

The Journal of the College Literacy and Learning ~ Special Interest Group of the International Literacy Association

CONTENTS

- 1 Helping Students Develop Identity, Agency, and Awareness: Necessary Tools for Navigating College Success**

Editors, Kristin Conley and Heather Johnson-Taylor

- 6 Corequisite Success: Integrating Reading, Writing, and English 101**

Lisa Bosley, Eastern Kentucky University

Dominic Ashby, Eastern Kentucky University

Shawne Alexander, Eastern Kentucky University

Matt Schumacher, Eastern Kentucky University

- 23 Literacy Strategy Use and Identity Enactment**

Emily Suh, Texas State University

- 46 Agency, Ownership, and Calls for Partnership: A Study of Six African American Undergraduate Readers**

Heather D. Porter, Salisbury University

JCLL

Volume 47 • 2021
Journal of College Literacy
and Learning

ABOUT JCLL

The *Journal of College Literacy and Learning* (JCLL) (ISSN 0738-9523) welcomes material related to advancing scholarship on reading, writing, and academic success at the postsecondary level. JCLL is published by the College Literacy and Learning Special Interest Group of the International Literacy Association and is intended to provide a forum for the exchange of information regarding research, theory, and practice.

The opinions published in JCLL do not necessarily reflect or imply advocacy or endorsement by the College Literacy and Learning Special Interest Group, the International Literacy Association, its officers, its members, or the JCLL Editorial Review Board.

JCLL is online at <http://j-cll.org/>

ABOUT THE CLL SIG

The College Literacy and Learning SIG represents a constituency of ILA focused on issues related to postsecondary literacy and learning. The SIG officers are:

Kristin Conley, Chair

Debby Kellner, Past Chair

Victoria Appatova, Past Chair

Toni Hernen, Treasurer

Laurie Bauer, Communications

Lou Ann Sears, Awards

Editorial Team

Editors

Heather Johnson- Taylor
Sinclair Community
College

Kristin Conley
Ferris State University

Associate Editor

Laurie Bauer
University of Cincinnati
~ BlueAsh College

From the Editors

Helping Students Develop Identity, Agency, and Awareness: Necessary Tools for Navigating College Success

Kristin Conley

Ferris State University

Heather Johnson-Taylor

Sinclair Community College

When we introduced last year's volume of JCLL, we were in the beginning stages of the COVID 19 pandemic. A global pandemic that continues today and forced most colleges and universities to teach remotely for much of the 2020-2021 academic year (Katz & Ognyanova, 2021). For many postsecondary educators, this required adaptation, as was the focus of last year's volume: the evolution of college literacy (Bauer & Johnson-Taylor, 2020). This evolution continues.

Today, there is continued discussion centered on equal access to quality education and free college tuition (Driscoll & Clapp, 2017). We also see continued educational reforms centered on developmental education (DE) and mandated enrollment in innovative DE instruction (Hodges, Payne, McConnell et al., 2020). These changes have and will

continue to impact the teaching and learning in postsecondary education.

As we introduce this volume of JCLL, we acknowledge the impact of increased online learning, changes to traditional DE courses, increased enrollment in corequisite courses, and an increased enrollment of historically underrepresented students. The college learning environment continues to evolve. This evolution requires students have increased self-awareness and the ability to self-advocate. An underlining theme present in each article in JCLL volume 47 is the importance of knowing oneself. Each article focuses on some element of self-awareness. Whether it is better understanding one's identity or strengthening one's self-agency in a constantly changing learning environment, the articles reiterate the

importance of empowering students to better understand themselves as learners and begin to take control of their literacy needs as they embark upon their educational journey.

The authors of **“Reading on Their Own Terms: Understanding the Motivated Reading Practices of Upper-Division African American Undergraduates”** show the importance of understanding one’s self-agency and remaining accountable. The authors describe how students take control of their learning and supplement it by “employing a decision matrix driven by career goals.” Their findings depict students as “active, intentional, and empowered learners” who seek ways to supplement the official curriculum when necessary and counter authority when needed with calls for “accountability.”

In **“Corequisite Success: Integrated Reading, Writing, and English 101”** the authors describe some changes taking place at a public university. Their study focuses on a developmental program redesign brought about by a response to “shifting state mandates.” The redesign includes enrolling students into a four- credit integrated reading and writing corequisite with supplemental supports. The changes focus on credit completion and improved retention.

Finally, in **“Literacy Strategy Use and Identity Enactment”** the authors illustrate the importance of understanding one’s identity. Working with Generation 1 learners, their findings reveal that a student’s emergent competence in relationship to studying and the use of literacy strategies aligns with their “college student” identity. Their research illustrates the importance of knowing who you are so you can know where you are going.

We hope the manuscripts presented in Volume 47 will be beneficial to you as you continue to grow in your teaching practice and research. It is our intention to provide scholarship on current trends to better support you as scholars and practitioners in

the field of college literacy and learning.

We appreciate the authors and thank them for sharing their important work, and for the many dedicated reviewers who give of their time, energy, talents, and expertise to JCLL. Finally, we would like to thank you, dear readers, for your interest and dedication to college literacy and learning and your support of this publication.

References

- Bauer, L., Johnson-Taylor, H. (2020). Evolutions in the field of college literacy and learning. *Journal of College Literacy & Learning*, 46, 1-2.
- Driscoll S., Clapp M. (2017). Free college tuition: Overview. Points of view: Free college tuition. Accessed May 7, 2021. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=pwh&AN=23712074&site=ehost-live>.
- Katz, V., Jordan, A., & Ognyanova, K. (2021). Digital inequality, faculty communication, and remote learning experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic: A survey of U.S. undergraduates. *PloS One*, 16(2), e0246641–e0246641. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246641>.
- Russ Hodges, Emily Miller Payne, Michael C McConnell, Jonathan Lollar, Denise A Guckert, Shiniece Owens, Cassandra Gonzales, Meagan A Hoff, Kristie O'Donnell Lussier, Na Wu, & Holly B Shinn. (2020). Developmental education policy and reforms: A 50-State snapshot. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 44(1), 2–17.

Corequisite Success: Integrating Reading, Writing, and English 101

Lisa Bosley

Eastern Kentucky University

Dominic Ashby

Eastern Kentucky University

Shawne Alexander

Eastern Kentucky University

Matt Schumacher

Eastern Kentucky University

ABSTRACT

This article reports on a developmental program redesign at a public university to accelerate students' credit completion and improve retention. English and reading faculty created a corequisite course integrating separate developmental reading and writing courses with a four credit-hour First-Year Writing (FYW) course supported by Course-Embedded Consultants. The authors provide institutional context and describe the redesign process, emphasizing responses to shifting state mandates. Program success is assessed in terms of earning FYW credit, retention, and meeting FYW learning outcomes. Data show that the corequisite program accelerates student achievement of FYW credit and course learning outcomes. Student retention rates increased slightly, but continue to be below those of standard-admittance students. With adequate financial support for professional development and student supports, a corequisite reading and writing course can succeed at a four-year institution.

Introduction

Over the past decade, a growing body of research on the limited success of post-secondary developmental education prompted a reform movement that has reshaped the field (Adams et al., 2012; Boylan et al., 2017;

Daugherty et al., 2018; Holschuh & Paulson, 2013; Jenkins et al., 2010; Mangan, 2019; Rutschow & Schneider, 2011). The effort has resulted in state mandates to accelerate, limit, or prohibit pre-credit developmental course requirements. In many colleges, the corequisite model has replaced semester-long,

separate pre-credit courses in English and reading, which, for some students, contributed to depletion of financial aid, accumulation of debt, and the loss of momentum toward a postsecondary degree (Bailey et al., 2013; Levin & Calcagno, 2008). This article reports on the evolution and outcomes of a corequisite course implemented at Appalachian Regional University (ARU, a pseudonym) in response to a state mandate to accelerate developmental requirement completion and increase retention and graduation rates of these students (Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education, 2016).

In 2013, when Kentucky's Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) began enacting policies to encourage developmental education redesign, ARU English and reading faculty piloted an integrated developmental writing and reading course, ENG 101R, corequisite with the first-year English course required of all students, ENG 101. Following the pilot, ARU began offering ENG 101R to all students who were near college-readiness benchmarks in English and reading; students with lower assessment scores continued to take pre-credit developmental courses. In 2018, when the state announced that within a year it would no longer allow public four-year colleges and universities to enroll underprepared students in pre-credit developmental courses, ARU replaced *all* pre-credit course offerings with the corequisite English course, ENG 101R.

ARU's developmental redesign was guided by the growing, though limited, evidence that accelerated, corequisite learning models, which provide important supports within required first-year college courses, are viable alternatives to pre-credit courses (Belfield et al., 2016; Cho et al., 2012; Community College Research Center 2014; Rutschow & Mayer, 2018). However, much of the research on corequisite models has been conducted with community college data; there

is little published data about the outcomes of corequisite courses in four-year institutions. This article addresses the need for more research on corequisite education by providing descriptive data on the structural, curricular, and pedagogical changes implemented at ARU and on student learning outcomes for the new course.

The need for descriptive data is all the more important given that the research driving the developmental education reform movement is limited and, some claim, oversimplified (Boylan et al., 2017; Jagers et al., 2015; Levine-Brown & Anthony, 2017; Saxon et al.). Rutschow and Schneider (2011) reviewed research on corequisite, or "mainstreamed" models of developmental education and noted that these non-experimental studies demonstrated higher pass and persistence rates. Jenkins et al. (2010), for example, examined the corequisite model in place at Community College of Baltimore County, and reported that students in the accelerated program passed the required first-year English sequence at higher levels than students in traditional developmental courses. However, they noted that long-term effects of accelerated developmental education have not been adequately studied; less time in developmental coursework may not adequately prepare students for long-term academic success. Boylan also stressed the need for developmental educators to "evaluate the effectiveness of statewide policies on developmental education" (Levine-Brown & Anthony, 2017, p. 21). This study responds to that call by sharing and analyzing data, including rates of attaining credit for ENG 101, fall-to-fall student retention, and assessment of student writing to measure achievement of course learning outcomes.

We present evidence that a corequisite approach to integrated reading, writing, and the required first-year writing course, ENG 101, can successfully replace pre-credit developmental English and reading at a four-

year institution. Since its inception at ARU, corequisite ENG 101R has helped underprepared students achieve the learning outcomes of ENG 101 and earn credit for that course sooner than the stand-alone developmental course model. It has also helped to retain students to the following year at an equivalent rate as students who completed the stand-alone sequence, allaying concerns that the accelerated rate might leave students behind. This article provides background information about the corequisite program at ARU, including an overview of the pre-credit developmental writing and reading sequence it came to replace, as well as the Course-Embedded Consultant program hosted by ARU's Center for Academic Creativity, which became essential to our approach to corequisite course design. We then present a theoretical framework to explain the pedagogical theories that shaped our course design, especially the Reading Apprenticeship model for teaching critical reading strategies. The background and framework are followed by an explanation of our research method, which follows the rigorous, annual assessment that we have engaged in since implementing the corequisite curriculum. Our results compare yearly course completion rates of corequisite to pre-credit developmental and standard-admittance ENG 101 from 2015 to 2018; comparison of retention rates for the same years; and assessment of completion of learning outcomes based upon a sampling of revised, ENG 101R final essays for 2016, 2017, and 2018. In discussing these results, we argue that the shift to corequisite reading and writing at ARU is successful overall, while finding room for further improvement in the area of retention. Throughout this description of our developmental program redesign, we emphasize the need for flexibility in implementing such a program, as changing institutional needs and state mandates may shift placement and enrollment criteria. We conclude with some advice for other scholars

and practitioners who might seek to design a similar corequisite program, or who aim to evaluate programs at their own or other institutions.

Background of Corequisite Course at Appalachian Regional University

Appalachian Regional University, with an enrollment of approximately 16,000 students, serves the under-resourced areas of Appalachian Kentucky in addition to more prosperous regions. As "A School of Opportunity," ARU has long offered developmental education courses and support programs to underprepared students. The nationwide developmental education reform movement buoyed ARU's efforts to improve retention and graduation rates among students with developmental requirements by making available competitive state grants and institutional funding for course redesign, professional development, and institutional supports.

In 2013, developmental English and reading faculty piloted the corequisite course ENG 101R, "Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric (Supported)." At that point, the developmental reading and writing program, housed in the Department of English, offered a pre-credit, two course sequence in reading, ENR 090 and ENR 095, and a pre-credit, two course sequence in writing, ENG 090 and ENG 095 (see Table 1 for an overview of courses and years offered). Depending upon students' placement scores in the areas of reading and English, students could take from three to twelve hours of pre-credit coursework in reading and/or English before they could enter the credit-bearing first year composition sequence, ENG 101 "Reading, Writing and Rhetoric" and ENG 102 "Research, Writing, and Rhetoric," required of all first-year students. ARU developmental reading and writing faculty were themselves troubled by the delay to credit-bearing coursework the sequence could impose on students; therefore, when the state called for

acceleration, many were eager to try something new.

Corequisite ENG 101R integrated content from the separate, 095-level developmental courses in reading and writing with ENG 101, replacing nine hours of coursework, six without college credit across three separate courses, with one, four credit-hour course. Class size was capped at eighteen. When piloted, ENG 101R was only made available to students with both developmental reading and writing requirements who were near the state benchmark for college-readiness. A grade of C or better was required to pass the course and satisfy the university's developmental reading and writing requirements, in keeping with the general first-year writing requirement that students complete ENG 101 with at least a C to be eligible for ENG 102. A part of ARU's General Education curriculum, all undergraduate students must complete both ENG 101 and ENG 102; ENG 101R satisfies the General Education requirement for ENG 101.

Developmental reading and first-year composition faculty favored integrating reading and writing instruction, recognizing the reciprocal nature of the two. In 2013, English faculty had redesigned the two-semester sequence of first-year writing, ENG 101 and ENG 102, to include a more explicit connection between reading and writing and began offering professional development in critical reading instruction to composition instructors (Bosley, 2016).

Initially, ACT score placement requirements for ENG 101R were 17 on English and/or 17-19 on Reading. A secondary institutional assessment provided another measure for placement. Separate developmental pre-credit courses in English and reading continued to be offered during the pilot phase of ENG 101R for those with

lower ACT scores. An integrated developmental reading and writing course, ENG 095R, was also piloted in 2015. In 2016, the university began full scale placements in ENG 101R and ENG 095R and stopped offering ENG 090 and ENR 090 except in a summer bridge program. By Fall 2018, responding proactively to a call by the Kentucky CPE to end all pre-credit developmental courses by Fall 2019, all ARU students with developmental needs in English and reading were placed into ENG 101R, which expanded the placement score range considerably from when the course was first conceived, to include ACT scores of 14-17 on English and 14-19 on Reading. This continuous change in developmental course offerings and the evolving role of ENG 101R to meet the needs of a more academically diverse pool of students posed curricular challenges, as the program sought to increase access while maintaining the quality of support and instruction. In 2018, faculty created ENG 102R, which extended instructional and CEC support for the FYW sequence, to meet the needs of these less-prepared students.

Academic support for ENG 101R was provided through ARU's Center for Academic Creativity (a combined reading, writing, and communication center) and its Course Embedded Consultant (CEC), or peer-tutor, program. In addition to attending class meetings four hours per week, ENG 101R students were required to meet with the CEC outside of class eight times per semester. The individualized student attention offered by the CEC, supported through ongoing communication with the course instructor, has been an essential component of the corequisite program.

Table 1*Developmental Course Offerings*

Course	Years Offered
Pre-Credit Courses	
ENG 090: Developmental Writing I	1982–2016
ENG 095: Developmental Writing II	1984–2016
ENR 090: Developmental Reading I	1982–2016
ENR 095: Developmental Reading II	1984–2016
ENG 095R: Developmental Reading and Writing II	2015–2018
Credit-Bearing Courses	
ENG 101R: Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric (Corequisite)	2013–present
ENG 102R: Research, Writing, and Rhetoric (Corequisite)	2018–present

The CEC model was based on research that supports peer assistance to improve student learning outcomes (Dvorak et al., 2012). Additionally, recent investigations of course-embedded writing assistance programs have demonstrated positive impacts on students' reading and writing processes (Carpenter et al. 2014). ARU CECs were managed through the Center for Academic Creativity, which provided ongoing training in teaching and modeling critical reading strategies and writing about reading. CECs attended all ENG101R class meetings and provided individualized course-specific reading and writing support in-class and out-of-class. The CEC component, essential to the course design, adds to the overall cost of the program to the university. It was originally funded through

the ARU Provost's office as a retention initiative; funding continued through grants from the Kentucky CPE, then shifted to the budget of ARU's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which focuses on critical reading. The QEP, part of the SACSCOC accreditation requirement, is a university-wide effort to

improve student success. By investing more in the success of these at-risk students, the university sought to bring their passing and retention rates closer to those of standard-admittance students.

Since few instructors had experience with both first-year writing and developmental reading, collaborative course design and professional development were a priority for developing the course. As several reports have concluded, ongoing professional development is an essential component of the success of

accelerated and corequisite developmental programs (Boylan, Calderwood, et al., 2017; Hassel et al., 2015; Jagers et al., 2015). Grants from the Kentucky CPE provided faculty stipends for initial course design and professional development. ARU's QEP provides funding for ongoing faculty development focused on research-supported curriculum and pedagogy. These additional funding sources for CEC and instructor development have been crucial for data-driven improvements to the course.

Theoretical Framework

The curricular and pedagogical framework for ENG 101R is based on the accelerated developmental programs implemented in a number of states over the past decade, which promote an integrated approach to reading and writing instruction that is grounded in rhetorical processes and metacognitive strategies (Bickerstaff & Raufman, 2017; Edgecombe et al., 2014; Goen-Salter, 2008; Hern, 2013; Katz et al., 2013). A substantial body of research supports the reciprocal link between reading and writing as generative processes (Hass & Flower, 1988; Shanahan, 2006; Tierney & Pearson, 1983). Teachers and scholars have advocated integrating developmental reading and writing courses for decades, although distinct disciplinary structures kept them separate. The developmental reform movement is now making integrated reading/writing courses the norm in many states (Holschuh & Paulson, 2013; Stahl & Armstrong, 2018).

