, and two participants had previously failed College Composition I and were retaking the required course. Tinto's (1988) interactionist theory understands these marginal students as undergoing a process of transition. He postulated that students entering college undergo a transitional period in which they interact with community members, adopt the community's values and behaviors, and eventually become integrated as new members. This academic socialization perspective holds student engagement, and subsequently student writing, to be representative of the degree to which students are acculturated or inducted into the academic community. Despite participants' marginality, the findings from this study suggest that selected CCI students considered themselves engaged participants to some extent in the campus, academic, and academic writing communities, which complicates Tinto's concept of community membership.

As expected, the answer to the first research question "Do selected undergraduate CCI students consider themselves engaged participants in the academic community?" was not a simple "yes" or "no." Participants considered themselves members of the

campus and academic communities in some respects and not in others. Observations made about student comportment and interactions during the interviews did not always align with reported interactions within the community, nor did reported interactions align with writing attitudes, habits, and in-text interactions. Four out of seven participants considered themselves engaged participants in the community when asked about their in-class and out-of-class engagement. However, that number dropped to only two participants, Terra and Courtney, when asked about their attitudes and habits as writers in the academic community. Terra and Courtney's self-conceptualizations as engaged participants and academic writers were nevertheless compromised by their student statuses. In other words, they were confident in their abilities as students to work hard, crank out essays, and pass classes, but not necessarily as knowledge creators contributing to an academic community or as full members free from the particular expectations of professors. Students were often familiar with the habits and assumptions of expert writers, but distanced themselves from this academic writer identity. Other examples of participants' with quasi-membership were students who appeared invested in their major field of study, but not across the curriculum or in the general academic community. Anthony, Carl, and Hanna explicitly disclosed a commitment to their field of study and a non-commitment to general education requirements and other courses of study. This complicates Tinto's membership model by drawing attention to different communities within the academic community, as well as different degrees of membership.

The two participants, Hanna and Anthony, who were most explicitly rejected by the community by failing to pass a required college course, were otherwise very engaged in and interactive within their fields of study, both by professors and by the course

80

material. In Hanna's case, it was not clear whether faculty engagement was a response to her academic struggles. Anthony, however, was clearly engaged with and engaged by the faculty, not as a result of his struggles in a particular course, but rather as a result of his own interest and common practice in the Music Department.

In this study, I identified five themes that recurred throughout student interviews: interest as a factor in academic engagement, lack of student-faculty interaction, minimal writing across the curriculum, positive attitudes toward writing, and writing to make the grade. Two of these themes, lack of student-faculty interaction and minimal writing across the curriculum, pointed to missing pieces in student experiences that have previously been shown to increase student engagement (NSSE, 2008). With the exception of Anthony and Hanna, students were not engaged by faculty outside of class, and this led students to only see themselves as student performers subject to grading rather than as collaborative learners. The lack of student-faculty interaction evident in this study may be explained by the timing of the first interview. Students, especially the three students who had just transferred, had perhaps not yet had time to build a relationship with faculty members. For several students, those who reported writing primarily with the professor in mind, in-text interaction was perhaps a form of student-faculty interaction. A different kind of student-faculty interaction takes place when faculty members provide students with feedback for improvement and students revise accordingly.

The apparent dearth of writing across the curriculum may be explained by students' misestimations or inability to recall every writing assignment. Moreover, students may not have saved electronic copies of informal writing assignments, and may

not have considered informal writing acceptable for submission. Finally, participants

may not have been comfortable sharing all their academic writing, therefore giving the

impression that they did not write as much as they did. Still, several students spoke

explicitly about the light writing load of their courses. If writing is a form of student

engagement with academics and perhaps a form of faculty-student engagement, then

students may benefit from more writing, informal writing assignments, and writing

intensive courses at Rowan University.

The remaining three themes reflected the contradiction in feeling part of the

community and having community membership compromised by student status. While

the themes of interest and positive attitudes toward writing suggested connectedness with

the academic community, the theme of "writing to make the grade" suggested a divide

between students and the academic community. Students considered themselves engaged

participants when interested in the subject or activity. Interest and motivation are well

documented elements of engagement (Kuh et al., 2007). Students cited interest as both a

factor in class participation and in academic writing.

When speaking about the importance of writing across the curriculum and

addressing appropriate audiences, students demonstrated that they were familiar with the

language of academic writing and writing instruction. In other words, simply by

discussing writing practices and differences between disciplines, students were practicing

academic discourses (Bizzell, 2002). Students demonstrated discourses by using

vocabulary that was not fed by the interview questions. Nevertheless, the discourse used

and explanations given by some participants were less refined, complex, or

knowledgeable than others. Interactional features in students' writing also suggested that

students were adopting academic discourses. Consistent use of certain engagement and stance features may be explained by how comfortable a student feels in the role of an academic writer writing within academic discourse communities. Despite showing interest and motivation, using academic terminology and language to articulate positive attitudes toward writing, and using interactional features in their writing, students positioned their out-of-text and in-text engagement around their success in school, as suggested the "writing to make the grade" theme.

