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Abstract

This study explores the similarities and differences between concurrent enrollment (CE) courses and on-campus courses. It specifically looks at the construction of place as location, locale, and sense of place (SOP) within first year composition (FYC) and how the understanding of place affects students' and instructors' roles within the places of instruction. Within this framework, identity, interpersonal relationships, responsibility, and work are examined as indicators of "college student" identity within the high school setting. Ultimately, the study questions the validity of CE as a college course if it exists in the high school setting.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Tuesday morning. Fourth period. ENGL 104: College Writing 1. Some students are just arriving, some are coming from math, robotics, art, or any other number of courses. One thing all these college students have in common is that they are all high school students.

Tuesday night. 5:00pm. ENGL 104: College Writing 1. Some students are just arriving, some are coming from work, the dining hall, practice, or any other number of responsibilities. One thing all these students have in common is that they are all college students.

These classes share the same course name, syllabus, assignments, rubrics, and grading scale. In theory, these spaces of learning are the same. However, although legislation, accreditation bodies, and educational institutions work to create alignment between these spaces, are they the same in practice? Can they be the same? These two seemingly similar spaces are both first year composition (FYC) courses, but one is on-campus and the other is in the high school. While college classes on college campuses are an established entity and a concept readily understood, the way that college classes take place on high school campuses is currently being defined through new legislation and practices that prompt a closer look into concurrent enrollment (CE). That closer look is the purpose of this study.

CE/CCP

On the national level, concurrent enrollment is defined as college credit courses offered to high school students within the high school setting and taught by high school teachers. CE allows “students [to] gain exposure to the academic challenges of college while in their supportive high school environment” (NACEP, n.d., para. 1). The National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) has created standards to ensure consistency, rigor, and standard of achievement between CE courses and their on-campus counterparts. Additionally, NACEP also sets standards for instructor requirements. While sixteen states have
adopted NACEP standards into state policy, some states have created their own, and one of those is Ohio.

The Ohio Department of Higher Education’s College Credit Plus (CCP) is an all-inclusive title for college courses offered in multiple settings: the high school, the college campus, and online. Therefore, concurrent enrollment is part of CCP; because CCP includes more than concurrent enrollment, CCP will not be used in this study when specifically addressing concurrent enrollment courses. Like NACEP standards, CCP also addresses the nature of the courses under revised code 3365.12. According to 33 Ohio Rev. Code (2011), “courses offered under the college credit plus program shall be the same courses that are included in the partnering college’s course catalogue for college level, nonremedial courses” (para. 1). The concept of consistency and “sameness” between the college courses in the high school and those on campus is emphasized. However, with different spaces, is it possible to have the same course? This question is what drives the research of this thesis.

FYC

According to the Ohio Department of Higher Education (2016), in the 2015-2016 school year, more than 52,000 Ohio high school students took college courses through CCP. Out of those courses, English was the most popular subject area with 24% of the students taking some type of English course through CCP (Ohio Department, 2016). Although CE courses can be in many areas of study, the popularity of English courses affords possibilities for research. The popularity of the area of study and my own experience as a CE instructor for college English courses on both high school and college campuses offers a focus for my research of CE places, specifically within first year composition (FYC).

Before stepping into the place of FYC, building an understanding of the course, its goals, and common functions gives context to the space FYC already inhabits within the university.
Looking at the make-up of FYC, Hansen (2010) identifies commonalities of what she calls the "generic brand" of FYC (p. 9). In other words, while differences exist among programs and courses, many FYC courses include at least some elements of this "generic brand." One common goal or theoretical leaning is that "FYC should introduce students to the rhetorical practices of the academy – the intellectual and discursive moves that are common to all disciplines, moves that students need to know how to make if they are to succeed in college" (Hansen, 2010, p. 10). This belief speaks to FYC as a foundational element of introduction to and success in college. Yancey and Morrison (2006) recognize and support this foundational purpose of FYC as they examine FYC curriculum. Referencing the "Portraits of Composition" study of which Yancey was a part, Yancey and Morrison (2006) discuss how the study found that over half of the respondents "taught a curriculum focused on academic discourse" (p. 268). Academic discourse is communication within an academic setting and perhaps more aligned with Blau's (2006) discussion of intellectual communities and how college establishes a new discourse community that is distinctly different from high school. Based on Blau's (2006) view of discourse in the college setting, academic discourse requires challenge of preconceived ideas, questioning, and entrance into a community that requires more independent thought.

Gutierrez (1995) adds to this concept of academic discourse by stating that "Becoming a member of a discourse community and developing discourse competence requires having linguistic knowledge, as well as knowing how to act, talk, interpret, and think according to a particular cultural or social group" (p. 23-24). Therefore, within the college and academic discourse community, part of FYC's goal is to introduce students to the ways of acting, talking, and thinking within the university. Therefore, the focus on academic discourse and, by extension, the academic discourse community highlights FYC's role as integral to the entrance into this
discourse community.