The ENG 101R curriculum, aligned with that of ENG 101, integrates reading and writing instruction through a recursive practice of rhetorical analysis: as readers, students work to understand the rhetorical approaches writers use to achieve their purposes; as writers, students work to understand how to use rhetorical approaches

to construct their own arguments (Hern, 2013). Teaching students to read rhetorically, to read like a writer, can improve literacy learning (Sanchez & Helfeldt, 2014), while teaching students to use sources in their writing helps students construct more effective academic arguments (Haller, 2010).

Flower et al. (1990) noted that "reading-to-write" is the foundation of academic work (p. 4). However, as Jamieson and Howard (2013) reported, many students struggle to use academic texts to develop their own arguments. Their work with the Citation Project, a multi-institution study of college writing and plagiarism, showed that students "mine sources" at the sentence level, indicating little understanding of text. Direct instruction in and practice of "rhetorical reading" can help students comprehend central claims of texts through analysis of a writer's context and purpose; thus, students begin to see their own writing as responding to rhetorical situations with clear purpose, appropriate voice, and effective appeals to readers (Haas & Flower, 1988, p. 168).

In addition to a focus on rhetorical awareness, the ENG 101R curriculum also integrates reading and writing through research-based, explicit instruction in strategies that increase students' metacognitive awareness. These strategies are promoted through a dialogic approach that respects and builds on students' social and cultural perspectives and helps them develop as purposeful readers and writers (Bauer & Theado, 2014; El-Hindi, 1997; Flavell, 1979; Horning, 2013; Pacello, 2014; Pugh et al., 2000). Wilkinson and Son (2011) reviewed a number of studies that promote teaching reading strategies "in the context of discussion to stimulate dialogue about texts" (p. 360). They describe reading instruction based on Pressley and colleagues' (1992) transactional strategies instruction that emphasized "joint construction of understanding" through dialogue (p. 367). Another approach which has influenced our

work in helping ENG 101R students notice and articulate their thinking while reading and writing is the Reading Apprenticeship model of disciplinary learning, with its emphasis on developing academic literacy through metacognitive conversations (Schoenbach & Greenleaf, 2009).

In addition to concepts of rhetorical reading and writing and metacognitive conversations about texts, ENG 101R is focused on critical thinking activities grounded in relevant content; frequent, collaborative writing about reading; just-in-time remediation to address grammar and usage in writing; and deliberate consideration of students' affective needs. Major assignments include thematically connected readings related to uses of language: instructors use a common textbook, *Language Awareness* (Escholz et al., 2016). Students write numerous low-stakes papers, such as reflections on their learning, and summary, analysis, and synthesis essays on their reading. They also write a personal literacy narrative and three major essays related to course readings. The final paper, an argumentative synthesis essay, showcases writing that interacts with and builds on course readings.

Method

This study examined ENG 101R outcomes data from 2015 to 2018. ARU's Institutional Review Board approved the use of (a) data collected from the Office of Retention and Graduation on students who enrolled in ENG 095, ENR 095, ENG 095R, ENG 101R, and ENG 101 from Fall 2013 through Fall 2018; and (b) students' final ENG 101R papers collected from Fall 2016–Fall 2018.

In order to determine if ENG 101R had similar or better course credit completion and retention rates as stand-alone developmental reading and writing courses, the authors examined 2015–2018 passing and retention data through the next semester and the next

academic year from ENG 095, ENR 095, ENG 095R, and ENG 101R. We also looked at these data to determine if the corequisite model resulted in students earning ENG 101 credit sooner than in the stand-alone developmental courses. Additionally, instructors compared ENG 101R passing and retention data to the ENG 101 course.

Students' final papers, based on a common synthesis assignment, were also collected to examine evidence of critical reading, integrated reading and writing, and achievement of course objectives. Beginning in 2016, a formal rubric-based assessment of a random sample of final papers was begun: 28 synthesis essays were evaluated from fall 2016; 33 from fall 2017; and 40 from fall 2018. ENG 101R instructors assessed student essays using ARU's existing General Education Assessment Rubric. The rubric was revised in 2017 to reflect the university's QEP focus on critical reading. For this reason, assessment results for 2016 and 2017 have slightly different categories than those reported for 2018. At each paper assessment session, which was attended by most ENG 101R instructors, two instructors assessed each essay and their scores were averaged if they were within one point of each other; if any score for an essay deviated by more than one point, a third assessor read the essay, and the three readers' scores were averaged.

Results

Credit Completion Rates

The data demonstrate that students enrolled in corequisite ENG 101R earned FYW credit sooner and at a higher rate than students in the stand-alone and integrated developmental courses. We provide a year-by-year breakdown of these data below, summarized in Table 2.

Fall 2015

In Fall 2015, 33% of the cohort that took ENR 095 ($N = 51$) passed ENG 101 by the

following fall semester; 53% of the cohort that took ENG 095 ($N = 140$) passed ENG 101 by the following fall semester; 60% of the cohort that took ENG 095R ($N = 20$; a pilot year) passed ENG 101 by the following fall semester, while 82% of students enrolled in ENG 101R ($N = 33$) their first semester in college passed and earned credit for ENG

101. Although ENG 101R was still in its pilot phase and the number enrolled was small ($N = 33$), the higher success rate in earning ENG 101 credit was noteworthy and encouraged us to take the ENG 101R course full-scale the following year for students who met placement criteria.

Table 2

Comparison of Success Rates in Developmental, Corequisite, and ENG 101 Courses*

Term	ENR 095	Percentage Successful	ENG 095	Percentage Successful	ENG 095R	Percentage Successful	ENG 101R	Percentage Successful	ENG 101	Percentage Successful
Fall 2015	51	33%	140	53%	20	60%	33	82%	1,757	77%
Fall 2016					150	51%	146	71%	1,348	79%
Fall 2017					172	45%	178	79%	1,201	75%
Fall 2018							302	75%	1,033	77%

* Success indicates achievement of ENG 101 Credit

Fall 2016

In 2016, ARU replaced stand-alone pre-credit English (ENG 095) and reading (ENR 095) courses with the integrated developmental course, ENG 095R, and expanded the placement criteria to move more students into ENG 101R. The 2016 data also indicate greater success for students enrolled in the corequisite model: 51% of students enrolled in ENG 095R ($N = 150$) earned ENG 101 credit by the following fall semester, while 71% of students enrolled in ENG 101R ($N = 146$) their first semester in college passed and earned credit for ENG 101. Although we saw

a decrease in the percentage of ENG 101R students earning ENG 101 credit between 2015 and 2016, the 2016 cohort includes a much larger sample size. Further, when considering the total number of students taking developmental courses and earning ENG 101 credit, the percentage of success goes up: in 2015, a total of 244 students enrolled in either a pre-credit or a corequisite course, with 130, or 53%, earning 101 credit by the end of the academic year; in 2016, 296 students enrolled in either pre-credit ENG095R or corequisite 101R, with 180 or 61% earning 101 credit by the end of the

academic year, making 2016's overall 101 success rate 8% higher. The 2016 results are particularly noteworthy since this is the first year our program moved to full integration of reading and English, having eliminated all stand-alone sections.

Fall 2017

2017 saw a slight decrease in the ENG 095R cohort ($N = 172$) earning credit for ENG 101, with 45% of students earning ENG 101 credit by the following fall semester; but an increase in the ENG 101R cohort ($N = 178$) earning credit for ENG 101, with 79%, of students earning credit for ENG 101 their first semester in college. By comparison, in this same year, 75% of students in the standard-admittance ENG 101 cohort ($N = 1201$) succeed in 101.

Fall 2018

2018, the year that ENG 101R became the only supported course for students with developmental reading and/or writing requirements, 75% of the ENG 101R cohort ($N = 302$) earned credit for ENG 101. This is comparable to the percentage of standard-admittance students who enrolled in ENG 101 ($N = 1033$) their first semester in college: 77% of that cohort earned credit for ENG 101 in that semester. The 75% success rate of

students in ENG 101R is particularly important when compared to the combined developmental and corequisite pass rates for previous years: 47% in both 2013 and 2014; 53% in 2015, 61% in 2016, 62% in 2017, and 75% in 2018. As more students took corequisite ENG 101R rather than pre-credit courses, a higher percentage successfully earned first-year writing credits.

The difference becomes even more pronounced when the success rates for only students enrolled in pre-credit developmental courses are compared to students enrolled in ENG 101R: as Table 3 indicates, in 2013, the combined success rate for ENG 095 and ENR 095 earning ENG 101 credit by the end of the academic year was 43% and in 2014 it was 42%: in 2018, students with similar ACT scores were instead enrolled in ENG 101R, with a success rate of 75%—a positive difference of 32%. These data demonstrate that in 2018, the ENG 101R students were achieving credit and progressing toward a degree at nearly the same rate as standard-admittance students. They also answer our question regarding pass rates in the positive: students taking corequisite ENG 101R are earning ENG 101 credit at not just equal, but a higher rate than students had previously when taking stand-alone and/or pre-credit developmental courses.

Table 3

Number Enrolled in ENR/ENG Course and Percent Who Passed ENG 101/101R

Term	ENR 095	% Passed ENG 101/R	ENG 095	% Passed ENG 101/R	ENG 101R	% Passed ENG 101/R	ENG 101	% Passed ENG 101/R
Fall 2013	54	41%	229	44%	34	77%	1,638	82%
Fall 2014	75	32%	198	51%	45	58%	1,657	76%

Retention Rates

While enrollment in ENG 101R is clearly accelerating underprepared students' achievement of ENG 101 credit, and improving fall-to-fall retention rates slightly, retention rates for students who enter the university with developmental requirements continue to be lower than those of standard-admittance students. These data are summarized in Table 4.

Fall 2015

In Fall 2015, students enrolled in ENG 095 were retained to the following fall semester at 49%; students enrolled in ENR 095 were retained to the following fall semester at 45%; students enrolled in ENG 095R were retained to the following fall semester at 45%; students enrolled in ENG 101R were retained to the following fall semester at 58%. Total developmental and corequisite fall-to-fall retention was 49%. In comparison, the fall 2015 to fall 2016 retention of standard-admittance students who took ENG 101 was 63%.

Fall 2016

In Fall 2016, when ENG 095R and ENG 101R became the only supported course offerings for students with developmental requirements, students enrolled in ENG 095R were retained to the following fall semester at 49%; students enrolled in ENG 101R were similarly retained to the following fall semester at 49%, a decrease from the previous year that might reflect the expanded placement criteria for the course. Total developmental and corequisite fall-to-fall retention was 49%, steady with the previous year. This compares negatively with fall 2016 to fall 2017 retention of standard-admittance students who took ENG 101: they were retained at 61%.

Fall 2017

In Fall 2017, students enrolled in ENG 095R were retained to the following fall semester at 46%; students enrolled in ENG 101R were retained to the following fall semester at 46%, for a combined developmental and corequisite retention of just 46%, a decrease from the previous years and still well below the retention of standard-admittance students who took ENG 101: they were retained at 60%.

Table 4

Fall-to-Fall Retention

Course	ENG 095	ENR 95	ENG 095R	ENG 101R	ENG 101
2013-14	49%	43%		56%	62%
2014-15	43%	55%		33%	61%
2015-16	49%	45%	45%	45%	63%
2016-17			49%	49%	61%
2017-18			46%	46%	60%
2018-19				46%	61%

Fall 2018

In Fall 2018, when ENG 101R became the only supported course for students with developmental requirements in reading and/or writing, students enrolled in ENG 101R were retained to the following fall semester at 46%, the same as for the previous year, and still well below the retention of standard-admittance students who took ENG

101: they were retained at 61%.

Although ENG 101R retention rates lag behind the ENG 101 population in retention, they are comparable to the fall-to-fall retention rates of the pre-credit developmental courses, a rate that has fluctuated slightly each year since 2013: 48% in 2013 and 47% in 2014 for standalone ENG 095 and ENR 095; 47% in 2015 for ENG 095, ENR 095, and ENG 095R; 49% in 2016 for ENG 095R; and 46% in 2017 for ENG 095R.

ENG 101R retention rates reflect the persistence issues of many students with developmental requirements, as well, possibly, of other affective and cognitive challenges that have been widely researched and reported on in the literature (Boylan, Calderwood, et al., 2017). Instructors reported that ENG 101R students faced many challenges, including balancing academics with jobs and other obligations, family, personal and financial issues, and lack of engagement and

motivation. In fall 2014, for example, institutional data revealed that 18% of those enrolled in ENG 101R failed because of attendance problems, compared with 4% for the standard-admittance ENG 101 population.

Achievement of ENG 101R Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment data indicates that students completing ENG 101R are achieving the Student Learning Outcomes of ENG 101, affirming that the rigor of the corequisite course meets that of the standard-admittance ENG 101.

ENG 101R instructors assessed final synthesis essays from fall semesters 2016–2018 using the university’s General Education Rubric. The sample size increased yearly as course enrollments increased. Each spring, papers randomly selected from across the course sections were scored on a scale of 1 to 4, where 1 indicates “Beginning” and 4 “Accomplished.” The goal was to find students in the 2 “Developing” and 3 “Competent” range, recognizing that students would have at least one more required semester of FYW, ENG 102, to meet the program’s learning outcomes. Since our assessment looked at final papers, the assessment results are most representative of the work composed by students who would pass the course with a C or higher.

Table 5

ENG 101R Assessment Average Results Using the 2015 General Education Rubric

#Essays Scored	Purpose/ Unity	Coherence	Critical Reading/ Synthesis	Rhetorical Awareness	Style	Surface Features
Fall 2016 N = 28	2.65	2.57	2.25	2.56	2.49	2.61
Fall 2017 N = 33	2.59	2.31	2.30	2.40	2.28	2.54

Table 6*ENG 101R Assessment Average Results Using the Revised General Education Rubric*

#Essays Scored	Coherence	Comprehension	Information Literacy: Analysis	Information Literacy: Synthesis	Evaluation	Rhetorical Awareness/ Style	Surface Features
Fall 2018 N = 40	2.49	2.64	2.41	2.45	2.07	2.54	2.64

Average rubric scores in the areas of Critical Reading/Synthesis was the only area to increase between fall 2016 and fall 2017. This uptick may reflect intentional changes made by ENG 101R instructors and CECs in response to the fall 2016 assessment results and the university's critical reading-focused QEP; metacognition and critical reading were also high on the agenda of CEC training in 2017. Due to the use of the revised rubric in fall 2018, this exact category was not evaluated that year; instead, the assessment area was covered by two separate categories: Comprehension, and Information Literacy: Synthesis. Interestingly, scores in both categories increased when assessed separately. It is tempting to interpret these increases as a result of the ongoing QEP—that as instructors in ENG 101R and the CECs continued to be trained and sensitized to promote critical reading skills, the curriculum has become more successful at teaching critical reading. However, it is also possible that at least some of the score increase may be a result of changes in the assessment rubric, which may have caused readers to evaluate these areas from a different perspective. Future assessments using the revised rubric may help to clarify the cause.

Overall, the fall 2018 final paper assessment shows the majority of categories near or above 2.5. The two categories that are notably lower (Information Literacy: Analysis at 2.41, and Evaluation, the lowest, at 2.07),

while developed in ENG 101 and ENG 101R, are skills more heavily emphasized in the ENG 102 curriculum, which focuses more on source evaluation and argumentation. For these reasons, assessment of student papers does suggest that student learning outcomes for ENG 101 are being successfully met in corequisite ENG 101R.

Discussion

The data over a four-year period indicate that ENG 101R is accelerating students' achievement of ENG 101 credit and ensuring that students meet the learning outcomes of ENG 101. Despite these encouraging indicators, student retention and persistence remain concerns, especially given recent lower placement score criteria for ENG 101R. The 2018–2019 academic year marked the first year that ARU went 100% credit-bearing corequisite and further extended the placement score range for the course to include students with ACT Reading and English scores as low as 14, whereas previously the range was 17 on English and 17–19 on Reading. This change was made to continue to give opportunity to students who used to enroll in pre-credit courses. Rather than turn these students away, and in keeping with our institution's mission as a “school of opportunity,” we chose to expand the eligibility for ENG 101R.

Instructors were concerned that while

these students might succeed in ENG 101R itself, a single semester with additional support may not be enough preparation to put the students in this expanded readiness score range on par with their standard-admittance peers in ENG 102. In the standard-admittance FYW sequence, ENG 102 already presents a significant challenge regarding reading and writing, as students in ENG 101 move from writing in response to shorter, instructor-selected essays and other non-fiction texts to longer, technical or academic texts selected by students as part of their library research process.

Given ongoing concerns about retention and the expanded placement range of students into ENG 101R, in 2018-2019 we implemented a second, partner corequisite in the FYW sequence, ENG 102R, for those students earning less than an A in ENG 101R. ENG 102R extends instructional and CEC support, with an emphasis on developing critical reading of academic, research-driven texts, for one more semester. Students see the value of the 4 credit-hour plus CEC model: 25 of those who earned an A in ENG 101R in fall 2018 opted to take ENG 102R in spring 2019, even though they qualified to take ENG 102. Going forward, it is important that we also monitor ENG 102R passing and retention data as a way to continue to assess the effectiveness of ENG 101R and of the corequisite model for this broader mandated placement score range.

Adding ENG 102R to the FYW sequence is just the latest example of the need for flexibility as state mandates and institutional needs change the parameters of the developmental program. We have continuously assessed and revised to extend what we know works—integrated reading and writing, faculty training in critical reading strategies, and courses supported by trained peer Course-Embedded Consultants—to an increasingly larger pool of students with an increasingly broader range of readiness needs.

In addition to flexibility, university-wide

collaboration has also been key to the evolution of the corequisite program. As Boylan, Calderwood, et al. (2017) noted, developmental redesign efforts must also be connected to the broader institution to sustain redesign efforts. ARU's Student Success Collaborative, an initiative of the ARU Division of Student Success, facilitates communication among all partners who support underprepared students. For example, students with two or more developmental needs work with their university advisor to create a learning contract. Also, in fall 2019, some ENG 101R sections are being paired with the three-hour university orientation course: these learning communities will offer an extra layer of support through a familiar cohort and increased communication and collaboration among instructors. Additionally, institutionalizing ongoing support for students' literacy development through ARU's QEP, with its focus on explicit instruction in critical reading across the disciplines, assists in supporting students who enter with developmental requirements. As these additional efforts suggest, there are many variables that contribute to student achievement of academic credit; research on the impact of each of these supports is needed to better understand the effectiveness of our corequisite model.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that a corequisite approach to college-level reading and writing can accelerate student credit achievement in a public university. Course assessment data indicate that students enrolled in ENG 101R are meeting the learning outcomes of ENG 101. These results support replacing stand alone, pre-credit developmental reading and writing courses with an integrated reading, writing, and FYW course. While fall-to-fall retention of students enrolled in the corequisite ENG 101R continues to need improvement, retention rates are equivalent

with those of the previous model. Importantly, students in the corequisite course earn credit for the first-year writing course in their first semester of college, sooner and at a higher rate than those in the previous model; even if they drop out of the university, students who pass the corequisite course leave with credit that will enable their later persistence toward a college degree.