In-text interactions of selected CCI students presented a contrast to those of professional academic writers and researchers described by Hyland (2005a). First, selected CCI students had higher frequencies of stance and engagement features than professional academic writers and researchers; Hyland counted features every 1,000 words, whereas features in this analysis appeared at similar rates every 100 words. This might be the result of generous interpretations by the analyst, or disproportionate use of certain features called for by the nature of the assignment, such as the use of self-mentions in personal reflection. Expert academic writers, according to Hyland (2005b) used hedges more often than any other feature, reflecting the importance of separating fact from opinion and the consciousness of appearing overly confident or assertive. This was not the case with five out of seven participants, who exhibited higher rates of boosters than hedges.

Hyland (2005b) emphasized the differences in written interactions among different disciplinary communities, finding that writers in the humanities and social sciences use interactional markers more often than writers in the hard sciences. Participants in this study wrote primarily in the social sciences and humanities, and only

seemed aware of disciplinary differences in a vague sense. These contrasts suggest that most participants were not yet members of specific disciplinary communities, aware of the conventions and subtleties of their field. In fact, there were greater interactional similarities among assignment types—reflections, opinions, and essays— than among disciplines. There was, however, one similarity between CCI writers and expert writers: overall, selected CCI students used less engagement features than they did features of stance in their academic writing, which is typical of expert academic writers as well.

The in-text interactions of selected CCI students also presented a contrast between those of undergraduate students in Hong Kong. Whereas Hyland (2009) found the most common engagement features (approximately two-thirds of all engagement features) in Hong Kong students' academic writing to be directives, the seven participants in this study most commonly displayed reader references. These were the features that students were most comfortable using to interact with their reader and flesh out a position for themselves in those academic contexts. The difference might lie in the type of writing students submitted. CCI students wrote short reflections, personal responses, analyses and opinion pieces, while Hong Kong undergraduates were seniors completing high-stakes final projects.

According to Hyland (2009), reader references acknowledge the audience and claim disciplinary affinity. The most visible example of reader references are second person and second person inclusive pronouns. Yet students are taught to avoid these as they are considered informal. Second person pronouns were more common in published research articles than in student writing. When student participants in Hong Kong used second person inclusive pronouns, they typically used them simply to appeal to everyday

knowledge and reason rather than to appeal to specialist understandings. In other words, undergraduates tended to built affinity around less specialized knowledge. This was generally the case among participants in the present study.

Assignments which had higher rates of engagement, above 2.0 features per 100 words, were often assignments for which audience was specified and/or central to the assignment. However, there were four assignments—by Hanna, Courtney, Jacky, and Anthony— with high rates of engagement that were not clearly attributable to the assignment type or to a specified audience. These were the most noteworthy because they reveal a comfort on the part of the writer in aligning themselves with and connecting to the reader. The most common engagement feature across all assignments was reader reference—that is, the use of second person pronouns.

The most common stance features found in participants' writing were attitude markers and self-mentions. Carl, Anthony, and Jacky had high rates of attitude markers, at least 2.0 markers per 100 words, across all submitted assignments. All participants had at least one attitude marker on all submitted assignments. This consistency suggests that the participants, especially Carl, Anthony, and Jacky, are comfortable making judgments and disclosing affective attitudes towards what they write about. This comfort, in turn, indicates a sense of membership in the academic community, where judgments are made and attitudes shaped. The rates of self-mentions were in large part attributable to the assignment type; assignments emphasizing personal reflection call for first-person pronouns. Yet there are a couple assignments that are not personal reflections—opinion papers by Hanna and Jacky—with self-mention rates of at least 2.0 per 100 words.

85

Again, these in-text interactions reflected their reported comfort and confidence as engaged student participants.

Conclusions

This study provided a different perspective from which teachers and administrators can evaluate student writing and student engagement, one which rests on interactions between students and professors and written interactions between students and hypothetical audiences. Selected CCI students considered themselves engaged participants in at least one area of the community: in out-of-class activities, in-class activities, and in certain classes more than others. Participants expressed their sense of membership through confidence, familiarity with the language and habits of the community, use of written interactional metadiscourse features, and sometimes explicit disclosure. With few exceptions, the participants more readily thought of themselves as engaged student participants than as academic writers participating in the academic community. Selected participants interacted with audience in their academic writing mainly through the use of self-mentions, attitude markers, and reader references. These features in some cases reflected participants' reported comfort and confidence within the community, but also reflected the cautiousness of student writers under evaluation. These student writing case studies support the notion that involved and engaged students in one area are not involved and engaged in other areas of the academic community. Students who are otherwise acculturated as students in the community may not feel like a collaborator, a contributing member in the academic writing community.