As Blau (2006) points out, the academic and intellectual community is an "entire culture whose most distinctive features are those that render it wholly unlike the culture of high school" (p. 370). Whether the high school and college spaces of learning are truly "wholly unlike" each other, the reality that these spaces are different needs to be recognized as CE becomes part of the discussion and part of the academic discourse community.

Two Places of Instruction

College courses entering the high school setting prompt instructors and students to deal with more than just different grading scales, assignments, and course numbers. Yancey and Morrison's (2006) research shows that the differences between the spaces of high school and college are more ingrained in the cultures of those communities. The culture of these communities is important for students because as Bizzell (1982/2011) asserts, "what is underdeveloped is their [students'] knowledge of the ways experience is constituted and interpreted in the academic discourse community" (p. 381). Reither (1985/2000) echoes the importance of discourse communities within reference to Bizzell (1982/2011) and states that "student writing difficulties often stem not from faulty or ineffective composing processes but, rather, from unfamiliarity with academic discourse conventions" (287). The underdeveloped familiarity for students highlights the very issues that need to be developed to enter a new academic discourse community: knowledge, vocabulary, context, interpretation, and ways of thinking. The necessity of developing this knowledge and these abilities for success in the college setting increases the importance of how students gain or are taught this information.

Understanding discourse communities can also help explain the issues that may arise when that college academic discourse community moves into the high school community. Yancey and Morrison (2006) assert that "The discourse communities that these composition
programs [high school and college composition] inhabit are quite different” (p. 269). Therefore, when CE becomes part of the discussion, the “quite different” discourse communities become intertwined. As CE asks students to enter a new discourse community while still entrenched in the high school culture, it creates a disconnect between the two spaces of learning: high school and college. The incongruences between high school and college settings, cultures, and ways of thinking and interpreting offer unique challenges in attempting to have students enter a new discourse community that is physically rooted in another. For example, as students attempt to enter the college community, they are constantly reminded that they are not college students: announcements, bells, assemblies, senior surveys, parent-teacher conferences, and any other tenets of the high school setting. The importance and impact of the discourse community and the difficulty of students’ entrance into this community highlights why an important part of FYC’s role is to introduce students to the academic discourse community. Understanding the purpose of FYC on the college campus and the differences between the college and high school spaces can help identify the issues that may arise when trying to standardize those different communities through concurrent enrollment.

As a way to begin understanding the similarities and differences between the college and high school communities, I provide a brief overview of my own experience teaching FYC at both the high school and college settings. The four main variables impacted by the different spaces are the following: student population, daily activities, schedule, and modes of communication. All students within my CE course were high school students while students in my FYC course on the college campus included high school students, first-year college students, transfer students, and non-traditional students. My CE course met five days a week for forty-seven minutes each class period while my on-campus course met one day a week for three hours. Therefore, CE offered
more face-to-face interaction and communication with students than my on-campus course. While both college and high school settings had activities throughout the day, those activities within a college setting were more optional and less invasive. In the high school, announcements, fire drills, and assemblies were just a few of the interruptions that were part of the day-to-day.

As the instructor, I am one factor that remained constant between these two spaces. However, being a first time TA on a college campus was a new role even though I had taught the ENGL 104 CE course the previous year. My own familiarity with these two spaces may also need to be considered. For the CE course, I was teaching students I had taught previously in an English 10 course, I was in a classroom I had taught in for 14 years, and I was surrounded by colleagues I had worked and socialized with for just as many years. As a TA, I was teaching students I had never taught before, was in a classroom in one of the science buildings, and was teaching down the hall from an instructor I did not know and never met. My on-campus students may have also experienced a feeling of alienation as they were coming from diverse backgrounds and were also new to the campus. Therefore, for all the “sameness” between these courses, many differences existed as well. I wonder if these courses really were and are the same or if standards can overcome the differences. Additionally, what are the implications for the standardization of CE and on-campus courses when considering the issue of space and the rhetorical notion of space?

**Transition and Learning Space**

In order to best research these spaces of learning, it is important to first understand how the space of CE has been defined and characterized, with a focus on its supposed position as a transitional space to develop college readiness (Karp, 2012; Denecker, 2013). Much of the research on college readiness looks at students who have completed their high school education,
have graduated, and are now entering college (Denni hy, 2015; Davies, 2010). However, with CE, this transition is no longer constrained to two separate spaces. As a result, concurrent enrollment creates the condition for two environments, high school and college, to exist in one space: high school. Because students earn high school and college credit for CE courses, viewing the college course as completely separate from the high school setting it inhabits is not really feasible. The college course offers college rigor, guidelines, outcomes, grading scale, and a theoretical framework that aligns with the partnering university. The high school setting offers convenience, familiarity, and connections to high school culture (lockers, bells, announcements).

These offerings from both the college and the high school impact the literal and physical space that CE inhabits. While the class is theoretically in the college, it is physically in the high school. Because physical locations hold meaning built from experiences, the reality of CE courses is that the lines between literal and figurative space become blurred. The outcome of this blurring is that the space of CE is not distinctly part of high school or college culture and learning.