Drawing from the experience of our redesign, we offer the following as keys to our program's success:

A firm theoretical foundation: integrating writing and critical reading instruction, supported by the Reading Apprenticeship model, provides a basis for training faculty and Course-Embedded Consultants; data-driven scholarship supporting Reading Apprenticeship helped to build administrative and instructor support for the corequisite curriculum.

Ongoing faculty collaboration and professional development: State and institutional support for ongoing professional development for instructors has been essential to the success of the move to a fully corequisite program, as has instructors' commitment to data-driven and ongoing program improvement. These efforts have resulted in a maturing curriculum marked by greater alignment between final assignments as a result of collaborative assessment; assessment reading gives all instructors a greater sense of student needs and how other instructors have approached them. The core group of ENG 101R instructors has developed greater facility with teaching critical reading and integrating it with writing instruction, which they also pass along to newer instructors.

Peer tutors: ARU's Course-Embedded Consultants provide corequisite students with just-in-time support for their class work and offer a model of successful student behavior to emulate. CECs partner with instructors to provide more feedback and support to at-risk students, and their involvement is critical for

making the 4 hours of ENG 101R a learning-equivalent to the previous pre-credit developmental sequence of courses. CEC training and pedagogy have evolved through continuous reflection, assessment, and development of the program; student consultations with the CECs have become more intentional, focused, and spread across the semester by attaching them to each assignment sequence.

Partnerships with other units: Recruiting, advising, and academic support services such as writing centers all need to be involved in supporting students in the corequisite courses. Accurate projections of student enrollments are needed to hire CECs or other tutors; students need to be given accurate information about the corequisite course while registering for classes; and CECs need training specific to working with the content and with the student population.

Financial support: With smaller class sizes and the addition of CEC support, the corequisite model we present here is costly—yet, we have successfully maintained and expanded the program in the face of institutional budget cuts every year since 2013. Early support from the provost and grants from the state CPE aided in professional development and with hiring additional CECs; the writing and communication center's willingness to commit part of its budget to this program is essential for staffing the CEC positions. Administrators' agreement to maintain lower course enrollments (18 in ENG 101R compared to 25 in ENG 101) ensures that corequisite students receive more individual support from their instructors and CECs. The data shared in this article have been crucial to building and maintaining that financial support. As enrollments in ENG 101R and now ENG 102R have increased, funding sources for the CECs have also had to increase, with the university needing to commit more support to match the increased enrollments.

As each of these essential components illustrates, flexibility, collaboration, and adequate resource funding have been integral to our corequisite success. The redesign of the developmental education program at ARU has evolved through shifting state mandates and national trends, changing placement criteria, and budget and staffing challenges. It is clear that the corequisite program demonstrates

student learning and accelerates student achievement of credit in their first year of college. Still, further study is needed to understand the long-term impact of the corequisite model on student persistence and graduation rates and to develop program supports to ensure that more students achieve academic success.

References

- Adams, P., Adams, W., Bailey, T., Denley, T., DeWit, T., McFarland, S., & Mireles, S. (2012). Remediation: Higher education's bridge to nowhere. *Complete College America*. <http://www.completecollege.org/docs/CCARemediation-summary.pdf>
- Bailey, T., Jaggars, S., & Scott-Clayton, J. (2013). Characterizing the effectiveness of developmental education: A response to recent criticism. *Community College Resource Center: Teachers College Columbia University*, 1–16.
- Bauer, L., & Theado, C. K. (2014). Examining the “social turn” in postsecondary literacy research and instruction: A retrospective view of JCRL scholarship, 2005-2013. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 45(1), 67–84.
- Belfield, C., Jenkins, D., & Lahr, H. (2016). Is corequisite remediation cost-effective? Early findings from Tennessee (CCRC Brief # 62). Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Bickerstaff, S. & Raufman, J. (2017). From “additive” to “integrative”: Experiences of faculty teaching developmental integrated reading and writing courses (CCRC Working Paper No. 86). Community College Research Center, Teacher's College, Columbia University.
- Bosley, L. (2016). Integrating Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric in First-Year Writing. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 42, 77–97.
- Boylan, H., Brown, P., & Anthony, S. W. (2017). The “perfect storm” of policy issues and its impact on developmental education. *NADE Digest*, 9(1), 2–7.
- Boylan, H., Calderwood, B., & Bonham, B. (2017). College completion: Focus on the finish line. National Center for Developmental Education. www.ncde.appstate.edu/
- Carpenter, R., Whiddon, S., & Dvorak, K. (2014). Guest editor introduction: Revisiting and revising course-embedded tutoring facilitated by writing centers. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 12(1). <http://www.praxisuwc.com/from-the-guest-editors>

- Cho, S.-W., Kopko, E., Jenkins, D., Jaggars, S. (2012). New evidence of success for community college remedial English students: Tracking the outcomes of students in the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) (CCRC Working Paper No. 53). Community College Research Center, Teacher's College, Columbia University.
- Community College Research Center (2014). What we know about accelerated developmental education acceleration. Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Daugherty, L., Gomez, C., Carew, D., Mendoza-Graf, A., & Miller, T. (2018). Designing and implementing corequisite models of developmental education: Findings from Texas community colleges. RAND Corporation.
- Dvorak, K., Shanti, B, and Lutkewitte, C. (2012). Getting the Writing Center into FYC classrooms.” *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 16(4).
- Edgecomb, N., Jaggars, S., Xu, D., & Barragan, M. (2014). Accelerating the integrated instruction of developmental reading and writing at Chabot College (Working Paper No. 71). Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- El-Hindi, A. E. (1997). Connecting reading and writing: College learner's metacognitive awareness. *Journal of Developmental Education*. 21 (2), 10-19.
- Escholz, P., Rosa, A., & Clark, V. (2016). *Language Awareness*. Bedford/St. Martin's. Boston.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34, 906–911.
- Flower, L., Stein, V., Ackerman, J., Kantz, M. J., McCormick, K., & Peck, W. C. (1990). *Reading to write: Exploring a cognitive & social process*. Oxford University Press.
- Goen-Salter, S. (2008). Critiquing the need to eliminate remediation: Lessons from San Francisco State. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 27(2), 81–105.
- Haas, C., & Flower, L. (1988). Rhetorical reading strategies and the construction of meaning. *College Composition and Communication*, 39(2), 167–183.
- Haller, C. R. (2010). Toward rhetorical source use: Three student journeys. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 34(1), 33–59.
- Hassel, H., Klausman, J., Giordano, J., O'Rourke, M., Roberts, L., Sullivan, P., & Toth, C. (2015). TYCA white paper on developmental education reforms. *Teaching English in the Two Year College* 42 (3), 227–243.
- Hern, K. (2013). Window into an accelerated classroom: Readings and major assignments from English 102. California Acceleration Project. <http://alp-deved.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Hern-Preconference-workshop-ALP-2014.pdf>

- Holschuh, J. P. & Paulson, E. J. (2013). The terrain of college developmental reading. (College Reading and Learning Association Paper).
<https://www.crla.net/images/whitepaper/TheTerrainofCollege91913.pdf>
- Horning, A. & Kraemer, E. W. (Eds.). (2013). *Reconnecting reading and writing*. The WAC Clearinghouse. <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/referenceguides/reconnecting/>
- Jaggars, S., Smith, S., Hodara, M., Cho, S., & Xu, D. (2015). Three developmental education programs: Features, student outcomes, and implications. *Community College Review*, 43(1), 3–26.
- Jamieson, S., & Howard, R. M. (2013). Sentence-mining: Uncovering the amount of reading and reading comprehension in college writers' researched writing. In R. McClure & J. Purdy, *The new digital scholar: Exploring and enriching the research and writing practices of Nextgen students* (pp.111–133). American Society for Information Science and Technology.
- Jenkins, D., Speroni, C., Belfield, C., Jaggars, S., & Edgecomb, N. (2010). A model for accelerating academic success of community college remedial English students: Is the accelerated learning program (ALP) effective and affordable? (CCRC Working Paper No. 21). Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Katz, M., Brynolson, N. & Edlund, J. R. (2013). Enacting rhetorical literacies: The expository reading and writing curriculum in theory and practice. In D. Alvermann, N. Unrau, & R. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading*, (pp. 978–1014). International Reading Association.
- Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (2016). *Stronger by Degrees: 2016–2021 Strategic Agenda*.
<http://cpe.ky.gov/ourwork/strongerbydegrees.html>
- Levin, H., & Calcagno, J. (2008). Remediation in the Community College: An educator's perspective. *Community College Review*, 35(3), 181–207.
- Levine-Brown, P. & Anthony, S. W. (2017). The current state of developmental education: An interview with Hunter R. Boylan. *Journal of Developmental Education* 41(1), 18–22.
- Mangan, K. (2019). The end of the remedial course. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
<https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/Trend19-Remediation-Main>
- Pacello, J. (2014). Integrating metacognition into a developmental reading and writing course to promote skill transfer: An examination of student perceptions and experiences. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 44 (2), 119–140.
- Pressley, M., El-Dinary, P., Gaskins, I., Schuder, T., Bergman, J., Almasi, J., & Brown, R., (1992). Beyond direct explanation: Transactional instruction of reading comprehension strategies. *Elementary School Journal*, 92, 511–554.

- Pugh, S. L., Pawan, F. & Antommarchi, C. (2000). Academic literacy and the new college learner. In R. F. Flippo & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (pp. 25–42). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rutschow, E. Z. & Schneider, E. (2011). Unlocking the gate: What we know about improving developmental education. MDRC. <http://www.mdrc.org/publication/unlocking-gate>
- Rutschow, E. Z. & Mayer, A. K. (2018). Early findings from a national survey of developmental education practices. Center for the Analysis of Postsecondary Readiness. <https://www.mdrc.org/publication/early-findings-national-survey-developmental-education-practices>
- Sanchez, B., & Helfeldt, J. (2014). Effects of rhetorical reading on the reading and writing performances of ELL and native English speaking college students. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 40, 3–18.
- Saxon, D. P., Martirosyan, N. M., & Vick, N. T. (2016). Best practices and challenges in integrated reading and writing: A survey of field professionals, part II. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 39 (3), 34–35.
- Schoenbach, R. & Greenleaf, C. (2009). Fostering adolescents' engaged academic literacy. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer, & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent literacy research* (pp. 98–112). Guilford.
- Shanahan, T. (2006). Relations among oral language, reading, and writing development. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 171–183). New York Guilford.
- Stahl, N. & Armstrong, S. L. (2018) Re-claiming, re-inventing, and re-reforming a field: The future of college reading, *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 48 (1), 47–66.
- Tierney, R., & Pearson, P. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts*, 60, 568–580.

Literacy Strategy Use and Identity Enactment

Emily Suh

Texas State University

ABSTRACT

The domain of literacy is vast and encompasses a multitude of strategies learners can apply to improving literacy or studying in college. This thematic analysis examines how Generation 1 learners (adult-arrival immigrants who transition from adult ESL into college) demonstrate their emergent competence within the domain of studying and how their use of literacy strategies aligns with their college student identities. Because much of their strategy use occurred outside the classroom, instructors often failed to recognize learners' emerging proficiency. The article concludes with implications for further developing all learners' literacy strategy use.

Multilingual students made up nearly two-thirds of community college students in the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (Kanno & Cromley, 2013). Researchers found that at one public four-year institution, students who earned their high school diplomas outside of the U.S. had lower academic reading proficiency than their U.S.-graduated peers, suggesting the importance of supporting the academic literacy skills development of these learners (Gorzycki et al., 2016). Indeed, “pedagogical concerns within English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction” was selected as one of the top five themes in a retrospective analysis of the JCLL and Forum for Reading (Bauer & Johnson, 2011, p. 42). Nearly a decade later, surveyed literacy leaders continue to identify the designation of English learners/ESL as a “very hot” topic, illustrating college literacy researchers’ and professionals’ ongoing interest in supporting multilingual learners

(Cassidy et al., 2020). Much of the literature focuses on Generation 1.5 students born abroad who received most of their formal education in the U.S. K-12 system (de Kleine & Lawton, 2015; Kanno & Harklau, 2012; Suarez-Orozco et al., 2008). Unlike their U.S.-educated peers, Generation 1 learners are adult-arrival immigrants whose previous formal education occurred abroad and whose prior experiences with the U.S. education system occurred in adult ESL contexts outside of the K-12 system (Suh, 2018). As adults with social roles and responsibilities outside of college, Generation 1 learners share several characteristics of non-traditional students (Kenner & Weinerman, 2011). As adult learners (Knowles, 1970), they are presumed to draw from their rich previous experiences in their learning (Suh, 2018).

Generation 1 learners are often perceived by college faculty as being under-prepared linguistically and culturally for

participating in the college's academic community of practice—despite the learners' placement scores suggesting their preparation for postsecondary developmental or credit-level courses and their strengths as multilingual and experienced learners (Diaz et al., 2016; Harklau, 2000). Because of the essential role of literacy for college success (Holschuh & Paulson, 2013), the purpose of this study was to explore Generation 1 learners' participation in college through their knowledge and use of reading strategies. Three questions guided the research:

- How do Generation 1 learners use literacy strategies in college?
- How is their strategy use related to their desired identities?
- How do college personnel perceive and respond to learners' strategy use?

Literature Review

Second language acquisition research enumerates the close association between target language reading and language proficiency (Alderson, 1984). Learners' abilities to engage in the target language are essential to their identity enactment as members of the target language community (Norton, 2013). In this review, linkages between metacognitive literacy instruction, a lifetime perspective on literacy development, and the identity enactment of adult language learners are explored.

Literacy Strategy Instruction and Use in ESL and College Literacy Contexts

Postsecondary literacy strategy instruction is often discussed separately by discipline (e.g., reading is separated from writing) in the literature despite the growing trend to integrate reading and writing (Holschuh & Paulson, 2013) and the ESL whole language movement (Freeman & Freeman, 1998). Metacognitive reading strategies refer to the intentional application and monitoring of knowledge, mental processes, and behaviors controlling readers'

efforts to understand and making meaning of text (Afflerbach et al., 2008; Tarricone, 2011), and researchers promote strategy instruction, noting the correlation between strategy use and proficiency in print and online environments (Poole, 2008; Sibold, 2010). Metacognitive reading instruction has positively impacted comprehension in a variety of postsecondary English language acquisition environments (Dreyer & Nel, 2003; Habibian, 2015; Meniado, 2016). Similarly, research in college contexts outside of language acquisition (i.e., English as a Second/Additional or Foreign Language) classrooms demonstrates significant correlations between students' perceived use of metacognitive strategies and their comprehension of print and online texts (Boudreaux, 2016). Researchers frequently point to the importance of explicit instruction to increase students' awareness of how learners can apply metacognitive strategies and the benefits of these strategies (Allen & Hancock, 2008; Habibian, 2015; Isakson & Isakson, 2017; Meniado, 2016). However, even when students possess knowledge of and prior experience with strategy use, they do not always apply those reading comprehension strategies. For example, Sampson et al. (2013) found that preservice teachers did not transfer their knowledge of or exposure to comprehension strategies to their teaching when faced with strong external forces that discouraged their application.

Metacognitive strategies can be divided into several types. Global Reading Strategies are "generalized, intentional reading strategies aimed at setting the stage for the reading act" (Mokharti & Reichard, 2002, p. 252). The second type of strategy, problem-solving strategies, involves repairing comprehension break down. Problem-solving more frequently occurs at the individual word level; however, these strategies can also support comprehension more globally, such as through checking to understand conflicting information or rereading for overall understanding. Common strategies include

rereading, pausing to reflect on reading, reading aloud, guessing the meaning of unfamiliar words, and adjusting reading rate (Almasi & Fullerton, 2012; Mokharti & Reichard, 2002). Problem-solving strategies are the most frequently applied reading strategy for English language learners (Alsuhaibani, 2019; Aziz et al., 2019), and researchers have found positive correlations between problem-solving strategy use and comprehension (Ilustre, 2011; Ismail & Tawalbeh, 2015). Finally, support strategies aid reading comprehension through summarizing or discussing a reading, using reference aids, note-taking, underlining in a text, or using a dictionary (Almasi & Fullerton, 2012).

The literature on writing strategy instruction suggests a similar emphasis on metacognition and self-regulation of strategy use as well as the benefits of explicit instruction (Cumming et al., 2016; MacArthur et al., 2015). Specific strategies commonly relate to planning, drafting, and revising writing (Philippakos & MacArthur, 2019). Instruction has been found to improve strategy use (Cumming et al., 2016), mastery motivation (MacArthur et al., 2015), and self-efficacy for English language learners (Yang & Wang, 2015).

Literacy Competencies and Identity Enactment

Identity enactment is a complex topic with unique theorizations and multiple methodologies for its study in a range of disciplines. Below, I explore identity through a narrow lens of personal experience and desired identities within academic contexts. I further limit my exploration of identity to the relationship between learners' demonstrated literacy competencies and their experiences and goals.

A Developmental Perspective on Literacy

Alexander's (2005) Lifespan Developmental Perspective on Reading incorporates several metacognitive aspects of

literacy development and has been linked to learners' motivation and self-identity development (Alexander, 2005). The perspective is based on the Model of Domain Learning (Alexander, 2003), which examines learning within various domains. Domain knowledge refers to the breadth of the learner's knowledge about reading and writing, whereas topic knowledge refers to the depth of knowledge about specific domain topics and text-based references. For example, content knowledge might include how to write a critical reaction paper and the learners' knowledge about the topic (i.e., gun control) presented in the reading being critically analyzed. Particularly during the early stage of acclimation, learners' ability to understand a text is dependent upon their pre-existing knowledge about the domain as well as concepts discussed in the text. Both domain and topic knowledge increase as learners move from acclimation towards competence and finally, proficiency/expertise.