Recommendations for Practice

Even though most participants had positive attitudes toward writing and believed

that writing should be incorporated across the curriculum, few were taking writing-

intensive courses or writing in other classes. This suggests that the efforts of the Writing

Across the Curriculum (WAC) movement have not yet transformed curriculum at Rowan

University. Participants spoke of the differences in writing between disciplines in a

general and vague sense; two students admitted that they did not approach writing any

differently when switching disciplines. If students are to become more comfortable in an

academic setting and more familiar with academic conventions, then WAC and Writing

in the Disciplines (WID) should continue to be topics at faculty workshops and on

curriculum committees.

Participants were familiar with the concept of audience; this was a frequently

covered topic in their composition courses. Each participant could articulate how writers

adjust to different audiences. However, if participants' discussions of audience are

reflective of the discussions that take place in class, I recommend that such discussions

go beyond writing for familiar versus high-brow audiences to the specific interactions

academic writers enter with audience. This might include directly teaching interactional

features to students. Many students identified as the professor as their audience when

unspecified, usually in their non-composition courses. Professors outside of composition

courses might deliberately discuss audience on each assignment to encourage greater

interaction with the material and the reader.

Faculty and student affairs professionals must engage students outside of class in

academically enriching ways and promote learning as collaboration, deemphasizing the

87

teacher-student power hierarchy. Professors must make students feel like they are part of

the academic community, co-builders of knowledge, if they want to fully integrate

students into the academic community and encourage interactional writing.

Recommendations for Further Research

There are many factors that determine the level of stance and engagement in

college students' academic writing: pre-college experiences, assignment, genre,

professor, and discipline, to name a few. Future research might focus on which factor(s)

are most significant for college students in composition courses. One of the factors noted

in the data analysis is personal interest.   Is personal interest a significant factor in

students' in-text interactions? Exploring factors other than social, interactional factors

may mean approaching research on student writing from another theoretical perspective,

such as those found in psychology.

Although this study sought to offer a broad, qualitative view of students'

interactions and writing across the curriculum, future research might arrive at more

specific recommendations and more comparable results if they control for more variables.

The clearest way to control for variables is to compare student writing born of the same

assignment. This would be difficult to accomplish on a large, cross-campus scale, as

producing writing samples is more time-consuming and more personal than taking

surveys, for instance. However, this might be accomplished on a class-wide basis. The

composition instructor is in an ideal place to conduct such research, or an ideal person to

partner with when conducting such research: he or she has access to a variety of

comparable drafts and final products written by students, as well as a perspective of

students' participation in class and interaction with the material. He or she might teach

several sections of the same course, or teach the same course over several years, thus

enlarging the research sample size.

References

Abdollahzadeh, E. (2003). Interpersonal metadiscourse in ELT papers by Iranian and
    Anglo American academic writers. Paper presented at the INGED conference
    "Multiculturalism in ELT Practices: Unity and Diversity" at Baskent University,
    Ankara.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education.
    Journal of College Student Development, 25, 297–308.

Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical
    marking of evidentiality and affect. *TEXT, 9* (1), 93-124.

Bizzell, P. (2002). The intellectual work of "mixed" forms of academic discourses. In
    Schroeder, Fox, & Bizzell (Eds.), *Alt dis: Alternative discourses and the academy*.
    Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Burke, S. (2010). The construction of writer identity in the academic writing of Korean
    ESL students: A qualitative study of six Korean students in the U.S. Retrieved
    from ProQuest Digital Dissertations.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in
    undergraduate education. *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin, 39*
    (7). 3-7.

Council of Writing Program Administrators, & National Survey of Student Engagement.
    (2008). Consortium for the study of writing in college. Retrieved from
    http://comppile.org/wpa+nsse/

Elkins, H., Buckingham, T., & Cochran, L. (2003). In their own words: Assessment to
    understand the dynamics of college retention. Proceedings from the

Annual Meeting of the Mid Western Educational Research Association. Columbus, OH.

Foucault, M. (1972). The discourse on language. Archaeology of knowledge. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon.

Gee, J. P. (1992). The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice. Series in language and ideology. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (1999). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method. London: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2000). The new literacy studies. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 177-195). London: Routledge.