Because of the overlap, this space is often seen as transitional or liminal as it functions as an in-between from high school to college since it inhabits both worlds (Hofmann & Volo ch, 2012; Karp, 2012; Denecker, 2013). As a liminal space, Hofmann and Voloch (2012) present the space of dual enrollment as more than just transition. It is a space that highlights the “unease of dissolved boundaries and creates a productive tension” for secondary and postsecondary partners to work together (p. 101). Because the partners straddle two educational spheres, the work done with defining expectations for “college-ready students” and “college-level work” rests within the realm of transition (p. 101). Karp (2012) also places dual enrollment as transitional space as she looks to the space as one that “can contribute to college preparation” (p.
21), CE as a space of preparation for college – not as a college space. This view of space as transitional or liminal is a contradiction to the legislation that places the CE space as equivalent to the on-campus space.

Although it might seem to make sense to use the CE setting as a transitional space, according to standards and guidelines, the CE setting is not meant to be transitional. According to the 33 Ohio Revised Code (2011), as previously mentioned, the courses offered to high school students are to be the same as those offered on the college campuses. With the CE setting established as the same as on-campus courses, the transition from high school to college is no longer a defined period of time that exists between high school and college. Additionally, although identified as a college course, the high school setting of CE creates some questions about its ability to be “the same” as an on-campus course. The literal space of CE connects the course to the high school. The figurative space of theory and practice connects the course to the college. The disconnect that Yancey and Morrison (2006) addressed between these discourse communities and the forced overlap from concurrent enrollment highlight the potential problem of defining this space. Figuring out how to define this space prompts numerous questions. What is the intent of CE? What is the reality of CE? How does the space of CE factor in to understanding its function? With CE labeled as high school credit, college credit, and a transitional space, figuring out what the space of CE actually is can potentially help structure courses that are more effective. Figuring out what CE space actually is helps ensure that all stakeholders – legislators and K-16 administrators, instructors, and students – can understand the purpose and role of concurrent enrollment within education.

**Theory of Place**

Theories of place can help inform the answers to these questions about CE and the learning environment. A greater theoretical understanding of place allows for more fruitful
analysis of concurrent enrollment and how place impacts concurrent enrollment’s ability to recreate a college course in a high school setting. Beginning with the geographical concept of place, political geographer Agnew (1987) distinguishes three variances of place: location, locale, and “sense of place” (as cited in Cresswell, 2004, p. 16). While Agnew (1987) discussed these concepts in relation to the world economy, Cresswell (2004) places this three-prong discussion into Humanistic Geography. Within his understanding, location is the most barren view of place as it focuses on the physical or geographical position (Cresswell, 2004, p. 17). Viewing place as a set of coordinates or a place on a map is barren because it only tells the “where” of a place—not the “who” or “what” of what happens in that place. For the learning space of CE, a clear distinction exists between the college campus and the high school. The physical location is different.

Locale builds upon the geographical position and develops location in relation to the individual by focusing on the objects and surroundings of an individual (Cresswell, 2004, p. 17). Locale develops the idea of place by including the objects that inhabit a place and a person’s location within that place and with those objects. For the CE setting, this includes the objects of a locker, textbooks, visuals related to the high school (mascots, school colors, etc.), and students’ placement within specific classrooms and other school areas, like the lunchroom.

While locale includes the concept of the individual, sense of place embodies connotative elements of place as it focuses on how individuals are emotionally attached to a location (Cresswell, 2004, p. 17). Zia, et al (2014) concur with the multifaceted view of place as they claim that the central concept that encompasses the distinction between place and sense of place is in many respects the distinction between the denotation and connotation of a word. Place is more about the “physical space,” while “sense of place” is about “personal attachments,
memories, relationships" within that physical space (Zia, et al, 2014, p. 283). Place is often separated from the concept of location in order to embody the connotative elements present in sense of place, which aligns with Cresswell’s (2004) interpretation of Agnew’s distinctions between location, locale, and sense of place. It is necessary to understand the distinction among location, locale, and sense of place in order to begin to understand the complexity of requiring a high school setting to become a college setting. Additional theoretical implications of sense of place will be developed later in Chapter 2 in the literature review.

The Study

**Autoethnography.** As I moved between high school and college instruction and became more involved in FYC in both of these spaces, I experienced the similarities and differences between these spaces. A desire to look more closely at these spaces, especially in the climate of CCP and an increased push for post-secondary options for high school students, was the catalyst for this research.

Autoethnography is a legitimate and fitting research approach for my study of CE and the places in which it exists. One reason that autoethnography is the best choice for my research is that it “recognize[s] the innumerable ways personal experience influences the research process” (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011, p. 274). As an instructor within high school, CE, and college spaces, my personal experience is a part of my research. Additionally, educational research should take into consideration the voices of those involved in the research in order to protect against an authoritarian approach that could silence voices or exploit members of the educational communities, especially students and instructors (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011, p. 274). This approach has been used by researchers in many areas of research to present more narrative and analytical socially conscious research (Ellis, Bochner, Pratt, Chang, Belcher, Connor, Casanave, Vandrick, Anderson).
Along with the acceptance of autoethnography as a legitimate research method, looking at the word “autoethnography” supports the foundation for my research about my experiences with space and concurrent enrollment. As Canagarajah (2012) explains, auto applies to the self, “whether one’s own experiences or those of one’s community” (p. 113), or in my case, both of these situations. First of all, I am a member of the educational community, specifically at the high school level. Since CE impacts the curriculum for my students, I am part of the community that is impacted by the implementation of CE courses. I have colleagues who currently teach and are acquiring the education to teach CE. Issues related to continuing education and course scheduling for CE are part of my educational community. Additionally, I am a CE instructor, so as I engage with CE courses, my own experience is part of that engagement.