As learners develop mastery, their interests become "a driving force," connecting their underlying needs and goals to their literacy development (Alexander, 2005, p. 413). When learners are invested in a topic or domain, they identify with the domain, and they see accumulating that knowledge as essential to their ability to enact their desired identities. As learners move towards competence, their self-interest increasingly sustains their literacy development.

Finally, competence and expertise involve the effective resolution of comprehension problems within the domain. Learners apply various strategies (i.e., predicting, outlining) or cognitive procedures to monitor and adjust their learning (Aziz et al., 2019; Ustünbas, 2019). In focusing on reading development, Alexander distinguishes between surface-level strategies, which facilitate initial access to the meaning of a text, and deep-processing strategies, which facilitate a personal connection to the text or text transformation (Alexander et al., 2004).

Deep-processing includes, for example, intertextual practices that transform a text's meaning through intertextuality or questioning a text's accuracy or importance (Alexander, 2005). Competent and expert performance requires that learners know how to apply both surface-level and deep-processing strategies and that they can effectively problem-solve, considering knowledge gained from previous experience and their personal goals in their strategy application. Thus, metacognition and self-regulation are essential to literacy competence and expertise.

Connecting Language Learning and Identity Investment

Although developmental perspectives on literacy acknowledge how aspects of identity, including previous experiences and personal goals, shape learners' literacy development, applied linguistics scholars explicate a much stronger connection between language learning and identity. Bonny Norton Peirce's (1995) investment theory popularized this connection and described how adult language learners combine and deploy their previous experiences and their emergent English language skills as symbolic resources to enact their desired identities. Norton (2013) illustrated how adult English language learners claim a variety of identities, including professionals, parents, and community members; she further illuminated how certain identity positions constrain learners' ability to engage in the target language. For example, Katarina was a Polish teacher who immigrated to Canada, who felt the ESL class's literacy practices were too juvenile. Drawing from her experiences earning an advanced degree and teaching in her own classroom, Katarina resisted class activities which made her feel "like a student in the first grade" and sought alternative ways to learn English which better aligned with her identity as a highly trained educator (Norton, 2013, p. 177).

As Katarina's case illustrated, learners' identity enactment is not context-free.

Katarina's identity enactment as a knowledgeable teacher with a deep understanding of how to motivate and instruct adults was challenged in her ESL class where her instructor ignored Katarina's teaching experience and positioned her positioned as a novice student. Ultimately, Norton (2013) describes how Katarina dropped the class in order to seek alternative spaces to enact her identity as an educated learner. McKay and Wong (1996) explicate how learners negotiate "sites of contestation" which emerge between their desired identities and the identities imposed upon them by others (p. 603). In their efforts to (re)position themselves, learners draw from their previous experiences, including their resulting knowledge of literacy and learning strategies, as symbolic capital to invest in their desired identities (Norton, 2013). In postsecondary education contexts, Generation 1 learners' investment can occur through various literacy practices that demonstrate the learners' lifespan development in reading (Alexander, 2005) and their identities as college students rather than as "ESL students."

Instructor Perceptions of Students' Literacy Competencies

ESL and disciplinary instructors share similar expectations regarding the necessary English language and literacy competencies for college success (Hartshorn et al., 2019; Hartshorn, et al., 2017; Liu & Read, 2020). However, many instructors perceive multilingual students' academic success as involving multiple factors, including—but not limited to—linguistic or literacy competence (Jin & Schneider, 2019; Zamel, 1995). For example, Song (2006) found that college ESL faculty identified non-literacy related challenges (e.g., family responsibilities, employment) with slightly greater frequency than "literacy deficiency" (p. 423) as contributing to course failure. Instructors described limited first-language literacy development as a major obstacle to the learners' English literacy acquisition.

Instructors less frequently attributed their students' failure to an inability to adapt to U.S. styles of literacy instruction or difficulty with assignment topics (Song, 2006). Instructors' experiences teaching in a largely multicultural and multilingual college may contribute to their perceptions of their students' literacy competencies. Although scholars have explored instructor perceptions of language's role in students' literacy competence, the research does not yet explore the connection between learners' strategy use and their desired identity enactment. Research is also needed to examine how instructors' recognition of learners' literacy strategies can impact their perceptions of learners as college students.

Methodology

The present qualitative thematic analysis draws upon sociocultural theories of second language acquisition and a theory of mastery learning to explore how learners make sense of and apply various literacy strategies and how their strategy use is perceived by college faculty. Described as "a method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79), the present thematic analysis provided a nuanced and detailed account of commonalities across learners' literacy strategy use, including how it was perceived by the learners and college faculty.

Guiding Frameworks

I combine Alexander's (2005) lifespan developmental perspective on reading with Norton's (2013) investment theory to target my analysis of the connection between learners' desired identity as college students and their literacy knowledge and strategy use. Readers' understanding of language and the content domains are essential to developing their reading competence. Reading development is a multi-staged lifelong journey involving systematic changes in strategic

processing and motivated by a personal interest in reading across three stages of reading development: acclimation, competence, and proficiency/expertise.

Alexander's (2005) lifespan perspective is particularly beneficial for examining the literacy learning experiences of Generation 1 learners, whose English literacy learning did not occur in U.S. primary education contexts. In Alexander's emphasis on learners' connections and investment in the literacy domain and Norton's (2013) theorization of learners' commitment to literacy development as a form of identity work, both scholars conceptualize the literacy development of Generation 1 learners as a form of their literacy identity enactment. By exploring learners' literacy experiences, researchers can highlight how learners view the development and evolution of their literacy needs and goals.

Participants

Participants for this study were six Generation 1 learners transitioning from adult ESL into developmental English classes and seven faculty and staff at City Community College (all names are pseudonyms), a mid-sized Midwestern community college. (See Table 1.)

Data Collection and Analysis

The present study was part of a larger examination of Generation 1 learners' transition into credit-level courses (Suh, 2016). Data collection occurred during the learners' first term in college and included observations of learners studying, attending classes, and utilizing on-campus resources relevant to their literacy development (i.e., tutoring, advising). Data analysis began during data collection and incorporated observation notes, transcribed interviews, and collection of relevant artifacts (i.e., student notes, class assignments; see Table 2). The learners provided participant summaries of what they did during the observations. Then, the learners were asked to list and elaborate on all of the ways that they studied for college. The phrase "study" rather

than “read” or “write” was used to maximize learners’ descriptions of their literacy practices.

Table 1
Generation 1 Learner Participants

Participant	Self-Described Ethnicity	Approximate Age	Educational/Professional Goals
Al Share	(North) Sudanese	Early 70s	Political Activist and Author
Labiba	Afghani	Late 50s	Pharmacist
Mariam	Iraqi	Late 20s	College Graduate/Undecided
Olan	Yazidi (from Iraq)	Early 30s	Ultrasound Technician
Qadira	(North) Sudanese	Late 20s	Pharmacist
Rebecca	Nuer (from Sudan)	Late 30s	Nurse

Observations of students are documented in Table 2 although faculty and staff were also often part of the observation. Faculty and staff were also interviewed if learners interacted with them during an observation or referenced seeking literacy support from them (Table 3). For example, because Labiba frequently discussed visiting the writing center to receive help, I sought interviews with David and Jack, who regularly worked with her. For the present

study, data were thematically analyzed (Clarke & Braun, 2014) by identifying and clustering emergent themes into broad categories related to the research questions. Thematic analysis is a commonly applied method for “analyzing narrative materials of life stories” through a nonlinear analysis process involving “description and interpretation, both inductive and deductive, emphasizing context, integration of manifest and latent contents” (Vaismoradi et al., 2013, p. 399).

Table 2
Learner-Focused Data Collection Activities

Participant	Interview Time (Minutes)	Observation Tasks	Observation Time (Minutes)
Al Share	149	In Class, Studying	210
Labiba	80	In Class, In Lab	120
Mariam	122	In Class, Studying, Writing Center, Office Hours, Advising	330
Olan	119	In Class, Studying, Writing Center	210
Qadira	141	In Class, Studying	240
Rebecca	118	In Class	150
Totals	729		1260
			Grand Total 33 hours, 9 minutes

Table 3
Faculty/ Staff Interviews

Participant	College Role	Total Interview Time (Minutes)
Anne ¹	Literacy Instructor	130 (5 interviews)
David	Writing Tutor	30
Jack	Writing Tutor	38
Laura	Student Success Tutor	12
Lucas	Literacy Instructor, Writing Tutor	30
Rachel	Student Success Tutor	10
Rob	Literacy Instructor	15
		Total 4 hours, 25 minutes

1

Anne taught five of the learners over the length of data collection. She was interviewed about each learner separately.

The thematic analysis included six phases, presented in Table 4, regarding the present study. Applications in the table are intended as illustrations rather than exhaustive descriptions of the data analysis procedure. After initial code selection and themes refinement, observation vignettes and participant language were selected to illustrate each theme. Through reiterative data collection and analysis, additional examples were compared to the emerging themes, deepening the qualitative understanding of themes or creating a new theme. For example, “Lack of Awareness of Strategy Use” evolved into “Emergent—but Often Invisible Strategy Use” based on the recognition that not all learners demonstrated the level of strategy mastery expected by faculty. Once saturation was reached, refined themes were member checked with both a student participant and a faculty member who worked in the writing center (Creswell, 2013).

Findings

This section includes a discussion of the three dominant themes that emerged from exploring Generation 1 learners’ engagement as lifelong readers and writers through their

knowledge and use of literacy strategies in college.

Emergent—but Often Invisible—Literacy Strategy Use

Each learner described and was observed engaging in practices to monitor, deepen, and apply their reading and writing strategies in college contexts (Tables 5 and 6). However, the majority of this strategy use appeared to occur outside of class. For example, when I observed Olan studying in the family’s small apartment living room, I quickly noted how Olan’s reading included deep processing strategies. Olan had been an interpreter for the U.S. Army in Iraq before immigrating to the United States; from this work, he developed strong inference skills, which I frequently observed him applying as he stretched across the family’s rug, his computer and school supplies scattered around him. I also observed Olan regularly applying his growing understanding of U.S. culture to the assigned text, and when he came to an unknown word, he slowly reread the surrounding text aloud until he understood the new concept. As a last resort, Olan searched for the word in his dictionary, but he felt strongly that the best way to improve his English was by learning the meaning of the word in English rather than translating it into Arabic. Olan’s procedure for

reading activated his metacognitive awareness and applied problem-solving strategies, although he also used global reading strategies and support reading strategies. He varied his strategy use based upon level of repair

needed, illustrating both his growing comprehension and—more importantly—his emergent mastery of the domain of literacy.

Table 4

Analytical Phases and Application

Analytical Phase	Application Example
<i>Familiarizing with Data</i> Interview transcription, (re)reading data, drafting in-process memos	Reviewed transcripts and observation notes from 38+ hours of interviews and observations. During this process, captured potential points of inquiry through memos, such as “Who sees this strategy use and its intentionality?”
<i>Generating Initial Codes</i> Systematic coding of notable information across the dataset, collating data for each code	Established initial codes across participant experiences, such as “self-reported GLOB,” “observed PROB,” and “Lack of college awareness of strategy use”
<i>Searching for Themes</i> Identifying emergent themes, gathering data relevant to each theme	Established emergent relationships between repeated themes
<i>Reviewing Themes</i> Comparing themes to coded segments and data set	Documented patterns across learners’ self-reported and observed strategy use
<i>Defining Themes</i> Refining theme details and overall analytical sense-making of the experience	Added nuanced understanding of theme complexity by reviewing relevant data, for example memo: “Not all strategy use (visible or otherwise) is @ Mastery level [Alexander, 2005]. Strategies not recognized because not considered sufficient for college?”
<i>Producing Report</i> Selecting compelling data to illustrate the themes, connecting chosen data back to research questions and the literature	Identified, described, and explained specific vignettes to illustrate themes and their connection to existing literature on reading strategy use and identity enactment.

(Adapted from Braun & Clarke, 2006)

Table 5
Self-Reported, Interview-Reported, and Observed Reading Strategy Use

Participant	Self-Reported Strategies	Interview-Reported and Observed Strategies
Al Share	Global (<i>considering reading purpose, using context clues</i>) Problem-Solving (<i>rereading difficult texts</i>) Support (<i>using the dictionary, taking notes, summarizing the text</i>)	Global (<i>using context clues</i>) Problem-Solving (<i>rereading difficult texts slowly and carefully</i>) Support (<i>summarizing the text, paraphrasing</i>)
Labiba	Support (<i>taking notes, summarizing the text</i>)	Global (<i>using context clues</i>) Problem-Solving (<i>adjusting reading speed, reading difficult texts slowly and carefully, guessing unknown vocabulary</i>) Support (<i>taking notes, summarizing the text*</i>)
Mariam	Global (<i>considering text fit to reading purpose, using typographical aids</i>) Problem-Solving (<i>rereading difficult texts</i>) Support (<i>using the dictionary, taking notes, summarizing the text</i>)	Global (<i>using context clues, using typographical aids</i>) Problem-Solving (<i>reading difficult texts slowly and carefully</i>) Support (<i>using the dictionary*, taking notes, summarizing the text</i>)
Olan	Global (<i>rereading difficult texts, using context clues, guessing text meaning</i>) Problem-Solving (<i>guessing unknown words, returning to the text to check comprehension</i>) Support (<i>using the dictionary, summarizing the text</i>)	Problem-Solving (<i>rereading difficult texts, using context clues*, guessing text meaning</i>) Problem-Solving (<i>guessing unknown words, returning to the text to check comprehension</i>) Support (<i>summarizing the text</i>)
Qadira	Problem-Solving (<i>rereading difficult texts</i>)	Global (<i>consider reading purpose, use context clues</i>) Problem-Solving (<i>rereading difficult texts, guessing unknown words*, adjusting reading speed</i>) Support (<i>summarizing the text, reading aloud</i>)
Rebecca	Problem-Solving (<i>rereading difficult texts</i>)	Problem Solving (<i>adjusting reading speed</i>) Support (<i>using the dictionary*, taking notes, summarizing the text, reading aloud</i>)

* Strategy acknowledged by college personnel

Table 6
Self-Reported and Observed Writing Strategy Use

Participant	Self-Reported Strategies	Interview-Reported and Observed Strategies
Al Share	Drafting (<i>writing on his computer</i>)	Planning (<i>retrieving information**</i>) Translating (<i>Arabic to English</i>) Revising (<i>attending to grammar and punctuation**, rewriting to strengthen purpose**</i>)
Labiba	Planning (<i>outlining</i>) Translating (<i>between seven languages</i>) Drafting (<i>rereading difficult texts</i>) Revising (<i>attending to grammar and punctuation, seeking revision assistance</i>)	Planning (<i>outlining**, retrieving information**</i>) Translating (<i>Pashtu, to Arabic, to English</i>) Drafting (<i>writing several drafts with assistance from writing tutors, instructor, and classmates**</i>) Revising (<i>attending to grammar and punctuation, seeking revision assistance*</i>)
Mariam	Planning (<i>“dream[ing] my essay,” outlining, retrieving information</i>) Drafting (<i>rereading difficult texts</i>) Revising (<i>attending to grammar and punctuation</i>)	Planning (<i>“dream[ing] my essay,” outlining**, retrieving information**</i>) Translating (<i>Arabic to English</i>) Revising (<i>attending to grammar and punctuation**, seeking revision assistance**, peer reviewing**</i>) Metacognitive (<i>creating, reflecting on, and articulating an intentional writing process**</i>)
Olan	Planning (<i>retrieving information</i>) Translating (<i>Kurdish to Arabic to English</i>) Drafting (<i>writing essays on the computer</i>)	Revising (<i>attending to grammar and punctuation**, seeking revision assistance</i>) Metacognitive (<i>reflecting on, creating, and articulating an intentional writing process</i>)
Qadira	Drafting (<i>writing</i>) Revising (<i>seeking revision assistance</i>)	Planning (<i>retrieving information**</i>) Drafting (<i>writing first in a notebook, then on the computer</i>) Revising (<i>attending to source citation*/**, seeking revision assistance*, peer reviewing**</i>) Metacognitive (<i>explaining and incorporating peer review feedback**</i>)
Rebecca	Drafting (<i>writing essays at work, then typing them in class</i>)	Planning (<i>retrieving information**</i>) Drafting (<i>writing at the computer*</i>) Revising (<i>attending to grammar and punctuation*, peer reviewing**</i>)

* Strategy acknowledged by college personnel

** Strategy modeled/taught in class

Similarly, when I observed Mariam's at-home study routine, she explained her detailed process for writing an academic paper. Mariam had graduated from an Iraqi high school and intended to go to college in Baghdad before immigrating to the United States to marry. Mariam incorporated strategies from previous educational experiences and her developmental English class into a writing process she could apply to any assignment or genre.

Mariam read a section of the textbook, occasionally pausing to jot down brief phrases on a small steno pad: "Process analysis," then leaving several blank lines, "thesis." After completing the short reading, she left her opened books on the kitchen table and turned to her stove, where she stirred a pot of soup before turning to the sink to wash dishes. (Observation Notes)

Mariam returned to her studies throughout the afternoon, filling in ideas underneath the "headlines," the word she used to describe the phrases she wrote as she read. She explained, "Headlines is like a note. Or the main point I have to focus on this essay. The headlines help for me to make my essay." Her instructor had introduced headlines for organizing and lengthening essays, and Mariam incorporated this global reading strategy as a part of her writing process of "dream[ing] my essay"—or thinking about the essay while she did housework. Mariam had previously developed this deep processing routine when, as a new mother, she struggled to make time for studying while caring for her infant daughter and husband. Mariam's awareness that she needed extended periods to think about her assignments, in addition to her house-and-homework solution, demonstrated both her metacognitive awareness and her emerging literacy domain competence.

Another student, Labiba, also demonstrated her advanced acclimation through her strategic studying. Labiba had a

fierce sense of determination instilled from her years living abroad as an Afghan refugee. By the time she entered college, in her late 50s and with four grown children, she was committed to succeeding at all costs. Labiba thus made daily visits to the Writing Center. There she sought out tutors who would sit with her as she worked through each aspect of an assignment beginning with reading the chapter and taking notes until she drafted and edited her written response. One tutor, David, explained,

[Labiba] put more hours and more work into the developmental classes than any student I've ever seen. Even when she wasn't with a tutor, [Labiba] would spend entire days... working on the computer or reading in her book, or doing whatever she could to try to get this work done.