Giuliana, D. (2008). Emphasizers in spoken and written academic discourse: The case of really. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 13* (3), 296-321.

Graham, C. R., Tripp, T. R., Seawright, L., & Joeckel, G. L. (2007). Empowering or compelling reluctant participators using audience response systems. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 8* (3), 233–258.

Gute, D., & Gute, G. (2008). Flow writing in the liberal arts core and across the disciplines: A vehicle for confronting and transforming academic disengagement. *JGE, 57* (4), 190-222.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Introduction to functional grammar*, 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hollander, P. (2010). Finding "sponsorship" in the academy: Three case-studies of first

    year writing students. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 41* (1).

Hu, S ., & Kuh, G. D. (2001). Being (dis)engaged in educationally purposeful

    activities. The influences of student and institutional characteristics. Paper

    presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference.

    Seattle, WA,   10–14 April.

Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (Eds.) (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the*

    construction of discourse. Oxford: OUP.

Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London:

    Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2005b). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic

    discourse. *Discourse Studies, 7* (2), 173-192.

Hyland, K. (2009). Corpus informed discourse analysis: The case of academic

    engagement. p. 111-128.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in*

    academic writing. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kepler, K. (2005). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic

    writing, and teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Technical*

    Communication, 52, 401-403.

Kuteeva, M. (2011). Wikis and academic writing: Changing the writer-reader

    relationship. *English for Specific Purposes, 30* (1), 44-57.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2007). Piecing

    together the student success puzzle: Research, propositions, and

recommendations. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 32* (5). San Francisco: Jossey Bass

Kuh, G. D. (1996). Guiding principles for creating seamless learning environments for undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development, 37* (2), 135-48.

Kuh, G. D. (2007). What student engagement data tell us about college readiness. *Peer Review, 9,* 4–8. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/prwi07/prwi07 _analysis1.cfm

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning. *Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Lea, M. & Street, B. (1997, June). *Models of student writing in higher education*. Paper presented at Social anthropology teaching and learning network workshop: New forms of student writing, Falmer, East Sussex, England, UK.

Le, L. (2004). Active participation within written argumentation: Metadiscourse and editorialist's authority. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 687-714.

Martin, J. (2000). Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL Systems in English, in S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). The language of evaluation, appraisal in English. London & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martinez, J., & Martinez, N. (1987). Are basic writers cognitively deficient? Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Western College Reading and Learning Association. Albuquerque, NM.

Monroe, J. (2003). Writing and the disciplines. *Peer Review, 6*, 4-8.

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2008). *Promoting engagement for all students:*

The imperative to look within. Bloomington, IN. Retrieved from

http://nsse.iub.edu/NSSE_2008_Results/docs/withhold/NSSE2008_Results.pdf

Nivales, M. L. (2011). Hedging in college research papers: Implications for language

instruction. *Asian EFL Journal, 52*, 35-44.

Nystrand, M. (1982). *What writers know: The language, process, and structure of

written discourse*. New York: Academic Press.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and

insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Pittam, G., Elander, J., Lusher, J., Fox, P., & Payne, N. (2009). Student beliefs and

attitudes about authorial identity in academic writing. *Studies in Higher

Education, 34* (2), 153-170.

Prater, M. A. (1992). Increasing time-on-task in the classroom: Suggestions for

improving the amount of time learners spend in on-task behaviors. *Intervention

in   School and Clinic, 28* (1), 22-27.

Rowan University (2011). Rowan university fast facts 2011-2012. Retrieved from

http://www.rowan.edu/fastfacts/

Rowan University Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, & Planning. (2010).

Fall 2010 facts & figures. Retrieved from http://www.rowan.edu/president/

ierp/fastfacts/pdf/RU_2010FactsFigures.pdf

Scribner, S. (1984). Literacy in three metaphors. *American Journal of Education, 93*, 6

21.

Sisco, B. R. (1981). A study of the attitudes of selected academics and selected decision

makers toward adult learners. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse

University.

Shaughnessy, M. (1977). *Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

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

Swales, J. M. (1990) *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swee Heng, C., & Tan, H. (2010). Extracting and comparing the intricacies of metadiscourse of two written persuasive corpora. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology, 6* (3), 124-146.

Tang, R., & Suganthi, J. (1999). The "I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes, 18* (1), 23-39.

Tinto, V. (1988). Reflections on the longitudinal character of student leaving. *The Journal of Higher Education, 59* (4), 438-455.

Thomas, G. (2011). A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse, and structure. *Qualitative Inquiry, 17*. P 511.

Trowler, V. (2010). Student engagement literature review. *The Higher Education Academy*. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/ studentengagement/StudentEngaementLiteratureReview.pdf

White, P. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text, 23* (2), 2594–8.