Because of my role in the CE community, the school cultures impact me, which connects to “ethno.” Ethno addresses “how culture shapes and is shaped by the personal” (Canagarajah, 2012, p. 113). By placing the research within the frame of “sense of place,” the personal and how it shapes one’s culture is an integral part of the research. By placing myself into the research, as a high school and CE instructor and as a student finishing up my Master’s in Rhetoric and Writing, this involvement allows me to reflect on my own experiences, identify similarities and differences among instructors and classrooms, look for trends, and begin to identify areas for further research.

The final element of autoethnography – “graphy” – focuses on writing and “research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyze” (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011, p. 273). This focus is reflected within the reporting of the research and the focus on FYC. My own writing and the writing I ask my students to do, especially within CE, are both informed by my experiences within composition and education.
Additionally, autoethnography is the most responsible approach with my involvement within my research because it "acknowledges and accommodates subjectivity, emotionality, and the researcher's influence on research, rather than hiding from these matters or assuming they don't exist" (Ellis, Adams, Bochner, 2011, p. 274). As I am in my sixteenth year of teaching high school English, I am personally invested in education and have been shaped by my experiences within this field. When CE became a more prevalent part of the educational culture, I wondered about its impact. I love that opportunities are available for students who want to be challenged or who need the financial break that CE offers. However, I am also concerned about what students are missing in regards to curriculum and experience in general. As I begin my third year as a CE instructor, many of the concerns still exist. I wonder if I am preparing my students enough, if I am giving them a "true" college experience, and if they will be able to transfer what they have learned as they leave the high school setting and enter the university. I worry that the space of CE has not done enough to give students the reality of college.

To pretend that my involvement in the CE community does not impact my research would fail to offer transparency to the research. That lack of transparency could have negative implications as "researchers do not exist in isolation...[and] when we conduct and write research, we implicate others in our work" (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011, p. 281). Therefore, by being a participant and observer in my research, the awareness of the potential impact on participants is heightened as I am part of the participant community. Additionally, by owning up to my personal involvement within CE and FYC, I also have to own up to my bias within these spaces and experience. While my personal bias is a part of the research, by including other voices – instructors and students – my individual bias is mitigated as my voice and bias are tempered by others' views and interpretations.
Research design. Because the research focuses on “sense of place,” which is about “personal attachments, memories, relationships” within physical space (Zia, et al, 2014, p. 283), I approached the research through a constructivist worldview. The focus on the “personal attachment” and my own inclusion through an autoethnographic approach aligned well with constructivism’s view that “individuals develop subjective meanings of their experiences” (Creswell, 2014, p. 8), and therefore, “the goal of the research is to rely as much as possible on the participants’ views of the situation being studied” (Creswell, 2014, p. 8). By engaging with CE and FYC instructors and students, individual views and perceptions were used to identify common themes or moments of disparity within the data. Additionally, as these participants were the subjects of the study and were actively engaged in CE and FYC spaces, they offered the most valid information regarding their own experiences and how meaning was created within their spaces.

Along with the constructivist worldview, I used a qualitative methods design which included the following: personal narrative, observation data, and surveys. The research methods gathered data from students and instructors who participate in the CE and FYC communities. To focus on the spaces more narrowly, I used instructors and programs that all worked with the same institution, a private university in Northwest Ohio. The observations for all courses covered one instructional period, which ranged from 47 minutes to 60 minutes and were conducted in April 2017.

Theoretical framework. The research develops from humanistic geography and social psychology. Humanistic geography moves the discussion of place beyond location to a more inclusive and rich discussion founded on the relationship between people and spaces. This alignment and understanding is important for research dealing with learning spaces, because if
CE is only taken as a set of standards to be met, then the place of learning is “marginalized to location” (Taylor, 2013, p. 807). As Cresswell (2004) discusses, place is such a part of everyday life that our usage of the term “place” evokes numerous meanings: ownership, privacy, belonging, social position, etc. (p. 12). With the understanding that place is complex and deeply ingrained in individuals’ perceptions, the link with social psychology offers some direction for those connections between place and perceptions.