David described Labiba's belief that her limited understanding—most notably related to the vocabulary—slowed the development of her college study skills: "She was so frustrated because she was putting so much more time into the work than her classmates were, but she felt like she was getting so much less out of it." According to David and Jack, who both regularly worked with Labiba in the writing center, she recognized which literacy tasks she needed to complete, but her limited knowledge of specific aspects of U.S. culture or Western history often prevented her from accessing necessary background information to comprehend the texts. Thus, her problem-solving strategies were insufficient for comprehending the text because she could not access the necessary level of content domain knowledge. Despite these challenges, Labiba's self-directed efforts to resolve her confusion and strengthen her understanding of her studying processes demonstrated her advanced acclimation within the domain.

Although learners often engaged in complicated efforts to master the literacy domain, much of their strategy use and expertise remained invisible to faculty. As the

examples above illustrate, this work often occurred outside of the classroom. Furthermore, in class, instructors were often focused on learners' ability to demonstrate content mastery specific to their classes rather than the broader domain of literacy.

Missed Opportunities and Misperceptions: Failed Recognition of Learner Competence

The invisibility of learners' emerging competence addresses the second research question related to faculty perceptions of and responses to learners' strategy use. Although the learners were observed participating in developmental English courses which purported to integrate reading and writing, I observed no explicit reading strategy instruction. Instead, my review of course assignments and observations of instruction suggested that instructors viewed reading as a means to producing writing—a process that faculty introduced through explicit strategy instruction and daily opportunities for in-class practice. I did not, however, observe instruction developing students' abilities to reflect metacognitively on their processes. This instructional focus on process-to-product without reflection resulted in multiple misperceptions about learners' strategy use and missed opportunities for explicit literacy strategy instruction.

In several in-class observations, learners engaged in literacy strategy use, which their instructors felt was inappropriate for that particular context; however, faculty often chose not to discuss these moments with learners even though such open communication might have reduced some of the instructors' misperceptions about the learners' strategy application. The first type of missed opportunity was related to expanding learners' understanding of the timing of particular strategies. For example, during one class, I observed Rebecca read silently while her classmates collectively completed an assignment. As a self-described "shy person" and a working single mother of six, Rebecca

tried to study at her job as a night-shift medication aide, but she told me that she felt confident in her understanding of the course materials.

On that particular day, I noted:

Although she sat at the circle of tables with her classmates, Rebecca read her book, ignoring the conversation around her. The class was looking for sentence patterns within their assigned reading, a nonfiction book. When the instructor called on Rebecca, she quietly said she had not gotten to that sentence type and returned to her reading. Rather than skim for the required dependent clause, Rebecca appeared to be reading the book for comprehension. While the class continued discussing particular sentence structures, Rebecca lightly wrote short annotations in the margins of the text and underlined a passage, identifying it as the main idea. (Observation Notes)

The reading had been assigned the previous class, but Rebecca had not participated in the discussion. While others shared their answers with the class, she continued reading quietly, pausing only briefly to search for various sentence types before returning to her annotations but leaving her handout incomplete.

Rebecca's annotating—an important reading strategy—did not demonstrate the type of engagement her instructor expected during the class activity; however, in an interview, the instructor described her hesitancy to correct students' in-class behaviors. The instructor, Anne, recognized that many of her students entered college and her class with a heightened sense of anxiety due to previous "trauma" or negative past schooling experiences. She explained, "You've got all of these people together who are on edge anyway, and it's pretty hard for them to be thinking about writing" (interview). Thus, Anne did not again attempt to engage with Rebecca during the class activity or individual work time. Anne failed to acknowledge how Rebecca's reading or dictionary use—despite

being inappropriately timed—demonstrated her support strategy use. As a result, Rebecca received no encouragement to transition from her use of surface-level to deep processing by incorporating other reading strategies, such as annotating personal connections to the text, while continuing to her current thoughtful strategy application.

Another example of a missed opportunity stemming from a misperception of strategy application related to learners' use of dictionary apps. Five learners described their frequent use of a dictionary to support their reading comprehension. During interviews, however, faculty negatively described what they perceived to be an overreliance upon the technology: "If she [Mariam] could, she would have it [her dictionary app] out all of the time" (Rob). Rob equated using a phone's dictionary to other inappropriate cell phone uses. However, he acknowledged that he did not initiate a class discussion about appropriate phone usage, "Since [Mariam is] the only one who appears to pull out the phone for that use [looking up words], she's the only one that I talk with about it." Mariam's phone usage could have been an opportunity to discuss participation expectations with the entire class and acknowledge all students' existing strategy use while encouraging their development of additional strategies or alternative times for specific strategy application.

Qadira's uncited use of verbatim language from the text represented an additional type of missed opportunity related to learners' emerging literacy domain mastery: exploring underlying class ideologies. A self-described gifted Sudanese student who planned to become a pharmacist before immigrating to the U.S. for marriage, Qadira often challenged her instructor, Anne, when she felt misunderstood or disagreed with Anne's teaching. I observed one such instance when Qadira approached Anne for feedback.

Anne underlined several sentences from Qadira's draft, which had been copied directly from the book. At first, Qadira

denied copying the text, but when Anne pointed to specific places in the book, Qadira argued that the rest of the essay was not plagiarized. Anne moved on to the next paragraphs, again underlining copied sentences. Anne repeatedly explained how to write a summary and response without copying the author's language exactly. Qadira responded, "While I was just showing this to you; it's not done." (Observation Notes)

In our conversation after this exchange, Qadira demonstrated Turnitin, an online program which she explained as a resource she could use as a student to "make sure if anyone just copy from a line... just she [Anne] needs to make sure it's not make plagiarism." Her reference to "plagiarism" was telling since her instructor, Anne, had not used the word when explaining how to avoid copying from the text. In fact, the instructor's explanation included valuable information. However, by not explicitly labeling Qadira's "copying" as plagiarism in this conversation, Anne missed a valuable opportunity to discuss the ownership of ideas as an ideology that permeated the course and institutional language about participation.

Conflicting Perceptions of Strategy Use and Identity Enactment

Every learner openly described the importance of being a college student and their investment in further developing their literacy skills towards that aim. Learners' strategy use was a form of investment in their identities as college students and professionals. Like Mariam who internalized headlines into her writing process, the learners intentionally cultivated a series of literacy strategies to enact identities as college students and achieve personal goals. Al Share, for example, enrolled in college after fleeing persecution in Egypt and his native North Sudan, and he explained his English literacy efforts as connected to his international political activism: "I insist to take English serious, to master that language, to write. I am

going to write something in English even to my children—to our children in Sudan. I want to tell him this and against the Islam.” Labiba similarly viewed succeeding in college as a way to overcome her previous hardships: “War take everything, but war not take the small thing from my head.... I have to use this one for my school.” Labiba described her extreme efforts to continue her education as she moved between various Middle Eastern countries seeking safety. She viewed her persistence as vital to her academic success, and she applied this persistence through several literacy strategies, such as note-taking: She once showed me a single textbook passage which she had translated into six languages—a practice that aligned with her identity as a diligent multilingual student with valuable multiliteracy skills. Although robust, her literacy strategy use was largely surface-level and insufficient to demonstrate literacy proficiency to her instructor.

Faculty were often unaware of the strategies that learners used or the connections learners made between their strategy use and their identities as college students. Instead, because a majority of learners’ literacy strategies were utilized outside of the classroom, instructors often only witnessed support strategies (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002) which did not demonstrate the learners’ emerging metacognitive abilities and obscured their developing literacy proficiency. Indeed, many instructors held deficit perspectives about students’ language. Only Olan was identified by his instructor as prepared for the linguistic requirements of college expectations. Instructors described other students as not yet able to handle the linguistic demands of classes, which, according to one instructor, “assume that you’re able to parlay in standard American English.” The instructor Rob explained, “There’s a great deal of work to be done between, in my opinion, where [Mariam] is now and what she needs to be ready for Composition.... It concerns me that her language skills in English are where they are.”

Ultimately, Rob concluded that Mariam would benefit from “doing some more of the ESL run of things, maybe preparing a bit more for jumping both feet into a class that I think expects a bit more ability in standard American English then perhaps she’s ready to handle.” In interviews, staff echoed instructors’ use of language identifying the learners as “ESL”—an identity position which the learners themselves specifically rejected as they attempted to demonstrate literacy strategies which they associated with being college students. Importantly, regardless of faculty and staff perception of the learners as “ESL” students, every learner in the study had scored high enough on the college’s placement test to enroll in developmental English classes: Their scores placed them outside of Adult Basic Education and therefore outside of the ESL sequence.

Despite instructors’ perceptions that most of the learners were unprepared for the linguistic and literacy demands of developmental English and other college courses, instructors often held vague or highly dated notions of what constituted appropriate demonstrations of literacy strategy use. Furthermore, their expectations of learners’ strategy use were less specific than the faculty expectations regarding literacy competence reported in the literature (Hartshorn et al., 2017; Liu & Read, 2020). For example, Lucas described students as needing to demonstrate “the ability to read and write and take notes and express [themselves] in a way that’s clear and cogent.” He further explained, “I think the language skills are pretty essential” (Lucas), echoing Anne’s assertion that learners need to be able to “really read ... and understand the 20 pages [in ways equivalent to] the native speakers.” In interviews and observations, neither Lucas nor Anne provided concrete explanations of how learners might apply various literacy strategies to these tasks. See Suh (2020) for a taxonomic analysis highlighting the disconnect between the learners’ detailed descriptions of their strategy use in studying and instructors’

broad descriptions of studying which made infrequent reference to specific literacy strategies. Those findings and the present study illustrate how different perceptions about learners' literacy strategies and their value hampered instructors' recognition of the learners' identity enactment as highly literate college students and skilled readers and writers.

In interviews and during observations, instructors rarely elaborated on the processes by which learners could demonstrate their literacy competencies. Rob reported that he did not emphasize literacy strategy instruction in his class. Instead, he recommended that Mariam return to ESL for additional support, noting how Mariam would benefit from "more Basal foundations work"—a highly critiqued and monolingual word-identification program (Weaver, 1988) which most ESL professionals recognize as dated and inappropriate for emergent multilingual students (Branton, 1992; Fukada, 2018). Even more problematic, such a program leaves no space to acknowledge learners' demonstrated literacy strategy use or competence.

As indicated by Rob's comment about Basal reading, the college professionals' negative assessments of the learners may also have reflected their limited training and experience in supporting multilingual students, an issue receiving growing attention in the literature (Diaz et al., 2016). Faculty's presumed lack of preparation to teach multilingual students may have amplified perceptions of learners rooted in linguistic and academic deficit. For example, one instructor linked a student's frequent use of her cellphone's dictionary app to what he perceived to be broader issues with English language acquisition: "She appears to need to look things up pretty regularly and so is struggling with that and sometimes even sort of just what you might term every daily layman's language." In this case, the literacy strategy contributed to the tension between the learner's identity projection as a proficient college student and the instructor's

assumptions about multilingual college students.

Discussion

This thematic analysis illustrates a disconnect between the intentionality of learners' strategy use and how college instructors perceived their strategy use. Learners were observed in out-of-class contexts applying global and problem-solving strategies, which illustrated a level of metacognitive awareness identified in the literature indicating emerging mastery (Alexander, 2005; Vrugt & Oort, 2008). However, in class, learners often were perceived by their instructors as lacking a basic understanding of how to apply literacy strategies appropriately.

Generation 1 Learners' Literacy Strategy Use

Learners' strategy use primarily demonstrated their metacognitive skills and self-direction, such as Mariam and Olan's varied use of support strategies depending upon the text's difficulty and the reading task. The learners described their strategy use as manifesting their identities as college students and skilled multilingual learners. Emergent multilingual students have reported using support strategies when reading in the target language with greater frequency than their monolingual peers (Tercanlioglu, 2004). Although over-reliance upon these strategies can be indicative of acclimation, or the most basic level of mastery, Mariam and Olan's systematic and intentional application of these repair strategies suggested a level of metacognitive processing and self-regulation associated with more advanced levels of mastery (Alexander, 2005; Vrugt & Oort, 2008). Competence is linked to metacognition and self-regulation and topic knowledge, as increases in one type of knowledge facilitate development in the other (Alexander et al., 1995). Indeed, despite her struggles to

comprehend assigned texts, Labiba exhibited a self-directed literacy strategy application as she strengthened her overall understanding of the process of studying in college. However, like Mariam and Olan, Labiba predominantly applied literacy strategies in outside-of-class learning environments. Her strategy use, therefore, remained invisible to her instructor. Notably, the strategy use observed in this study by no means indicated that the learners had reached a mastery level. Instead, observations suggested learners' movement from acclimation to competence (Alexander, 2005). Learners in acclimation have a limited and non-cohesive base of reading knowledge; they, therefore, employ mainly surface-level strategies (Alexander, 2005). Faculty often perceived learners' visible application of particular literacy strategies as inappropriately timed or over used. For example, faculty expressed concern over learners' independent application of literacy strategies during group discussions. Rather than acknowledging the potential of more appropriately timed strategy use, instructor responses echoed deficit-based descriptions of adult learners' negative participation (Carter & Henrichsen, 2015; Gartman, 2016). Finally, learners also demonstrated the use of strategies facilitating personal connections, an indispensable component for their identity enactment, and their literacy strategy application. Such connections are theorized to be critical to mastery since much deep-processing is founded on readers' prior knowledge and experiences: "Readers who become competent in reading must find an abiding connection between themselves and written language" (Alexander, 2005, p. 421). Existing literature describes the importance of developing text-to-self connections to deepen reading comprehension and meaning-making (Keene & Zimmerman, 1998).

Faculty Roles in Supporting Strategy Use and Identity Enactment

This study uncovered areas of disconnect between faculty's perception of

learners' visible strategy use and learners' ability to demonstrate their intentional development and application of literacy strategies as enactment of a *college*—rather than *ESL*—student identity. However, the findings also indicated areas of alignment between instructional support and students' identity enactment. When faculty provided explicit strategy instruction, learners applied those strategies in and out of the classroom. Further, learners' deep processing suggested that they were at a level in which they could benefit from explicit strategy instruction. Mariam's incorporation of headlines, for example, demonstrated not only her metacognitive awareness in applying multiple strategies but also her ability to acquire new strategies. Researchers have identified the correlation between diverse students' literacy strategy use and academic success (Alsuhaibani, 2019; Chevalier et al., 2017). Metacognitive instruction can significantly increase multilingual students' comprehension (Ali & Razali, 2019; Ustünbas, 2019). However, in focusing on Generation 1 learners in college rather than traditionally-aged English as a Foreign Language students, the present study findings highlight a new population benefiting from metacognitive reading instruction.

Implications

English language learners are a heterogeneous group with distinct literacy strengths and growth edges. Given the diversity within this group, Domínguez and Gutiérrez (2015) advocate for pedagogical practices which draw from learners' unique experiences, pursuits, linguistic repertoires, and literacy skills. The present study recommends several approaches for differentiating instruction for post-secondary multilingual students.

The findings echoed the literature regarding the importance of creating supportive learning environments for adult learners. Because learners' identities are

grounded in their academic experiences, social and contextual factors within the learning environment can either enhance or restrict learners' internal motivation and use of metacognitive strategies (Hayward et al., 2018). Faculty recognition of both learners' present level of domain mastery and their capability of increasing their metacognitive and self-regulated strategy use can facilitate the recognition and support of Generation 1 learners'—indeed *all* adult learners'—desired identities and how their academic growth supports their fulfilment of those identities.

This study also endorses research on the connections between literacy skills application, positive learning, and engagement. Instructors play a crucial role in maximizing multilingual students' comprehension of complex texts by promoting their engagement through discussion and writing (Boardman et al., 2017; Cho et al., 2010; Wong-Fillmore & Fillmore, 2012). Leighton et al. (2019) documented how one teacher used the read-aloud strategy to model conceptual questioning and establish intertextual connections to deepen emergent multilingual students' topic knowledge. Such modeling can encourage multilingual students of all ages to apply global reading strategies (Mokharti & Reichard, 2002). Teachers' positive recognition of students' strategy use can boost students' engagement, self-efficacy, and reading comprehension (Leighton et al., 2019; Taboada Barber et al., 2015).

The study included several limitations: First, as noted previously, identity is a complex concept, the entirety of which cannot be adequately explored solely through the analysis of learners' literacy competence. Literacy scholars interested in identity enactment can find extensive literature on the role of language learning in identity; for example, Darvin and Norton (2015) summarize the discussion of identity investment within the field of applied linguistics and present an updated model of identity enactment within an increasingly digitized and mobile world. Additionally, this

study was limited by the small sample size and participants' homogeneous immigration experiences which may have minimized observed literacy strategy use. The study also lacked a measure of learners' self-reported strategy use, such as the ESL-specific Survey of Reading Strategies (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002). Despite these limitations, the thick, rich data allowed for qualitative understanding of three emerging themes previously explored quantitatively (Geertz, 1973). The findings indicate that instructors largely assessed the learners' present application of literacy strategies as insufficient for their success in the subsequent English Composition classes required for degree attainment. Future research can explore which categories of literacy strategy instruction learners require to persist through college literacy tasks. Given the benefits of explicit instruction on strategy use (Habibian, 2015), future research could also explore learners' metacognitive and self-regulatory strategy development over time.

The findings suggest the importance of instructors' recognition and support of adult learners' literacy development—beginning with recognizing learners as moving towards mastery and scaffolding their development accordingly. “A passion for the process of reading, or for encounters with specific forms of text... is necessary for the continued journey into competence or expertise” (Alexander, 2005, p. 421). This study shows the hidden nature of strategy use that multilingual Generation 1 students use to create personal connections between their desired identities and their emerging literacy domain competence.