APPENDIX A

Institutional Review Board Approval Letter

Rowan University

December 14, 2011

Florette Press
410 Jamaica Drive
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002

Dear Florette Press:

In accordance with the University's IRB policies and 45 CFR 46, the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to inform you that the Rowan University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved your project:

IRB application number: 2012-124

Project Title: In-Text and Out-Of-Text Engagement: Interactional Features in Students' Academic Writing and Academic Engagement

In accordance with federal law, this approval is effective for **one calendar year** from the date of this letter. If your research project extends beyond that date or if you need to make significant modifications to your study, you must notify the IRB immediately. Please reference the above-cited IRB application number in any future communications with our office regarding this research.

Please retain copies of consent forms for this research for three years after completion of the research.

If, during your research, you encounter any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects, you must report this immediately to Dr. Harriet Hartman (hartman@rowan.edu or call 856-256-4500, ext. 3787) or contact Dr. Shreekanth Mandayam, Associate Provost for Research (shreek@rowan.edu or call 856-256-5150).

If you have any administrative questions, please contact Karen Heiser (heiser@rowan.edu or 856-256-5150).

Sincerely,

Harriet Hartman

Harriet Hartman, Ph.D.
Chair, Rowan University IRB

c: Burton Sisco, Educational Services, Administration and Higher Education, Education Hall

APPENDIX B

Permission from College Composition I Instructor

Florette Press <florette.press@gmail.com>

Request to visit your Comp I class

5 messages

Florette Press <florette.press@gmail.com>   Tue, Jan 10, 2012 at 11:29 PM
To: selko@rowan.edu
Bcc: "Adams, Kelly R." <adamskel@rowan.edu>

Dear Professor Selko,

I am a graduate student here at Rowan and an intern at the Writing Center. I am completing my thesis (on student engagement and academic writing) this Spring, and I am writing to ask you if I may visit your Comp I class in January to briefly explain the study to students and solicit participation (this should take less than five minutes). I am looking for 8-10 Comp I students to participate in a qualitative study. If I am able to recruit at least eight participants, I will then ask your permission to sit in on the class to observe students' engagement (participation, note-taking, general attentiveness). Below is a brief description of the study. If you prefer, I can come speak to you in person.

Thanks for your time and hope to hear from you,

Florette Press

M.A. in Higher Education Administration

609-636-6989

Faculty Sponsor:

Dr. Burton Sisco

856-256-4500 x3717

sisco@rowan.edu

Title: In-text and Out-of-text Engagement: Interactional Features in Students' Academic Writing and Academic Engagement.

These case studies seek to explore the connection between writer-reader interaction in first-year students' academic writing and first-year students' overall academic engagement. Methods include text analysis, interviews, and classroom observation. Participants will submit written assignments from various classes to be analyzed for interactional features using Hyland's (2005) index. In two one-hour interviews, I will digitally record student responses to questions on academic background, academic engagement, and attitudes towards academics. I will also ask clarification questions about particular assignments and features that appear frequently in their writing. Finally, with the composition

instructor's permission, I will regularly observe the participants' classroom engagement, an indicator of overall academic engagement. After I collect these various data, I will compare texts produced by the same student, relate the text data to students' academic engagement profiles, and compare student cases.

Research Questions:

1) How does a first year student's written interactions compare to his/her real interactions in the academic community?

2) Does in-text interaction vary across a first-year student's writing assignments?

The risks involved in this study are no greater than those one would encounter in everyday life. Participants' names will be kept confidential. Once data collection is complete, students will receive a $20 gift certificate in thanks for their time and cooperation.

Selko, Christine <Selko@rowan.edu>   Thu, Jan 12, 2012 at 9:22 AM
To: Florette Press <florette.press@gmail.com>

Florette,

This is fine with me. Do you plan to attend both sections? Just let me know when.

Chris Selko

From: Florette Press [florette.press@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 11:29 PM
To: Selko, Christine
Subject: Request to visit your Comp I class

[Quoted text hidden]

Florette Press <florette.press@gmail.com>   Fri, Jan 13, 2012 at 2:51 AM
To: "Selko, Christine" <Selko@rowan.edu>

Hi Chris,

Great, thank you. Unless enough students from the Tuesday section sign-up, I would like to visit both Tuesday and Thursday sections. Is it okay if I come at 1 PM this first Tuesday? Or would you prefer I come in the first/last five minutes of class? I have no other commitments during that hour, so I could even sit in on the class until you finish first-class business, so as not to interrupt. The class is still in Robson 202?

Thanks!