Stedman (2002) highlights two social psychology research domains regarding place: “how place satisfaction and attachment are a function of symbolic meanings of the setting...[and] how symbolic meanings, attachment, and satisfaction affect place-related behaviors” (p. 565). These constructions of place and the connection between people’s perceptions of space and the impact it has on meaning and behavior are foundational when examining learning place and the impact that place has on the make-up of a classroom, specifically CE settings. One key element of place theory is its connection to identity through the concept of place attachment as “a bond between people and their environment” (Stedman, 2002, p. 563). Because CE brings together high school and college settings and identities, the place of CE offers an opportunity to research the possibility of two different identities – high school and college – in a space that has meaning and attachment for only one of them.

**Research Questions**

After examining theories of place and the implications they have for concurrent enrollment, I wanted to discover if place had any impact on the ability and the reality of a high school setting functioning as a college setting. Keeping in mind these factors, my research study addresses the following questions:

1. What are the similarities and differences between CE courses and on-campus courses in FYC?
2. What is the difference, if any, in the identity and behavior of FYC CE students and instructors while in a high school course versus an FYC CE course?

3. Based on the findings regarding FYC CE and on-campus courses, what are the implications for the validity of CE courses and the place it currently inhabits?
Chapter II: Literature Review

Last night I dreamt I went to Manderley again. – *Rebecca*

In a hole in the ground there lived a hobbit. – *The Hobbit*

If you really want to hear about it, the first thing you’ll probably want to know is where I was born, and what my lousy childhood was like, and how my parents were occupied and all before they had me, and all that David Copperfield kind of crap, but I don’t feel like going into it, if you want to know the truth. – *Catcher in the Rye*

While Holden Caulfield may not “feel like going into it,” the fact remains that stories are gone into over and over again. No matter how many times I read *Rebecca*, the first line transports me to Manderley and all the angst and mystery that ensues within its walls and surrounding landscape. Whether the place is Manderley, New York, or Middle Earth, those places hold meaning. As many stories show time and time again, the “where” is oftentimes just as important as the “who” or “what.” The same is true of CE spaces of instruction. Walking onto a college campus for the first time and into a strange room with strangers is a different experience from walking into one’s high school for the hundredth time and into a familiar room with familiar faces. With familiarity, the place of learning is more than a set of coordinates or a room bound by four walls. The place becomes what happens and what has happened within that space.

Just as settings in fiction help define the characters, plots, and themes, settings in real life also help define identities, behaviors, and purposes. These settings or places, the physical spaces that are inhabited, become imbued with layers of meaning as people engage and move within these spaces. Reynolds (2007) suggests this theory in her discussion of Phaedrus and how “Plato draws attention to the role of place in conversations, persuasion, and learning” (p. 1). Plato was
concerned about how writing would contribute to the loss of “myth-laden spot[s]” (Reynolds, 2007, p. 1) and an oral culture that reminded people of what was said or taught in these particularly memorable places. Although I am examining more of the written culture through FYC, both Plato and I agree that place and the memories and histories that embody a particular place are important in shaping one’s understanding and composing. Plato’s connection of place and what happens in that specific place begins the discussion that places are not just constructed by one element, whether that be the physical structure, the activity within the place, or the people who inhabit it. Places are constructed through layers of interactions, activities, materials, and purposes.

Within the context of CE, these courses are often students’ first entrance into the academic discourse community of the university. Therefore, new practices, vocabularies, activities, and fellow classmates are part of shaping the CE place and community. As this new discourse community evolves, students and instructors should also evolve and cross the boundaries that separate high school from college. However, if CE is situated in the high school community, can students and instructors fully engage in the new discourse community? If, as Reynolds (1993) asserts, “identity is formed through negotiations with social institutions (Brooke) and through one’s locatedness in various social and cultural ‘spaces’” (p. 326), then CE offers its own unique challenges for the evolution as college students and instructors. The social and cultural spaces these individuals inhabit as members of a high school community remain the same as members of the CE community. Additionally, while the theoretical institution shifts to that of the university, the physical institution remains the high school. Therefore, how do students and instructors negotiate a new theoretical space and identity while in a physical space that has already defined them within the high school community?
Discourse Communities

As individuals find their people, groups, and places within society, each of those communities “has a distinct history and rules governing appropriateness to which members are obliged to adhere” (Porter, 1986/1996, p. 228). While friend and social groups may not have a definitive handbook that outlines their rules or guidelines, many groups, jobs, and organizations do. These rules or guidelines help establish the specifics of particular discourse communities as “individuals bound by a common interest who communicate through approved channels and whose discourse is regulated” (Porter, 1986/1996, p. 228). Discourse communities represent the elements of place because these communities are created when groups and the interactions of the group members establish practices or conventions that modify thinking and language (Bizzell, 1982/2011, p. 368). The idea of multiple elements working together to establish skills or habits draw similarities between discourse communities and place. The connection between discourse communities and place is important because, as Bizzell (1982/2011) states, and according to outer-directed theorists, “thinking and language use can never occur free of a social context that conditions them” (p. 370). Therefore, the vocabulary, formality, and reasoning one has is directly connected to a particular community and the conventions established within that community. Examples of these communities could include anything from sports teams to various clubs to religious affiliations. CE would also be one of these communities, specifically an academic discourse community.