References

- Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. G. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher*, 61, 364–373. <https://doi.org/10.1598/rt.61.5.1>
- Alderson, C. J. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A reading problem or a language problem? In C. J. Alderson & A. Urhahar (Eds.), *Reading in a foreign language*. (pp. 1–24). Longman.
- Alexander, P. (2005). The path to competence: A lifespan developmental perspective on reading. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 37(4), 413–436. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15548430jlr3704_1
- Alexander, P., Jetton, T. L., & Kulikowich, J. M. (1995). Interrelationship of knowledge, interest, and recall: Assessing a model of domain learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(4), 559–575. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.87.4.559>
- Alexander, P. A., Sperl, C. T., Buehl, M. M., Fives, H., & Chiu, S. (2004). Modeling domain learning: Profiles from the field of special education. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(3), 545–557. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.96.3.545>
- Ali, A. M., & Razali, A. B. (2019). A review of studies on cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies in teaching reading comprehension for ESL/EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 12(6), 94–111. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n6p94>
- Allen, K. D., & Hancock, T. E. (2008). Reading comprehension improvement with individualized cognitive profiles and metacognition. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 47(2), 124–139.
- Al Masi, J. F., & Fullerton, S. K. (2012). *Teaching strategic processes in reading*. Guilford Press.
- Alsuhailani, Z. (2019). The relationship between female EFL students' use of reading strategies and their reading self-efficacy. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 19(2), 377–398. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes2000.19.2.8>
- Aziz, Z. A., Nasir, C., & Ramazani, R. (2019). Applying metacognitive strategies in comprehending English reading texts. *Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 19(1), 138–159. <https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v19i1.1863>
- Bauer, L. B., & Johnson, C. (2011). A retrospective analysis: A view of JCLL in literacy research. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 37(1), 41–53.
- Blanton, L. L. (1992). A holistic approach to college ESL: Integrating language and content. *ELT Journal*, 46(3), 285–293.
- Boardman, A. G., Boele, A. L., & Klingner, J. K. (2017). Strategy instruction shifts teacher and student interactions during text-based discussions. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 53(2), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.191>

- Boudreaux, M. K. (2016). Survey of developmental students' print and online metacognitive reading. *Education Research Quarterly*, 39(3), 3–22.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Carter, S. J., & Henrichsen, L. E. (2015). Addressing reticence: The challenge of engaging reluctant adult ESL students. *Journal of Adult Education*, 44(2), 15–21.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1083975.pdf>
- Cassidy, J., Grote-Garcia, S., & Ortlieb, E. (2020). What's hot in 2019: Expanded and interconnected notions of literacy. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 59(1), 39–52.
- Chevalier, T. M., Parrila, R., Ritchie, K. C., & Deacon, S. H. (2017). The role of metacognitive reading strategies, metacognitive study and learning strategies, and behavioral study and learning strategies in predicting academic success in students with and without a history of reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 50(1), 34–48.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219415588850>
- Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2014). Thematic analysis. In A. C. Michaels (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 6626–6628). Springer.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Cumming, A., Lai, C., & Cho, H. (2016). Students' writing from sources for academic purposes: A synthesis of recent research. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 47–58.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.06.002>
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–35. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000191>
- de Kleine, C., & Lawton, R. (2015). *Meeting the needs of linguistically diverse students at the college level* [White paper]. College Reading and Learning Association.
https://crla.net/images/whitepaper/Meeting_Needs_of_Diverse_Students.pdf
- Diaz, A., Cochran, K., & Karlin, N. (2016). The influence of teacher power on English language learners' self-perceptions of learner empowerment. *College Teaching*, 64(4), 158–167.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2015.1126801>
- Domínguez, M., & Gutiérrez, K. D. (2015). Best practices for teaching dual language learners: Design principles for leveraging everyday literacies. In L. B. Gambrell & L. M. Morrow (Eds.), *Best practices in literacy instruction* (5th ed., pp. 127–148). Pearson.
- Dreyer, C., & Nel, C. (2003). Teaching reading strategies and reading comprehension within a technology-enhanced learning environment. *System*, 31(3), 349–365.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x\(03\)00047-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x(03)00047-2)
- Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. E. (1998). *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success*. Heinemann.

- Fukada, Y. (2018). Whole language approach. In J. I. Lontas & M. Delli Carpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*. (pp. 1–7). Wiley & Sons.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0166>
- Gartman, K. (2016). Transformation of the resistant adult learner. *MPAEA Journal of Adult Education*, 45(2), 9–13.
- Geertz, Clifford. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books.
- Gorzycki, M., Howard, M., Allen, D., Desa, G., & Rosegard, E. (2016). An exploration of academic reading proficiency at the university level: A cross-sectional study of 848 undergraduates. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 55(2), 142–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1938807.2015.1133738>
- Habibian, M. (2015). The impact of training metacognitive strategies on reading comprehension among ESL learners. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(28), 61–69.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the ‘good kids’ to the ‘worst’: Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 35–67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588096>
- Harklau, L., & Siegal, M. (2009). Immigrant youth and higher education: An overview. In M. Roberge, M. Siegal, & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition* (pp.135–149). Routledge.
- Hartshorn, K. J., Hart, J. M., & McMurphy, B. L. (2019). Comparing language skill priorities among TESL faculty and ESL students bound for English-medium universities. *TESOL Journal*, 10(3), <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.438>
- Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Egbert, J., & Johnson, A. (2017). Discipline-specific reading expectation and challenges for ESL learners in US universities. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 29(1), 36–60.
- Hayward, L., Ventura, S., Schuldt, H., & Donlan, P. (2018). Student pedagogical teams: Students as course consultants engaged in process of teaching and learning. *College Teaching*, 66(1), 37–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2017.1405904>
- Holschuh, J. P., & Paulson, E. J. (2013). *The terrain of college developmental reading*. Executive summary and paper commissioned by the College Reading and Learning Association
<https://www.crla.net/images/whitepaper/TheTerrainofCollege91913.pdf>
- Ilustre, C. A. (2011). Beliefs about reading, metacognitive reading strategies and text comprehension among college students in a private university. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 7, 28–47.
- Isakson, R. L., & Isakson, M. B. (2017). Preparing college students to learn more from academic texts through metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. In K. Mokhtari (Ed.), *Improving reading comprehension through metacognitive reading strategies instruction* (pp. 155–175). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Ismail, N. M., & Tawalbeh, T. I. (2015). Effectiveness of a metacognitive reading strategies program for improving low achieving EFL readers. *International Education Studies*, 8(1), 71–81.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v8n1p71>
- Jin, L., & Schneider, J. (2019). Faculty views on international students: A survey study. *Journal of International Students*, 9(1), 84–99.

- Kanno, Y., & Cromley, J. G. (2013). English language learners' pathways to four-year colleges. *Teachers College Record*, 117(1), 1-44.
- Kanno, Y., & Harklau, L. (2012). Linguistic minority students go to college: Introduction. In Y. Kanno & L. Harklau (Eds.). *Linguistic minority students go to college: Preparation, access and persistence* (pp. 1-16). Routledge.
- Keene, E. O., & Zimmerman, S. (1998). *Mosaic of thought: Teaching reading comprehension in a reader's workshop*. Heinemann.
- Kenner, C., & Weinerman, J. (2011). Adult learning theory: Applications to non-traditional college students. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 41(2), 87-96.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2011.10850344>
- Knowles, M.S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy*. Association Press.
- Leighton, C. M., Ford-Connors, E., Proctor, C. P., & Wyatt, J. (2019). Engaging second-grade English language learners in complex texts, topics, and tasks. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 58(4), 272-294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2019.1638473>
- Liu, X., & Read, J. (2020). General Skill Needs and Challenges in University Academic Reading: Voices from Undergraduates and Language Teachers. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 50(2), 70-93.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2020.1734885>
- MacArthur, C. A., Philippakos, Z. A., & Ianetta, M. (2015). Self-regulated strategy instruction in college developmental writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 107(3), 855-867.
- McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 3, 577-608.
- Meniado, J. C. (2016). Metacognitive reading strategies, motivation, and reading comprehension performance of Saudi EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, 9(3), 117-129.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n3p117>
- Mokhtari, K., Dimitrov, D. M., & Reichard, C. A. (2018). Revising the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies inventory (MARSI) and testing for factorial invariance. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 219-246.
- Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 249-259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.249>.
- Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(3), 2-10.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation*. Channel View Publications.
- Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.
- Philippakos, Z. A., & MacArthur, C. A. (2019). Writing strategy instruction for low-skilled postsecondary students. In D. Perin (Ed.), *The Wiley Handbook of Adult Literacy* (pp. 495-515). Wiley.

- Poole, A. (2008). The relationship of reading proficiency to online strategy use: A study of U.S. college students. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 35(1), 3–12.
- Sampson, M. B., Linek, W. M., Raine, L., Szabo, S. (2013). The influence of prior knowledge, university coursework, and field experience on primary preservice teachers' use of reading comprehension strategies in a year-long, field-based teacher education program. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 52(4), 281–311.
- Sibold, C. (2010). Rules of engagement: Modeling and implementing literacy activities in the college classroom. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 36, 14–23.
- Song, B. (2006) Failure in a college ESL course: Perspectives of instructors and students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30(5), 417–431.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., Suarez-Orozco, M., & Todorova, I. (2008). *Learning in a new land: Immigrant students in American society*. Harvard University Press.
- Suh, E. K. (2016). Language minority student transitions. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 40(1), 26–28.
- Suh, E. K. (2018). Counting backwards toward the future of community college immigrant students: Conceptualizing generation 1 learners. *Basic Writing e-Journal*, 15(1), 1–41.
- Suh, E. K. (2020). Lost in translation: A taxonomic analysis of generation 1 learner and faculty expectations for being a college student. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 50(2), 94–112
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2019.1620143>
- Tarricone, P. (2011). *The taxonomy of metacognition*. Taylor and Francis.
- Tercanlioglu, L. (2004). Postgraduate students' use of reading strategies in L1 and ESL contexts: Links to success. *International Education Journal*, 5(4), 562–570.
- Taboada Barber, A., Buehl, M. M., Kidd, J. K., Sturtevant, E. G., Nuland, L. R., & Beck, J. (2015). Reading engagement in social studies: Exploring the role of a social studies literacy intervention on reading comprehension, reading self-efficacy, and engagement in middle school students with different language backgrounds. *Reading Psychology*, 36(1), 31–85.
- Üstünbas, U. (2019). Use of cognitive strategies in reading: A descriptive study on EFL learners' metacognition. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 5(2), 121–131.
- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing and Health Sciences* 15(3), 398–405.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12048>
- Vrugt, A., & Oort, F. J. (2008). Metacognition, achievement goals, study strategies and academic achievement: Pathways to achievement. *Metacognition Learning*, 30(2), 123–146.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-008-9022-4>
- Weaver, C. (1988). *Reading process and practice: From socio-psycholinguistics to whole language*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

- Wong-Fillmore, L., & Fillmore, C. J. (2012). Understanding language: What does text complexity mean for English learners and language minority students? <https://ell.stanford.edu/publication/what-does-text-complexity-mean-english-learners-and-language-minority-students>
- Yang, P. L., & Wang, A.-L. (2015). Investigation the relationship among language learning strategies, English self-efficacy, and explicit strategy instruction. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 12(1), 35–62.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(4), 506–521.

Agency, Ownership, and Calls for Partnership: A Study of Six African American Undergraduate Readers

Heather D. Porter

Salisbury University

ABSTRACT

Although literacy is fundamental to postsecondary learning, there are limited authentic accounts of students' perceptions and practices related to academic reading. Therefore, this qualitative study sought to explore how six upper-division African American undergraduates perceive and navigate curricular reading demands. Analysis revealed students scaffolded their own learning by employing a decision matrix driven by career goals; they viewed instructors as "one material on the materials list," and they supplemented the official curriculum and countered authority with calls for accountability and partnership. These findings depict students as active, intentional, and empowered learners, providing an alternative view from scholarship that positions them as lacking literacy knowledge and motivation. Implications include the need for instructors to consider their roles in supporting students' reading engagement and the need for more inquiry into undergraduate students' agencies for literacy and learning in the disciplines.

Keywords: postsecondary literacy; reading; African American/Black students

Introduction

I just feel like reading is a two-way street. Or, a three way actually because you have the author who needs to understand that the audience is going to get bored at some point, so they should try to make their reading more interesting. You have the professor who is going to assign the reading, who should have a better lesson plan or a better way to get students to, I mean, to see if their students understood what they are reading. Then, you have the students who have to understand that sometimes readings are boring, but it is for your own good... -Jasmine

In her call for greater accountability across all stakeholders, Jasmine, a third-year student studying marketing at a historically black state university, demonstrates a fervent awareness for the role reading might, and perhaps should, play in advancing her disciplinary knowledge while acknowledging the motivational challenge inherent in its pursuit. Yet, her statement also reflects an often-unheard voice from which we can understand the reality of undergraduate reading practices, adding an important student perspective to scholarly conversations that position college readers as ill-prepared or unmotivated for

reading demands (Barnett, 2000; Falk-Ross, 2001; Park, 2013; Van Blerkom & Van Blerkom, 2004).

Within the postsecondary context, reading is fundamental to college learning both in terms of serving as an underlying or initiating activity to content-driven learning tasks as well as a developmental learning process through which readers deepen their understanding and enact disciplinary-specific meaning making processes (Holschuh, 2019). Yet, past research indicates that postsecondary students carry under-examined views and beliefs about reading and their own self-efficacy towards their identities and strategies which influence their reading practices (Eckert, 2008; Gorzycki, et al., 2020; Hoeft, 2012; Holschuh, 2019; Porter, et al., 2020). Toward this end, this descriptive qualitative study of six upper-division African American undergraduates, involving participant interviews and reading logs, sought to explore their experiences with academic reading demands and how they made sense of their reading practices. This research was conducted by a three-member research team and began as part of a graduate inquiry project. The use of first-person plural pronouns throughout this writing reflects the author's desire to recognize and value the contributions of the co-researchers.

Literature Review

Nature of College Students' Academic Reading

Common to all disciplinary classrooms, texts serve as a critical stimulus for college learning (Fitzpatrick & McConnell, 2008), with some scholars attributing as much as 85% of college learning to out-of-class reading and study efforts (Nist & Holschuh, 2000). Although empirical evidence is limited, there is some literature associating important learning outcomes with curricular reading such as reading comprehension (Bray, et al., 2004), awareness of disciplinary discourses (Lockhart & Soliday, 2016; White & Ali-

Khan, 2013) and literacy proficiency (Lockhart & Soliday, 2016; Valeri-Gold & Deming, 2009; White & Ali-Khan, 2013). Despite reading's prominent value to postsecondary learning, past research suggests undergraduates' curricular reading motivation and engagement is insufficient for reaching such outcomes. For example, Mokhtari et al.'s (2009) survey study indicated a discrepancy in the proportion of time spent with academic and personal reading, noting that while 53% of respondents reported an average of 5.7 hours per week reading recreational texts and 10.85 hours reading academic texts, 85% of students indicated they spend over 12 hours per week on internet reading. In general, research over the past three decades indicates a decline in college students' reading activity despite the increase in the access to multimodal text sources (Hendel & Harold, 2004).

Other studies examining time spent reading academic texts suggest students insufficiently plan for out-of-class readings which results in an over-reliance on supplemental materials for learning (Murden & Gillespie, 1997; Sikorski et al., 2002) and an insufficient deployment of reading strategies (Barnett, 2000; Taraban, et al., 2000; Van Blerkom & Van Blerkom, 2004). While some research reports proficient undergraduate readers are metacognitively aware and responsive in their pursuit of reading by using personal standards for knowledge and cognitive strategies as tools for constructing meaning (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002; Linderholm, 2006, Linderholm & Wilde, 2010; Schraw & Bruning, 1996), much of the findings indicate students employ strategies aimed at cursory levels of comprehension (Cao & Nietfeld, 2007; Phillips & Phillips, 2007). In addition, research by Phillips & Phillips (2007) and Clump et al. (2004) offers insights into the nature of students' text usage, suggesting an extrinsically motivated, binge approach for curricular reading. Specifically, Phillips and Phillips' (2007) reported that 17% of students in an introductory accounting

course read the text chapter before content instruction and 55% of students read after course lectures, noting that two-thirds of chapters read were completed in one sitting with students spending an average of 100 minutes per chapter. Clump et al.'s (2004) study examining students' reading habits in psychology courses found only 27% of students read before class and 69% completed readings before a graded exam. Collectively, although these studies depict a dismal picture of students' time and effort towards curricular readings, we have limited accounts from the students, themselves, to deepen our understanding of these practices and the motivations behind them (Mann, 2000; Mokhtari et al., 2009).

African American Students as Agents for Undergraduate Learning

Notably absent in literacy scholarship is an understanding of the reading practices of African American undergraduate learners (White & Lowenthal, 2011). Widely known is that some students often face difficulty in successfully navigating college coursework due to reasons including under-preparation from past schooling (Banks, 2005; White & Ali-Khan, 2013; White & Lowenthal, 2011); a discourse mismatch between themselves and teachers (Banks, 2005; Delpit, 2006; White & Lowenthal, 2011); and a general lack of institutional support and mentoring (Perna, 2000; White & Ali-Khan, 2013). Consequently, African American students earn fewer postsecondary degrees when compared to their white peers (White & Lowenthal, 2011; White & Ali-Khan, 2013). Although the college degree remains a consistent source of social mobility, particularly for minority populations (White & Lowenthal, 2011; White & Ali-Khan, 2013), and literacy continues to play a vital role in supporting degree attainment (Lewin, 2005; Van Camp & Van Camp, 2012), research indicates minority populations make fewer gains toward literacy proficiency throughout college than their white peers (Bray, et al.,

2004) and struggle to meet academic literacy expectations (White & Ali-Khan, 2013). Given this context, more research is warranted to understand these students' postsecondary literacy experiences and development. Specifically, we endeavored to investigate six upper-division African American undergraduates' perspectives and practices with curricular reading demands.

Reading as Motivated Engagement with Texts

While reading is a broad construct, we foreground this study in reading motivation and engagement theories to explore how undergraduate African American students perceive and understand their reading practices. Informed by Guthrie & Wigfield's (2000) and Ruddell & Unrau's (2013) conceptual models, we posit that the nature and extent of readers' text engagement and comprehension is highly susceptible to the motivation, knowledge, and intent that readers bring forth for reading. While readers' motivation and behavioral choices shape the direction and intensity of their engagement, their awareness and activation of cognitive and metacognitive strategies scaffold their meaning construction (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Ruddell & Unrau, 2013). In this regard, we distinguish motivation and engagement as distinct but complementary constructs to understand students' reading practices. Whereas motivation is what initiates and drives behaviors—the goals, values and dispositions readers bring toward reading tasks—engagement is the extent of involvement a reader sustains upon initiating the activity—the behavioral decisions and actions enacted during the task (Guthrie, et al., 2012). Drawing upon these perspectives, we presume that engaged readers are committed readers who demonstrate an intentional deployment of strategies and motivated pursuance for generating understanding of texts (Guthrie, et al., 2012; Tracey & Morrow, 2012).