Florette

[Quoted text hidden]

Selko, Christine <Selko@rowan.edu>   Sat, Jan 14, 2012 at 7:25 PM
To: Florette Press <florette.press@gmail.com>

Florette,

Yes, my class meets in 202 Robinson. Also, I have a 4:45 class that meets in 206 Wilson. You can have access to both classes.

Chris Selko

From: Florette Press [florette.press@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2012 2:51 AM
To: Selko, Christine
Subject: Re: Request to visit your Comp I class

[Quoted text hidden]

Florette Press <florette.press@gmail.com>   Sun, Jan 15, 2012 at 10:23 PM
To: "Selko, Christine" <Selko@rowan.edu>

Ok, thank you! See you then.

-Florette
[Quoted text hidden]

APPENDIX C

Research Participant Consent Form

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
IN-TEXT AND OUT-OF-TEXT ENGAGEMENT:
INTERACTIONAL FEATURES IN STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING
AND ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT
Florette Press
Rowan University

Purpose of Research
 The goal of this research is to explore the connection between students' academic engagement and writer-reader interaction in their academic writing. Participants will submit final versions of writing assignments from each of their classes to be analyzed for features that signal writer-reader interaction. In two separate interviews, one before and one after the text analysis, students' responses to questions relating to background, academic engagement, and attitudes about academic engagement will be digitally recorded. I will also ask clarification questions about particular writing assignments and features that appear frequently in their writing. Finally, I will compare texts produced by each student to determine the consistency of their in-text interaction, relate the text data to students' academic engagement profiles, and compare student cases.

Duration of Participation
Data will be collected from the beginning of the spring 2012 semester until May 1st.

Benefits/Risks to the Individual
The risks involved in this study are no greater than those you would encounter in everyday life. Benefits include the chance to reflect on your writing and academic engagement. Once data collection is complete, students will receive a $20 gift certificate in thanks for their time and cooperation (only students who submit papers and complete both interviews are eligible to receive the gift certificate).
Participants' names will be kept confidential. The researcher will lock consent forms, recordings, notes, student texts, and flash drives containing data in a drawer at home. After three years, the researcher will erase all recordings and data saved on her flash drives. She will shred student papers and notes.

Voluntary Nature of Participation
I do not have to participate in this research project. If I agree to participate I can withdraw my participation at any time without penalty. My participation or non-participation will not have any effect on my grade in CCI.
If I have any questions about this research project, I can contact **Florette Press** at 609-636-6989 or pressf24@students.rowan.edu or her faculty sponsor, **Dr. Burton Sisco** at 856-256-4500 x3717 or sisco@rowan.edu
I HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO READ THIS **CONSENT FORM**, ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RESEARCH PROJECT AND AM PREPARED TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROJECT.

_____ _____
Participant's Signature   Date

_____ _____
Researcher's Signature   Date

APPENDIX D

Interview Questions

Interview I

This interview should take approximately half an hour. You do not have to answer any questions that you are not comfortable answering. Otherwise, please answer the questions honestly, give your best approximations, and explain when necessary. All questions refer to this past school year, beginning in September, 2011, unless otherwise noted. This interview will be digitally recorded. If you have any questions, you can contact **Florette Press** at 609-636-6989 or pressf24@students.rowan.edu; or her faculty sponsor, **Dr. Burton Sisco** at 856-256-4500 x3717 or sisco@rowan.edu

Demographics

Pseudonym:
Age:
Sex:
Ethnicity:
Year:
Major:

Class Schedule:

Engagement Outside of Class

1) How often have you discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)?

2) How many books have you read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment?

3) Do you write outside of school?

4) Do you participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together?

5) What is your relationship with other students? Friendly/unfriendly? Supportive/unsupportive? Alienating/close?

6) How often do you participate in community service or volunteer work?

7) Do you work for pay either on or off campus?

8) Do you participate in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, sports, etc.)?

9) How often do you relax and/or socialize (watch TV, party, etc.)?

Engagement In Class/For Class

10) How often do you ask questions in class/contribute to class discussion?

11) How often do you come to class without completing readings or assignments?

12) How often do you put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions?

13) How often have you worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's expectations?

14) How often do you work with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments?

15) How often do you use an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment?

16) How many drafts do you generally write before turning in an assignment?

17) Approximately how many assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings have you read this year?

18) Approximately how many papers or reports of 20 pages or more have you written this year?

19) Approximately how many papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages have you written this year?

20) Approximately how many papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages have you written this year?

21) About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework, and other academic activities)?