In regards to academics, Reither (1985/2000) asserts that “To belong to a discourse community is to belong to a knowledge community – an ‘inquiry community’” (p. 289). At the foundational level, inquiry is questioning and investigation. Therefore, to be part of an inquiry community means knowing the vocabulary, subject, and habits of a particular discourse community in order to move “students to search beyond their own limited present experience and
knowledge” (Reither, 1985/2000, p. 290). Knowing what type of questions to ask and what type of knowledge needs further investigation can aid students in offering productive inquiry and composing productive discourse within a community. According to Reither (1985/2000), “we need to find ways to immerse students in academic knowledge/discourse communities so they can write from within those communities” (p. 290). Therefore, CE students need to be immersed in a place that establishes the academic discourse community so students can acquire the language, reasoning, and conventions that must or should be followed if they are to enter this discourse community.

A point to consider regarding entrance into a discourse community is what happens if a person is part of two academic discourse communities within one place. In the situation of CE, students are straddling the known community of high school and the unfamiliar community of the university. It might seem like the overlap between these discourse communities could help ease the students into the unfamiliar place of the CE setting as suggested by those who see CE as a transitional or liminal space (Hofmann & Voloch, 2012; Karp, 2012; Denecker, 2013). However, Blau (2006) claims that high school does not really have a role in regards to academic and intellectual communities in the following:

the function of the first year college for most students from most high schools...turns out to have been largely to debunk much of what they learned in high school, to get them for the first time to challenge and interrogate their own beliefs, to prod them for the first time toward taking charge of their own learning, and to initiate them into an academic and intellectual community...to an entire culture whose most distinctive features are those that render it wholly unlike the culture of high school. Nor is there any generation in the history of public education in America for which this hasn’t been true. (p. 370)
From Blau’s view of high school and college, it would seem that students do not question, challenge beliefs, or have any control over their own learning until they get to college. These assertions would seem to imply a lack of engagement or active participation from students or a system that does not allow for agency in one’s education. Granted, high school courses oftentimes have more prescriptive standards and high schools are answerable to parents and community in a way that colleges oftentimes are not. However, the complete rejection of high school as an academic or intellectual community stunts attempts to bring these two communities closer.

This separation is problematic, especially for CE. If the high school discourse community and what students have learned in high school must be “debunked” before students can enter the academic discourse community of the university, how can this happen if CE resides in both places – the debunked and the intellectual community? Sehulster (2012) attempts to pull these two communities together and “bridge the gap” by bringing together instructors from both spheres of education. While Dennihy (2015) also echoes the importance of communication among these instructors, she also highlights a central problem that needs to be overcome. The lack of understanding between high school and college instructors oftentimes creates an “us vs. them” mentality that leads to a rejection of the other. One example of this is when Dennihy (2015) admits that she herself and her college instructor colleagues have uttered the sentiment to college students to “Forget what you learned in high school!” (p. 157). While Dennihy (2015) works to reject this type of dismissal of what students learned in high school through high school and college instructor collaboration, the very idea of this statement highlights the tension between the two places of learning.
This mentality creates problems for both instructors and students, especially within CE courses. Students are attempting to meet the demands of college rigor and expectations while being supported by the high school system. If students are taught to reject the very system that they are a part of, that leaves them with very little support. Additionally, if the college sphere and the knowledge it offers is privileged, especially to the dismissal of the high school education, this dichotomy creates tension for an instructor who teaches in both communities. How can a CE instructor be teaching the “wrong” and “right” information at the same time, within the same space? The impact this idea has on the CE setting is important because students and instructors are then put in the situation of entering a new community while rejecting the one that the new community still physically resides in.

Rather than rejection, an awareness of these spaces as two different discourse communities offers an opportunity for positive movement from high school to college. Hope resides in the concept that rather than debunking or forgetting what is learned in high school, instructors in both communities need to realize that persons [students] are not ‘knowing subjects’ who are capable of recognizing the histories, agendas, or borders of communities; neither do they neatly ‘cross over’ from one community to another...Writers do not simply or even consciously move in and out of separate, discrete communities, adjusting their language perfectly each time (Reynolds, 1993, p. 329).

When students, especially in FYC, move from the high school discourse community to the university, they will not have or even know that they are in a new community. Because it is still school, individuals might believe that the purposes, goals, and practices are the same. While there may be some overlap, the differences between these communities are important because
those are what will cause difficulties for students and instructors if both groups expect perfect alignment to and entrance into a new discourse community. Sehulster (2012) and Dennihy (2015) both highlight positive avenues of collaboration, and their respective partnerships between high school and college instructors show the importance of communication and understanding between these places of learning. CE instructors become agents for this understanding as they can identify as members of both spaces; therefore, any “us vs them” issues are removed or at the least mitigated by the instructors because they are part of both sides.