We also understand that readers'

motivation and interest for reading may be both stimulated and constrained by contextual influences of the learning environments in which reading takes place, highlighting the joint responsibility of student and teacher in supporting students' growth as constructors of meaning (Guthrie, et al., 2012; Ruddell & Unrau, 2013). Alexander & Fox (2011) posited that academic reading is purposefully driven by instructors' expectations for course integration and students' choice for engagement and grades (Howard, et al., 2018; Vafeas, 2013). Although college faculty value reading as a core component of course learning, scholars acknowledge inherent instructional challenges such as instructors' over-estimation of students' readiness for course readings (Lei et al., 2010) and their own under-preparedness for reading instruction and integration into classroom learning (Biggs, 2004; Lei et al., 2010; Weinberg, et al., 2012). Consequently, prior research indicates that college readers assert a sense of practicality towards their reading assignments, evaluating the extent of their effort in relation to the task's relevancy for course performance (Del Principe & Ihara, 2016; Howard, et al., 2018).

Methodology

This descriptive qualitative study was

conducted with students at a historically black land-grant university who were enrolled in two technical writing courses during the course of one semester. The institution, nestled off the main thoroughfare in a rural community, enrolls approximately 3,000 undergraduates in bachelor programs across four main fields of study: business and technology; education, arts, and social sciences; pharmacy and health professions; and agricultural and natural sciences. The technical writing course was taught by a member of the research team and is a requirement for all students to support their developing proficiency in professional writing.

Through purposive sampling, seven participants were selected, of which six participated. The following criteria were used for selection: junior or senior status, diversity of major and gender, and stratification of academic achievement ranges. Participants were enrolled as full-time students at the university, majoring in a variety of disciplines with GPAs ranging from 2.76 to 3.3 on a 4.0 scale. We employed these criteria to draw upon a student population whose prior success and academic contexts could deepen our understanding of undergraduates' reading practices across the university curriculum. Table 1 presents participants' names (pseudonyms), class designation, cumulative GPA, and major.

Table 1
Study Participants

<u>Student</u>	<u>Class Designation</u>	<u>GPA</u>	<u>Major</u>
Adana	Junior	3.16	Applied Design
Jasmine	Junior	3.09	Marketing
Sabra	Senior	3.07	Rehabilitation Services
Tyler	Junior	2.88	Music Education
Thaddeus	Junior	3.32	Accounting
Wade	Junior	2.76	Business Administration

Data Sources

Data, collected over a semester, included two in-depth interviews with each participant, each lasting approximately 60 minutes, and a reading log completed by each participant. The first interview was semi-structured (Glesne, 2016) and sought to understand participants' reading practices, how they navigate college-level texts from varied courses, and their perceptions regarding their knowledge of the reading strategies they employ and their sense of self-efficacy in college reading tasks. The second interview was unstructured and specifically aimed at understanding students' perceptions of their curricular reading engagement with additional questions developed after analysis of the first interviews and reading logs. Together, these interviews offered insight into participants' authentic experiences with curricular reading, allowing us to understand from the students, themselves, how they made sense of their reading practices (Seidman, 2019).

Participants also completed a reading log for a one-week period in order to obtain traces of their reading habits, illuminating tacit patterns that are not always known to readers (Foasberg, 2014). Participants were asked to track and record any reading activities they completed over the course of one week, including texts read for academic and personal purposes. The reading log prompted them to write notes on the nature and purpose for the reading, the duration of time spent reading and amount completed, the challenges the student may have perceived, and the reading strategies employed. This approach resulted in a snapshot of each participant's reading activities that were used as a secondary source in conjunction with their interviews to develop a rich, nuanced understanding of their experiences (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). While all six participants participated in both interviews and submitted reading logs, the

completeness of the logs varied. Submissions ranged from six to fourteen entries and included traces of both academic and personal reading activities, such as blogs, social media, and text messages. For the purposes of this study, we analyzed only the entries that pertained to academic reading, including full and partial submissions, as part of the data set. Table 2 presents an overview of the information collected from the logs, including the self-reported types of texts and number of pages, average duration and percentage of reading completed, reading strategies used, and challenges experienced.

Data Analysis

Using constant-comparative methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1999) and a multi-cycle approach (Saldaña, 2016), we analyzed the interview and reading log data through an iterative and recursive process of coding and interpreting. Initial codes were created using gerunds and taxonomies to consider both the processes and ways in which participants discussed their understanding of their reading practices (Glesne, 2016; Roulston, 2010). This process led to the emergence of a codebook and second-cycle analysis to identify existing patterns and relationships within the data (Saldaña, 2016), resulting in the generation of themes that revealed a rich, theoretical understanding of the participants' experiences. To ensure trustworthiness beyond the systematic analysis, we triangulated the interview and reading log data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), and used a portion of the second interview to corroborate initial interpretations. Upon completion of the first draft of findings, one member of the research team conducted an informal in-person member check with each participant to solicit feedback as to whether the findings aligned with the information they shared (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Table 2
Summary of Participants' Reading Logs

Type of Text	Number of Pages (average)	Reading Duration (average minutes)	Percentage of Reading Completed (average percent)	Purpose for Reading	Reading Strategies Used	Challenges Experienced During Reading	Participants Reporting Text Use
Authentic disciplinary text (e.g., field-specific scholarly journal; practitioner documents)	28	45	63%	Studying; Professional development	Referencing dictionary	New vocabulary	Tyler; Wade
Textbook (print)	14	41	47%	Studying; Previewing lecture material	Highlighting; Notetaking; Underlining	Maintaining attention; Text structure not engaging; Monitoring comprehension	Jasmine; Thaddeus
Textbook (digital)	25	55	73%	Previewing lecture material; Studying; Skimming for main ideas	Notetaking	Maintaining attention; Text structure not engaging	Adana; Jasmine
Novel (print)	18	33	90%	Pleasure	Re-reading; Referencing dictionary	New vocabulary; Maintaining attention	Adana
Novel (digital)	4.5 chapters	Not reported	Not reported	Pleasure	Personal reflection	None reported	Jasmine
Supplemental course materials (e.g., lecture notes; instructor handouts)	27	58	73%	Previewing lecture material; Studying; Completing homework	Highlighting; Notetaking; Text Annotation; Predicting Questions; Guided Practice Exercises	Retention of information; Need to re-read material	Adana; Sabra
Digital, web-based resources	1	22	90%	Studying; Research for course assignments	Notetaking	Determining source credibility; Selecting and understanding main ideas	Sabra; Tyler

Positionality

In this study, we endeavored toward theoretical sensitivity (Corbin & Strauss, 2014). We recognize that being white, privileged, academically successful, middle-class researchers, prevents us from narrating these students' stories and we strive to amplify the voices of the participants so they can depict their experiences through their own words. This approach aligns with scholarship on student voice that calls for the recognition of students as important knowledge authorities of their own educational experiences (Bovill, et al., 2011; Cook-Sather, 2002). Throughout data collection, we purposefully sought to reconfigure existing power dynamics by positioning ourselves as learners in our conversations, actively attending to participants' stories and reflections as an opportunity to gain an understanding of their lived experiences. With the understanding that power differentials are difficult to breakdown, the member checks served as a further opportunity for students to enact their authority as authors of their own experiences, ensuring that our interpretations aligned with their own understandings. Much as Brandt (2009) shares long passages of participants' accounts, we included multiple, unedited samples of participants' rich narrations of their experiences and reflections on their meanings in our presentation of findings. As educators who have each worked with diverse postsecondary populations, we are committed to understanding how African American students successfully navigate collegiate literacy expectations.

Findings

Analysis revealed three themes, offering a complex account of students' use of literacy knowledge and practices to navigate academic reading. First, participants positioned themselves as "self-scaffolders," exerting ownership for reading through the development of personal reading strategies in

the perceived absence of instructional support. Participants' accounts also revealed how they actively mediated their reading engagement by employing strategic decisions based on relevance and purpose. We further observed students' agencies for curricular reading through supplementation of the official curriculum and calls for instructor accountability for co-constructing meaningful literacy learning opportunities.

Self-Development of Strategies

Similar to reports from first-year undergraduates (Barnett, 2000; Falk-Ross, 2001), the participants did not reference a strong set of reading strategies developed in middle or high school that supported their transition to college. For Wade, this transition was a realization that college "is like you are on your own," requiring a concerted effort to adapt to new expectations. Jasmine recalled a similar realization: "It was a huge transition... in college, it's like if you don't read it on your own your teacher is not responsible for your bad grade, you are." In response to this shift in ownership for reading, the participants collectively shared a need to learn and employ personal support strategies for managing the increased rigor of college reading. Thaddeus explained the need to read early and actively monitor his understanding with notetaking to account for how the nature of reading had changed, "In college you've got to actually read everything a little more in depth like you've got to really read it." Despite reflecting a strong sense of self-reliance as they scaffolded their own reading, many participants described frustration with the limited instructional support they observed for adopting new reading practices. Adana explained:

I know people make suggestions on how to do things, but they don't really. It's like they give you the materials, but they don't really tell you how to use it. So, I have had a certain professor - say oh well - like you know what you should make or note about

this, but that is all they will say - it's that you should make a note about it. So yeah, you have to find your own way that works for you.

Adana's example illustrates the discrepancy between strategy knowledge and strategy use, noting that a key component of learning generative strategies is a holistic understanding of when, why, and how to employ the strategy effectively. As she suggested, without guidance of a knowledgeable mentor the resulting effort is a process of trial-and-error dependent upon individual student's metacognitive awareness for support. With the exception of Tyler, a music education major who learned some strategies through a first-year seminar, all participants shared Adana's sentiments that learning to meet reading expectations at the postsecondary level was an independent venture with minimal scaffolding provided by instructors.

In reflecting on the reading strategies they developed, participants articulated an acute awareness of their literacy knowledge, denoting their repertoires as varied and purposeful to reading and text demands. Each student described deliberately employing multiple comprehending strategies as they read such as rereading and annotating texts when they perceived a need to clarify understanding. For Wade, a cycle of pre-reading, reflecting, and re-reading texts was critical in helping him deepen his comprehension. He explained:

I like to do like a quick read first and then I don't know. I might not read it again right then and there, but I'll come back to it. I'll think on it and then come back to it and read it thoroughly. I might read it a couple times actually. So, I can understand it better if I read it a couple of times.

Two other students discussed how techniques aimed at supporting closer and more careful reading were initiated with a self-

awareness of text difficulty. In describing his marketing and organizational behavior course readings as "very elaborative," Thaddeus tacitly understood how text structure influenced reading and comprehension, thus sometimes requiring a slower approach. For him, this strategy was to break down the reading assignment into more manageable tasks over the course of multiple days while using highlighting and underlining as he navigated the text content, as he noted the need to "keep focused" throughout his reading log entries. Other participants' logs depicted similar intentionality in coping with text difficulty. For example, Tyler recognized that he needed to take notes to identify the main points "on a large piece of information when a lot of it was not concise with simple ideas" while he read an online text for a music research project.

Taken together, these experiences and reflections demonstrated participants' strong sense of resolve and ownership for their reading practices and speaks to both the determination and resourcefulness of the participants to navigate college-level demands in the perceived absence of instructional support. Our analysis revealed these readers were strategically responsive constructors of meaning (Ruddell & Unrau, 2013), a notable contrast to research suggesting that college students are not adept at drawing upon metacognitive awareness of their reading strategies (Barnett, 2000; Van Blerkom & Van Blerkom, 2004).

A Decision Matrix Driven by Career Goals

Participants' academic reading practices were motivationally driven, and career competency was of central importance. Often, the participants were strategically assessing, almost as a cost-benefit analysis, whether or not the reading was a good investment of time in light of competing demands. When they valued a reading assignment for its potential contribution to vocational proficiency, they were motivated to persist through reading assignments.

Thaddeus, who described accounting as “very complicated,” emphasized the necessity of reading to learn in order become a successful professional: “If you don’t read the materials or read the chapter, you are not going to get it, so I have to read in order to understand what I am trying to be.” This motivation to read through a career orientation perpetuated a distinct persistence for comprehension. In describing their strategies for reading in their area of concentration, many participants alluded to a desire to make deep connections and inferences, Sabra shared:

I’m a rehab major. If I read something about a child case where the parents are neglecting them, I’ll relate that back to maybe what I learned my first semester in junior year about child neglect and the videos that they showed us. Or, maybe you know my mother’s friend told me about it and I looked up some information about it, or maybe I saw a case on *Oprah* about it. So, I just relate personal experience to what I’m reading.

Wade further accentuated this career orientation by using visual imagery while reading in his field of study: “When I am reading it’s always talking about some kind of business and I want to be an entrepreneur, so I put myself in that story.” Connecting the course reading to career relevance helped both Wade and Sabra comprehend the text and retain the information. Tyler’s approach was to take detailed notes to synthesize or condense the main ideas into his own words. When discussing his strategy, Tyler felt that he understood what he was reading if he could “write about it, like I’m just prompted in class to do something the next day, and I can write about it without having to go back to it – it’s how I really know I understood something.” In each of these instances, participants articulated ways in which they constructed personally relevant meaning from their texts, revealing the transactive relationship between reader and text that is critical to

comprehension processes and reflective of engaged reading (Rosenblatt, 1994; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).

Yet, in contrast, participants described a lack of motivation to read in other contexts, such as general education courses, which were not perceived as supporting career competence. Adana explained, “I am not really going to be using these other skills towards my major or towards my career, so I don’t give as much energy towards it.” When participants lacked a career-related connection to the text, reading became a task to pass an assessment or complete an assignment, thus impacting their meaning negotiation. When reading to complete assessments, they intentionally employed more superficial reading strategies, as Sabra described: “You know, just reading it - just to retain the information so I could, you know, do well on my assignment.” As Sabra’s comment illustrates, when a reading had no perceived utility by participants, they applied cursory strategies aimed at completing or retaining the reading just enough to successfully pass the related course assignment. Similar strategies were documented in participants’ reading logs, such as when Adana acknowledged that she struggled to engage with her sociology text despite underlining and taking notes, describing it as “very boring” and completing only 20% of the assignment. While these practices may be viewed as hindering their depth of understanding, participants made strategic choices concerning texts perceived as lacking long-term value for their goals. Tyler explained:

It’s a bit more specific, the strategies for meaning-making, like if I do even read the text for my gen ed class, I’ll skim through and I will make sure I just look for keywords and you know vocabulary as opposed to process and sequences and things like that [in his music education major courses].

This finding complicates recent conversations about undergraduates’

inadequate reading strategies (Barnett, 2000; Van Blerkom & Van Blerkom, 2004) as it shows participants exhibited metacognitive awareness of their reading practices and ensuing comprehension of textual information. Reflective of Guthrie & Wigfield's (2000) notion of engaged readers, these participants deliberately demonstrated both high and low levels of engagement for reading, dependent upon the perceived relevance of the reading for their personal knowledge goals. Moreover, the participants' perceptive decision-making abilities revealed interesting insights into the consumer nature of undergraduates, projecting an image of these participants navigating personal pathways for their literacy and learning experiences. Rejecting the notion of texts being a central knowledge authority, these participants asserted their agencies for determining what constituted meaningful reading and what counted for knowledge.

Meaningful Understanding through the Supplementation of the Official Curriculum

Participants supplemented instruction and required texts with additional resources such as blogs and peer discussions to enhance their understanding when they felt course texts were limited or disconnected from the applied disciplinary understanding they sought in preparation for their careers. For example, Sabra, whose career aspirations are to counsel adolescent girls, read blogs about teen issues outside of class because she felt class readings were limited in offering practical insights into her future professional practice. The participants also described referring to online and curricular resources more often than their instructors as a way to gain additional, nuanced perspective on the material often citing the accessibility of these resources outside of class and the desire to deepen understanding on a more personal level. Overall, many of the participants felt a need to triangulate their comprehension through multiple sources. Tyler explained:

I enjoy the reading; however it's not as effective when you don't have the supplemental material that helps you understand what you are reading, or if you don't have the other assignments, or you just don't have any other forums to understand.

Adana, versed in the jargon of the arts, commented that she views a college instructor as "just another material on her materials list." She suggested that print texts, web resources, and peers share space on that list. With the multitude of resources the participants could access to build their knowledge, they did not perceive instructors as the primary source for information. Jasmine explained:

Most of the time I know what they are saying because I read it, but if I don't understand something they are saying, I'll write it down. And then I'll write down what I'm thinking they're saying or trying to say and then I'll go to my professor and say, 'Is this what they're saying? Is this what they mean?'. And then, if his opinion isn't my opinion, I'll try to understand what he's saying from his perspective, but if I still don't understand it, sometimes I get discouraged and be like whatever. But if I'm like really interested and it's like really bothering me to know, then I'll go online and I'll research it or I'll get like a peer review or a peer critique. I'll text my friends like, what do you think of this, or something, you know, try to get others' opinions and then slowly but surely, I begin to understand what it is that they were trying to say.

Jasmine's account provides an interesting way to view academic reading as a multi-source pursuit and positions the reader at an intersection of multiple perspectives. While participants' descriptions depicted them as consumers of a wide range of text and information sources, the criticality of such

sourcing remains a question. Although many of the participants did not share Jasmine's tenacity for negotiating meaning, this finding suggests that these college readers had the willingness to hone in on their interest, curiosity, and drive in pursuing disciplinary reading, though also highlighting that these motivations may be too little stimulated and sustained.

In regards to this untapped interest for deepening reading engagement, participants seemed particularly aware of the importance of understanding the purpose and relevance of assigned readings. Some participants perceived disconnects between assigned readings, instruction and disciplinary learning, questioning the relevance of reading for some classes. Rather than seeking out these connections on their own, participants often put the onus for relevant instruction and scaffolding on their instructors. Tyler discussed the disconnect he often feels about readings and assignments in some non-major courses:

I just feel like, you know, my gen ed I can get by without them [readings] somehow and a lot of them [professors] don't really focus on the readings as much as my major classes. They kind of give you the reading and if you don't understand it, you can ask questions and that is pretty much it. We don't really do like a lot of follow up things in most of my gen ed classes that I have had, except for a few.