22) During this school year, how much (very much / quite a bit / some / very little?) have your courses emphasized:

   a) *Memorizing* facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form?
   b) *Analyzing* the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components?
   c) *Synthesizing* and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships?
   d) *Making judgments* about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions?
   e) *Applying* theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations?

Interactions with Instructors/Staff

23) How often do you communicate over e-mail with an instructor?

24) How often do you discuss grades or assignments with an instructor?

25) How often do you talk about career plans with a faculty member or advisor?

26) How often do you discuss ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class?

27) How often have you worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)?

28) How would you describe your relationship with faculty members? Friendly/Unfriendly? Supportive/Unsupportive? Alienating/Close?

29) How would you describe your relationship with administrators? Friendly/Unfriendly? Supportive/Unsupportive? Alienating/Close?

Interview II

This interview should take approximately half an hour. You do not have to answer any questions that you are not comfortable answering. Otherwise, please answer the questions honestly, give your best approximations, and explain when necessary. All questions refer to this past school year, beginning in September, 2011, unless otherwise noted. This interview will be digitally recorded. If you have any questions, you can contact **Florette Press** at 609-636-6989 or pressf24@students.rowan.edu; or her faculty sponsor, **Dr. Burton Sisco** at 856-256-4500 x3717 or sisco@rowan.edu

2. Why are you taking Comp I?

3. Have you written anything since Interview I? (For Comp I? Micro? Macro? Economic Geography? Sociology of Minorities?)

4. So far I have X papers from you…

5. Did you ever receive detailed instructions for how to write any of these papers?

> Have your professors…
> - Explained in advance the criteria he or she would use to grade your assignment
> - Asked you to address a real or imagined audience such as your classmates, a politician, non- experts, etc.

6. Do you write differently for different courses? Explain.

- Do you write in the style and format of a specific field?

7. Do you agree with these statements (explain):

- Writing should be incorporated across the curriculum
- The audience for which I write is a strong factor in how and what I write.
- Writing an assignment is all about finding sources and arranging them in the form of an essay.
- Writing an assignment is all about making an argument based on my own thoughts.
- I feel confident when turning in writing assignments.
- College-level writing is different from the writing I did in high school.

8. What's your favorite type of writing assignment?

APPENDIX E

Content Analysis Procedures

APPENDIX E: RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR LOGICAL

ANALYSIS OF WRITTEN DATA

The following decisions were made regarding what was to be the unit of data

analysis (Sisco, 1981):

1. A phrase or clause will be the basic unit of analysis.

2. verbiage not considered essential to the phrase or clause will be edited out—

e.g., articles of speech, possessives, some adjectives, elaborative examples.

3. Where there is a violation of convention syntax in the data, it will be corrected.

4. Where there are compound thoughts in a phrase or clause, each unit of thought

will be represented separately (unless one was an elaboration of the other).

5. Where information seems important to add to the statement in order to clarify

it in a context, this information will be added to the unit by using parentheses.

The following decisions were made regarding the procedures for categorization o:

content units:

1. After several units are listed on a sheet of paper, they will be scanned in order

to determine differences and similarities.

2. From this tentative analysis, logical categories will derived for the units.

3. When additional units of data suggest further categories, they will be added to

the classification scheme.

4. After all the units from a particular question responses are thus classified, the

categories are further reduced to broader clusters (collapsing of categories).

5. Frequencies of units in each cluster category are determined and further analysis steps are undertaken, depending on the nature of the data-- i.e., ranking of categories with verbatim quotes which represent the range of ideas or opinions. (p. 177).

FROM: Sisco, B.R. (1981). A study of the attitudes of selected academics and selected decision-makers toward adult learners. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University.

APPENDIX F

Interactional Metadiscourse Typology

Appendix: Metadiscourse items investigated

These are the search items used in this book as potentially realizing metadiscourse functions. It must be remembered, of course, that all items can realize either propositional or metadiscoursal meanings and that many can express either interactive or interpersonal meanings. Every instance should therefore be studied in its sentential co-text.

Interactive Metadiscourse

Code Glosses

—
( )
as a matter of fact
called
defined as
e.g.
for example
for instance
I mean
i.e.
in fact
in other words
indeed
known as
namely
or X
put another way
say
specifically
such as
that is
that is to say
that means
this means
viz
which means

Endophoric Markers

(in) Chapter X
(in) Part X
(in) Section X
(in) the X chapter
(in) the X part
(in) the X section
(in) this chapter
(in) this part
(in) this section
Example X
Fig. X
Figure X
P. X
Page X
Table X
X above
X before
X below
X earlier
X later

Evidentials

(date)/(name)
(to) cite X
(to) quote X
[ref. no.]/[name]
according to X
cited
quoted