Bartholomae (1985/2011) highlights the difficulties students already face as they attempt to “invent the university” by appropriating the language and practices of an academic discourse community they are not part of yet (p. 524). Reynolds (2007) explains these difficulties and appropriations in reference to place; “Places, whether textual, material, or imaginary, are constructed and reproduced not simply by boundaries but also by practices, structures of feeling, and sedimented features of *habitus*” (p. 2, her italics). Places are clearly more than location. The “university” as a location is one concrete element, but the “university” as a much more malleable space that includes “features of habitus” or the system of behaviors and practices within a particular social setting, speaks to the necessity for both students and instructors to be part of the social structures of the university. In order to become part of this community, Reynolds (1993) places responsibility on the instructor to “investigate the ways in which our discourses and teaching practices construct and affect student writers, especially in terms of their fragile identities within the university and between sometimes painfully confusing states of their emerging authority as speakers and writers” (p. 335). Therefore, FYC is an important space of academic discourse as students enter the university and begin to develop their authority as
speakers and writers. This authority then becomes students’ way of developing a successful identity within this new discourse community.

Creating a successful identity is a challenge for students, and integrating the issues of the CE setting only exacerbates those difficulties. While much of SOP deals with the emotional and connotative connections to a place, the role of the physical space is also important when moving between discourse communities while inhabiting the same location. Mountford (2001) discusses how “material dimensions” are also part of social expectations, which would have an impact on how individuals behave and interact with others (p. 42). This concept raises questions then about the role and impact of place within CE and its overlap between high school and college. How does one physical location allow for the development of multiple discourse communities with differing habits and practices? Denecker (2013) offers the CE space as a way of gaining a better understanding how to create two spaces within one location; “It is in this space that the tensions and inconsistencies between secondary and post-secondary writing instruction have the potential for becoming clearly defined” (p. 29). If these tensions and differences can be defined, then instructors can gain a better understanding of how to shift from a high school to a college discourse community.

One final idea for consideration regarding discourse in the CE setting is that of abnormal discourse or “what happens when someone who joins in the discourse who is ignorant of [the] conventions or who sets them aside (Rorty, 1979, p. 320). If college courses are part of an academic discourse community of the university, does their inclusion in the high school setting put the CE course as a setting for abnormal discourse? Bruffee (1984/2011) asserts that “normal discourse maintains knowledge” and abnormal discourse generates knowledge (p. 409). If people accept the conventions of a particular community, then they are working within what is already
known and accepted. However, for those who are ignorant or choose not to follow the
conventions, they are not maintaining the status quo. While Rorty (1979) states that “the product
of abnormal discourse can be anything from nonsense to intellectual revolution” (p. 320), both
Rorty (1979) and Bruffee (1984/2011) look at abnormal discourse as a catalyst for something
different. Bruffee’s (1984/2011) view of abnormal discourse does lean more towards positive
intellectual revolution as he views it as an active element that “sniffs out stale, unproductive
knowledge and challenges its authority, that is, the authority of the community which that
knowledge constitutes” (p. 409). Although challenging “stale, unproductive knowledge” seems
positive, the outcome could create dissonance and tension between the shared spaces of learning
by seeing one type of knowledge as productive while the other is seen as unproductive.

In the CE setting, the outcome of viewing some knowledge as productive and others as
unproductive could create tension between current or past high school classes that CE students
are taking/have taken and the current CE courses they are taking. If the college courses are
privileged as having productive knowledge, this identification then degrades or downplays the
importance of the high school courses. Additionally, as I have most of my CE students in prior
high school English courses, the tension between the high school knowledge and CE knowledge
could create problems in how students perceive me as an instructor since I could be seen as
supporting both types of knowledge. If students value what I teach in the CE course but not what
I have taught them in previous years, my ability to scaffold or build on previous
教学/knowledge could be compromised.

This tension created between shared spaces is also addressed by Cresswell (2004). He
states that within the context of regions and communities, “Activities and forms of human life
and culture which threatened regional and place-based distinctiveness were...a threat” (p. 26).
Having two discourse communities occupy the same location could potentially create problems if one is seen as a threat. Harris (1989) offers a differing view of this tension and opposition between discourse communities; rather than individuals having to be part of a discourse community, Harris states that “one is always simultaneously part of several discourses, several communities, is always already committed to a number of conflicting beliefs and practices” (p. 19, emphasis in original). This view of multiple discourse and conflicting practices offers a point of discussion for students moving between high school and college communities. Whether the differing communities and the accompanying dissonance and tension would be positive or negative for the learning environment depends on the dynamics of the specific place. Knowing about the history and evolving definition of place sets the foundation for understanding the role of place in concurrent enrollment.

**Moving from Place to Sense of Place**

As place deals with the physical and the emotional or figurative, place theory is found in numerous areas of study: geography, science, social psychology, and composition. All these areas seem to agree that place matters; however, it is not always clear or agreed upon why it matters or how it matters. The history of place and how it has been defined helped cultivate my understanding of place and the significance of place for CE, so I could more clearly develop my research questions.