He then described how this disconnect subsequently impacts his engagement with course readings:

One of the things that I put in there [referencing the reading log], we had like fifteen pages to read and I think I read maybe the first two, but the whole time I'm reading it, I am not retaining anything. I'm not paying any attention to it whatsoever. So I have to have a purpose. If I don't have an intent, if it is not expressed explicitly

and I can't figure out for myself, then I just really don't care.

Although aware of the potential that reading has to support content learning, Tyler's comments raise concerns regarding the joint responsibility of instructors and students in shaping the role and purpose of academic reading. While denoting the importance of setting intent, he also acknowledges the need for faculty support in developing students' reading stances. Jasmine further emphasized, "We want to feel like we are actually immersed in the text and that the text is going to benefit us, whereas we are just reading it to pass a test or reading it to get a good grade in the class." Jasmine and Tyler's quotes demonstrate the frustration felt by many of the participants when they perceived reading was too often overlooked or neglected altogether in instructional emphasis across major and general education courses. For many participants, the desire for meaningful curricular reading experiences was often at odds with their own persistence to create such opportunities independent of instructor scaffolding. In addition to their stated reflections, we noted this tension throughout participants' logs (see Table 2) which revealed a range of curricular reading patterns from higher levels of engagement and completion with digital, authentic, and supplemental course materials than reported with print-based textbooks to more self-reported challenges with attention and comprehension for reading to study for class.

It is important to note that although participants acknowledged reading was assigned across course contexts, they perceived a consistent lack of discussion and integration of course readings during class instruction. While all students expressed a desire for meaningful reading experiences, Jasmine made pronounced calls for accountability. She explained, "As a professor, it's your job to make sure I understand. So, once I failed the quiz, what's next? Are you going to help me to understand?" In her

questioning, Jasmine articulates a keen understanding that assessments for which the purpose is reading accountability produces low motivation and insufficient understanding. This stance is important to recognize in light of scholarship that suggests the influential nature of classroom contexts and the teacher's role in supporting students' literacy engagement (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Ruddell & Unrau, 2013). Reflecting upon such influence, Tyler described:

I was lucky to have a teacher that did it [taught reading strategies] cause, I guess, since we were all education majors she had us really figure out these are strategies you can use to help you in class. We learned about chunking. We learned about learning association. We learned about stuff like that, but it was still brief and it was still freshman year, you know when the stuff that we are reading are not as intensive and as tedious as what we are doing now in upper-level classes. I don't think, besides that teacher, none of my professors have really offered ideas or solutions to try to read and handle these heavy texts we have.

While Tyler valued the role this education professor played in supporting his emergent literacy knowledge, it is worth noting that this was a singular account provided by one participant, signaling that instructors have the knowledge, but perhaps are more reticent to devote limited instructional time to such development. Regardless, the participants seemingly pushed back on the notion of a professor's instructional autonomy by calling upon them as co-constructors of meaningful literacy learning experiences.

Discussion & Significance

Collectively, the findings position the participants as motivated, strategic readers

within the diverse context of college learning. This context also includes the current sociopolitical context wherein student-led protests, sit-ins, and calls for administrator resignations reflect an empowered population of African American young adults and their allies who seek to reclaim the values, mission, and purpose for higher education in America. The voices of these students have been underrepresented in academic discourse (Harper & Davis, 2012; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995), but recent events have sharpened their stake for learning within the Academy, demanding that their perspectives be heard, considered, and included. As Willie, one of the participants, exclaimed after his first interview, "I like this interviewing. Someone wants to hear what I have to say." In these few words, Willie makes a profound statement about the power of inviting student voices in conversations about student learning, reflecting a sense of empowerment and agency for being recognized as a knowledgeable authority of his own experiences (Bovill, et al., 2011; Cook-Sather, 2002). Just as the participants in this study demonstrated a fervent consciousness about the need to reenvision the perspectives from whom they learn and the curriculum of which they study, their peers across the nation have powerfully called attention for the need to value students as partners in cultivating their educational experiences.

The findings also complicate scholarship that diminishes students' literacy knowledge (Barnett, 2000; Van Blerkom & Van Blerkom, 2004) by highlighting how participants engaged in strategic evaluation and pursued reading engagement even in the perceived absence of instructional support (Park, 2013; Phillips & Phillips, 2007). Consequently, this study raises implications for university instructors to examine the ways in which they engage students in course readings. Faculty, although described by participants as having a particular passivity towards supporting students' reading practices, have important expertise that

shapes the learning environment and outcomes for students. While participants were critical in their perceptions of faculty supporting their reading activities, we problematize this perspective as one that perhaps does not align with professors' expectations of their role as content facilitators rather than literacy teachers (Alvermann & Moje, 2013). Despite this distinction, faculty have a joint responsibility in supporting student engagement and understanding and, as Jasmine suggests, should embrace the opportunities that disciplinary reading offers as a "two-way street" of constructing meaningful learning. While it may be necessary to assign course readings, quizzes and papers as supplemental learning opportunities to class instruction it is not sufficient in and of itself to support the motivation, growth, and engagement of readers (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). Students need, and indeed want, to have a deeper understanding of their practices and knowledge, which can come through explicit and generative instruction for course readings that fosters students' intrinsic ownership for comprehension (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).

It is also important to emphasize the shared sense of responsibility these students had, often positioning themselves as constructive agents for their learning. However, many of these students described reading as a necessary, independent means to an end in that it was used to augment their in-class learning with the intent of supporting career capacities. This dichotomy between self-directed learning and a career readiness orientation presents an interesting challenge for today's instructors in that it underscores the importance of disciplinary mentorship for shaping students' appreciation and understanding of literacy within and beyond school-based norms. As Mann (2000) suggests, we need to "understand why [students] approach and experience the reading of texts in the ways that they do" in order to situate its value as a meaningful activity for students (p. 316). Through class

discussions instructors can facilitate feedback on course readings as a way to learn from students' experiences and inform instructional practice. Additionally, the students in this study consistently called for greater integration between content and career, perhaps signaling a need to shift towards a focus on career readiness at the postsecondary level which has been so prevalent in the secondary context from where these students came (Barnes & Slate, 2013). More research is needed to further investigate this observation, specifically geared towards understanding student and faculty perceptions about the value and role of traditional text readings and writing assignments for content mastery and career readiness as a way to find common ground towards meaningful literacy learning experiences. Cultivating classroom spaces where students are invited to become "co-creators" (Bovill, et al., 2011, p.134) of their academic literacy experiences can not only offer valuable perspective to faculty in shaping meaningful and relevant student learning, but can also foster students' agencies and ownership for their development (Cook-Sather, 2002).

Moreover, this study contributes to larger, albeit limited, conversations surrounding African American undergraduates' literacy experiences, illuminating their agency and ownership for literacy and learning. Their determinant mindsets and perceptive navigation of course demands afforded opportunities to cultivate their own reading practices and curricular learning experiences towards personally meaningful needs and aspirations. These findings speak to a complex dynamic between the perceived and real value of academic reading for college-level success. Although we are ardent advocates that reading is fundamental to disciplinary learning (Holschuh, 2019), the participants' accounts revealed they were successful students at the institution despite their varied degrees of fidelity towards reading to learn. Often misrepresented in educational discourse as

lesser in achievement, these students challenge that association, as they are successful upper-division students whose voices offer a compelling counter story of strength, knowledge, and confidence to the traditional, deficit-oriented narrative about African American college students. These students are ready and willing partners who, in rejecting their perception of the Academy's passivity, enact their own standards for what counts for reading and learning in undergraduate courses.

Author Note

I would like to recognize and thank Dr. Courtney Harned and Dr. Gray Jack for their contributions as members of the research team to this project. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Heather Porter, 1101 Camden Avenue, Salisbury MD 21801. Email hdporter@salisbury.edu.

References

- Alexander, P. A., & Fox, E. (2011). Adolescents as readers. In M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. P. Afflerbach (Eds.). *Handbook of reading research Vol. 4* (pp. 156–176). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203840412>
- Alvermann, D. & Moje, E. (2013). Adolescent literacy instruction and the discourse of “every teacher a teacher of reading.” In D. Alvermann, N. Unrau, & R. Ruddall (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (6th ed., pp. 1072–1103). International Reading Association.
- Banks, J. (2005). African American college students' perceptions of their high school literacy preparation. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 35(2), 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2005.10850171>
- Barnett, J.E. (2000). Self-regulated reading and test preparation among college students. *Journal of college reading and learning*, 31(1), 42–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2000.10850100>
- Barnes, W., & Slate, J.R. (2013). College-readiness is not one-size-fits-all. *Current Issues in Education*, 16(1), 1–12. <https://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/view/1070>
- Biggs, S.A. (2004). Reading comprehension instruction: Building on what we have learned. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 33, 74–85.
- Bovill, C., Cook-Sather, A., & Felten, P. (2011). Students as co-creators of teaching approaches, course design and curricula: Implications for academic developers. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 16(2), 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2011.568690>
- Brandt, D. (2009). *Literacy and learning: Reflections on writing, reading, and society*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bray, G.B., Pascarella, E.T., & Pierson, C.T. (2004). Postsecondary education and some dimensions of literacy development: An exploration of longitudinal evidence. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(3), 306–330. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.39.3.3>
- Cao, L., & Nietfeld, J. L. (2007). Examining the multiplicative relations among achievement goals, strategy use, and class performance in educational psychology. *Teaching Educational Psychology*, 2, 1–20.
- Clump, M.A., Bauer, H., & Bradley, C. (2004). The extent to which psychology students read textbooks: A multiple class analysis of reading across the psychology curriculum. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 31(3), 227–232.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2002). Authorizing students' perspectives: Toward trust, dialogue, and change in education. *Educational Researcher*, 31(4), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X031004003>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2014). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Del Principe, A., & Ihara, R. (2016). “I bought the book and I didn’t need it”: What reading looks like at an urban community college. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 43(3), 229–244.

- Delpit, L.D. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. The New Press.
- Eckert, L.S. (2008). Bridging the pedagogical gap: Intersections between literacy and reading theories in secondary and postsecondary literacy instruction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 110–118. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.52.2.2>
- Falk-Ross, F.C. (2001). Toward the new literacy: Changes in college students' reading comprehension strategies following reading/writing projects. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 45(4), 278–288. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40012204>
- Fitzpatrick, L., & McConnell, C. (2008). Student reading strategies and textbook use: An inquiry into economics and accounting courses. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 3.
- Foasberg, N.M. (2014). Student reading practices in print and electronic media. *College & Research Libraries*, 75(5), 705–723. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.75.5.705>
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, F., (1999). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Routledge.
- Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gorzycki, M., Desa, G., & Howard, P.J., & Allen, D.D. (2020). “Reading is important,” but “I don’t read”: Undergraduates’ experiences with academic reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 63(5), 499–508. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1020>
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, Vol. 3* (pp. 403–422). Earlbaum.
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & You, W. (2012). Instructional contexts for engagement and achievement in reading. In S.L. Christensen, A.L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 601–634). Springer Science. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_29
- Harper, S.R., & Davis, C.H.F. (2012). They (don't) care about education: A counternarrative on Black male students' responses to inequitable schooling. *The Journal of Educational Foundations*, 26(Winter/Spring), 103–120.
- Hendel, D.D., & Harrold, R.D. (2004). Undergraduate student leisure interests over three decades. *College Student Journal*, 38, 557–568.
- Holschuh, J. P. (2019). College reading and studying: The complexity of academic literacy task demands. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 62(6), 599–604. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.876>
- Hoeft, M. E. (2012). Why university students don’t read: What professors can do to increase compliance. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsoitl.2012.060212>

- Howard, P.J., Gorzycki, M., Desa, G., & Allen, D.D. (2018). Academic reading: Comparing students' and faculty perceptions of its value, practice, and pedagogy. *Journal of College Reading & Learning*, 48(3), 189–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2018.1472942>
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W.F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47–68.
- Lei, S., Rhinehart, P., Howard, H., & Cho, J. (2010). Strategies for improving reading comprehension among college students. *Reading Improvement*, 47(1), 30–42.
- Lewin, T. (2005, August 17). Many going to college aren't ready, report says. *New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/17/education/17scores.html>
- Linderholm, T. (2006). Reading with purpose. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 36(2), 70–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2006.10850189>
- Linderholm, T., & Wilde, A. (2010). College students' beliefs about comprehension when reading for different purposes. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 40(2), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2010.10850327>
- Lockhart, T., & Soliday, M. (2016). The critical place of reading in writing transfer (and beyond): A report of student experiences. *Pedagogy*, 16(1), 23–37.
- Mann, S. J. (2000). The students' experience of reading. *Higher Education*, 39, 297–317. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003953002704>
- Merriam, S.B., & Tisdell, E.J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 249–259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.249>
- Mokhtari, K., Reichard, C., & Gardner, A. (2009). The impact of internet and television use on the reading habits and practices of college students. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(7), 609–619. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.52.7.6>
- Murden, T., & Gillespie, C.S. (1997). The role of textbooks and reading in content area classrooms: What are teachers and students saying? In Linek & Sturtevant (Eds.), *Exploring Literacy* (pp. 87–96). College Reading Association.
- Nist, S. L., & Holschuh, J. L. (2000). Comprehension strategies at the college level. In R. F. Flippo & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (pp. 75–104). Erlbaum.
- Park, S.W. (2013). The potential of web 2.0 tools to promote reading engagement in a general education course. *TechTrends*, 57(2), 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-013-0645-1>

- Perna, L.W. (2000). Differences in the decision to attend college among African Americans, Hispanics, and Whites. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(2), 117-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2000.11778831>
- Phillips, B.J., & Phillips, F. (2007). Sink or skim: Textbook reading behaviors of introductory accounting students. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 22(1), 21-44. <https://doi.org/10.2308/iace.2007.22.1.21>
- Porter, H.D., Kim, K., Franzak, J.K., & MacDonald, K. (2020). Reframing and repositioning college readers' assumptions about reading through eye movement miscue analysis. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 63(5), 519-528. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1033>
- Rosenblatt, L.M. (1994). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Roulston, K. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 199-228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794109356739>
- Ruddell, R.B., & Unrau, N.J. (2013). Reading as a motivated meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In D. Alvermann, N. Unrau, & R. Ruddell's (Eds.) *Theoretical models and processes of reading*, (6th ed., pp. 1015-1068). International Reading Association.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Schraw, G., & Bruning, R. (1996). Readers' implicit models of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(3), 290-305. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.31.3.4>
- Seidman, I. (2019). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Sikorski, J.F., Rich, K., Saville, B.K., Buskist, W., Drogan, O., Davis, S.F., Griggs, R.A., Jackson, S.L., Marek, P., Boyce, T.E., Geller, E.S., Harvey, J.H., & Hofmann, W.J. (2002). Faculty Forum. Student use of introductory texts: Comparative survey findings from two universities, *Teaching of Psychology*, 29(4), 312-320. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328023TOP2904_13
- Taraban, R., Rynearson, K., & Kerr, M. (2000). College students' academic performance and self-reports of comprehension strategy use. *Reading Psychology*, 21(4), 283-308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/027027100750061930>
- Tracey, D. H., & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Vafeas, M. (2013). Attitudes toward, and use of, textbooks among marketing undergraduates: An exploratory study. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 35(3), 245-258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475313482927>
- Valeri-Gold, M., Deming, M.P., (2009). Reading, writing and the college student. In R. F. Flippo & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (2nd ed., pp. 149-173). Erlbaum.

- Van Blerkom, M.L., & Van Blerkom, D.L. (2004). Self-monitoring strategies used by developmental and non-developmental college students. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 34(2), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2004.10850161>
- Van Camp, D. & Van Camp W. (2012). Using content reading assignments in a psychology course to teach critical reading skills. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 13(1). 86–99. <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/josotl/article/view/2184>
- Weinberg, A., Wiesner, E., Benesh, B., Boester, T. (2012). Undergraduate students' self-reported use of mathematics textbooks. *Problems, Resources, and Issues in Mathematics Undergraduate Studies*, 22(2), 152–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511970.2010.509336>
- White, J.W., & Ali-Khan, C. (2013). The role of academic discourse in minority students' academic assimilation. *American Secondary Education*, 42(1), 24–42. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43694175>
- White, J.W., & Lowenthal, P.R. (2011). Minority college students and tacit "codes of power": Developing academic discourses and identities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34(2), 283–318. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2010.0028>

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

The Journal of College Literacy and Learning (JCLL) welcomes material related to advancing scholarship on reading, writing, and study strategies at the postsecondary level. *JCLL* is published annually by the College Literacy and Learning Special Interest Group of the International Literacy Association. It provides a forum for the exchange of information regarding research, theory, and practice.

JCLL is a refereed publication; therefore, all manuscripts are evaluated without author identification by members of the *JCLL* Editorial Review Board. The review process begins with an initial evaluation by the editorial team to determine appropriateness. Appropriate manuscripts are then sent out to a minimum of two reviewers for a double-blind peer review. Following this, the editorial team will provide a decision and feedback to authors. The entire review process typically takes approximately 10-12 weeks.

General Guidelines for Submissions

- Previously published or works under review elsewhere will not be considered.
- For all submissions, writing, citation, and documentation style should follow APA (7th edition) guidelines.
- Figures and tables should be all black and white, and should be submitted as separate files as well as embedded in the manuscript itself.
- Although manuscript length is not the primary consideration, full-length articles addressing research, pedagogy and theory should be 20-25 double-spaced pages and no more than 6000 words (excluding references).
- Submissions for other regular sections (including Research Briefs, Theory to Practice, and Tips for the Classroom) should be 8-12 double-spaced pages.
- Instructional Material and Book Reviews should be 500-1500 words.
- Authors should submit the following electronically, via email:
 - the full manuscript, including references and a 150-word max. abstract prepared for blind review (with author and contact information omitted)
 - a separate file containing a cover letter and title page with all authors' names, institutional affiliations, and full contact information for the first author

To be considered for Volume 48 (Spring 2022), manuscripts must be submitted by November 1, 2021.

Submissions after this date will be considered for Volume 49 (Spring 2023)

All manuscripts should be submitted via email to the following address:

Laurie Bauer, Associate Editor

Journal of College Literacy and Learning

Email: laurie.bauer@uc.edu

JCLL

The journal of the College Literacy and Learning ~ Special Interest Group of the
International Literacy Association

JCLL is online at www.J-CLL.org