Frame Markers

a) Sequencing

(in) chapter X
(in) part X
(in) section X
(in) the X chapter
(in) the X part
(in) the X section
(in) this chapter
(in) this part
(in) this section
finally
first
first of all
firstly
last
lastly
listing (a, b, c, etc.)
next
numbering (1, 2, 3, etc.)
second
secondly
subsequently
then
third
thirdly
to begin
to start with

b) label stages

all in all
at this point
at this stage
by far
for the moment
in brief
in conclusion
in short
in sum
in summary
now
on the whole
overall
so far
thus far
to conclude
to repeat
to sum up
to summarize

c) announce goal

(in) this chapter
(in) this part
(in) this section
aim
desire to
focus
focus
goal
intend to
intention
objective
objective
purpose
seek to
want to
wish to
would like to

d) shift topic
back to
digress
in regard to
move on
now
resume
return to
revisit
shift to
so
to look more closely
turn to
well
with regard to

Transition Markers
accordingly
additionally
again
also
alternatively
although
and
as a consequence
as a result
at the same time
because
besides
but
by contrast
by the same token
consequently
conversely
equally
even though
further
furthermore
hence
however
in addition
in contrast
in the same way

leads to
likewise
moreover
nevertheless
nonetheless
on the contrary
on the other hand
rather
result in
similarly
since
so
so as to
still
the result is
thereby
therefore
though
thus
whereas
while
yet

Interactional Metadiscourse

Attitude Markers
!
admittedly
agree
agrees
agreed
amazed
amazing
amazingly
appropriate
appropriately
astonished
astonishing
astonishingly
correctly
curious
curiously
desirable

desirably
disappointed
disappointing
disappointingly
disagree
disagreed
disagrees
dramatic
dramatically
essential
essentially
even x
expected
expectedly
fortunate
fortunately
hopeful
hopefully
important
importantly
inappropriate
inappropriately
interesting
interestingly
prefer
preferable
preferably
preferred
remarkable
remarkably
shocked
shocking
shockingly
striking
strikingly
surprised
surprising
surprisingly
unbelievable
unbelievably
understandable
understandably
unexpected

unexpectedly
unfortunate
unfortunately
unusual
unusually
usual

Boosters
actually
always
believe
believed
believes
beyond doubt
certain
certainly
clear
clearly
conclusively
decidedly
definite
definitely
demonstrate
demonstrated
demonstrates
doubtless
establish
established
evident
evidently
find
finds
found
in fact
incontestable
incontestably
incontrovertible
incontrovertibly
indeed
indisputable
indisputably
know
known

Boosters

must (*possibility*)
never
no doubt
obvious
obviously
of course
prove
proved
proves
realize
realized
realizes
really
show
showed
shown
shows
sure
surely
think
thinks
thought
truly
true
undeniable
undeniably
undisputedly
undoubtedly
without doubt

Self Mention

I
we
me
my
our
mine
us
the author
the author's
the writer
the writer's

Engagement Markers

(
?
(the) reader's
add
allow
analyse
apply
arrange
assess
assume
by the way
calculate
choose
classify
compare
connect
consider
consult
contrast
define
demonstrate
determine
do not
develop
employ
ensure
estimate
evaluate
find
follow
go
have to
imagine
incidentally
increase
input
insert
integrate
key
let x = y
let us
let's
look at
mark
measure
mount
must
need to
note
notice
observe
one's
order
ought
our (*inclusive*)
pay
picture
prepare
recall
recover
refer
regard
remember
remove
review
see
select
set
should
show
suppose
state
take (a look/as example)
think about
think of
turn
us (*inclusive*)
use
we (*inclusive*)
you
your

Hedges

about
almost
apparent
apparently
appear
appeared
appears
approximately
argue
argued
argues
around
assume
assumed
broadly
certain amount
certain extent
certain level
claim
claimed
claims
could
couldn't
doubt
doubtful
essentially
estimate
estimated
fairly
feel
feels
felt
frequently
from my perspective
from our perspective
from this perspective
generally
guess
indicate
indicated
indicates
in general
in most cases
in most instances
in my opinon

in my view	relatively
in this view	roughly
in our opinion	seems
in our view	should
largely	sometimes
likely	somewhat
mainly	suggest
may	suggested
maybe	suggests
might	suppose
mostly	supposed
often	supposes
on the whole	suspect
ought	suspects
perhaps	tend to
plausible	tended to
plausibly	tends to
possible	to my knowledge
possibly	typical
postulate	typically
postulated	uncertain
postulates	uncertainly
presumable	unclear
presumably	unclearly
probable	unlikely
probably	usually
quite	would
rather x	wouldn't