**What is place?** As Cresswell (2004) comments after a brief but thorough discussion of the genealogy of place, “Place is clearly a complicated concept. It is all the more confusing because, at first glance, it appears to be obvious and common sense” (p. 56). “Place” is a word that would seem to have a simple definition. People seem to understand when others use it and at its simplest form seems to indicate a specific location. Additionally, the use of “place” in everyday language and how people use it for many purposes — ownership, belonging, position,
etc. – seems to be so common that people just assume its meaning and that everyone else understands the usage of the word in whatever context it appears (Cresswell, 2004, p. 12). However, my research focused on looking more closely at these assumptions within the CE setting. While place may seem obvious and understood, the dual nature of place in CE – as both high school and college – offers a look at the complexity of place. This closer examination is necessary to answer my research questions, which will then hopefully help both students and instructors fully appreciate the distinctions between the high school and college space and the implications these distinctions will have on teaching and learning practices.

Cresswell’s opening definition of human geography as “the study of place” seems to be simplistic and accept the obviousness of the word. However, the movement and development of “place” from the initial study as “region” in the 1960s to the present day reveals the complexity, overlap, and repositioning of place. The 1970s marked the beginning of place and humanistic geography. As spatial science had limited place to location, humanistic geography developed around and in reaction to that limited view of place; place became the centralized focus of geographical study. Two key geographers in this development were Yi-Fu Tuan and Edward Relph who looked at place in relation to attachment, meaning, and overall connection to humans and their lives (Cresswell, 2004, p. 29). Tuan (1975) captures this idea of place as connected to humans as he contradicts what he believes is a faulty assertion regarding “centers of meaning:”

many well-educated and vocal people of urban background have come to believe that meaning in a place gains almost in proportion to the lack of people. In this view, sparsely settled farmlands are somehow more meaningful than cities, and wilderness areas more meaningful than farmland. (p. 156)
While both the farm and the city can be centers of meaning, a farm would only be a center of meaning for those who live on the farm while a city is a center of meaning for those who live there and those who view the city geographical in relation to other landscapes – cities, towns, farmland, etc. (Tuan, 1975, p. 156). Therefore, Tuan’s (1975) perspective shows a shift away from an isolated view of location to one that encompasses the human experience.

Because geography moved beyond examining place as simply location, the added dimensions of place became plentiful and nuanced. These new dimensions of place included the importance of one’s experiences in a place and the relationship with a place that developed from these experiences. Therefore, a multifaceted view of place as location, who is in that location, and what happens in that location places the discussion of having normally on-campus college course offered through CE as more than a simple change in physical location. Although not entirely inclusive of all potential definitions of place, the discussion of place and how it is defined can be narrowed to three issues: place vs. space, abstract vs. concrete, and producer vs. product.

**Place vs. space.** When looking at place, one of the first ways to define it is in contrast to space. While some uses of space as “socially produced space” align closely with definitions of place, most work with place and space identify these concepts as distinct from each other (Cresswell, 2004, p. 19). Tuan (1977) highlights the differences between these two concepts; “place is security, space is freedom: we are attached to one and long for the other” (p. 3). The attachment to place speaks to a connection or relationship – one that involves emotions, since a sense of security includes a sense of physical and emotional well-being. Space, on the other hand, is not as defined as “freedom” offers undefined options rather than security.
Understanding the distinctions between space and place are important because they impact and inform the definition and usage of place. Space is abstract, intangible, movable, open, and lacks content (Tuan, 1975; Cresswell, 2004; Reynolds, 2007). In contrast, place is meaning, attachment, stability, lived in, and experienced (Tuan, 1975; Cresswell, 2004). These differences indicate that space invites possibility while place invites certainty; space could be and place is.

Tuan (1977) explains the relationship between the two when he says, “what begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value” (p. 6). Getting to know a space better mimics the language of a relationship. The value of a relationship is a result of shared experiences, interactions, and time; therefore, place gains value in similar ways. When we create a relationship with a space, it becomes a place, and like relationships, it gains value. The CE space is often already place to many students because they have experiences and time in that place of learning. For example, most of my CE students created a place of learning within my classroom as they had me for high school sophomore English. If students have already created a place of value and security within my classroom, how does that impact the way they know that place as a college student rather than a high school student? Can one space be the place for two different relationships? This question is essential for how CE students navigate their places of learning.

The culture of high school and the culture of college, which have distinct differences, could impede CE students’ ability to define the high school setting as a college place of learning. However, Tuan’s (1977) view of culture offers hope for this transition. While recognizing that culture “strongly influences human behavior and traits” (p. 5), only focusing on the specifics of a culture overlooks traits that are more global or shared as part of the human condition. While more specific to education rather than the human condition, shared traits do exist between the
high school culture and the college culture. Both cultures are connected to academics that focus on similar, broad areas of study and similar interpersonal relationships (instructor – student and student – student). Additionally, high school instructors were taught within the college culture and then took their learning back into the K-12 culture. Therefore, this study’s examination of the high school setting and college setting works to identify the shared traits between the cultures that could potentially offer one avenue for helping students move between the high school place of learning and the CE place of learning.

Abstract vs. concrete. One concept that addresses the navigation of places of learning, particularly for CE, is how abstract and concrete ideas help define these places. It would seem that “a college course” is an abstract idea that includes movement, a possibility of many different types of content, and an openness that hints at a concept but does not actually embody specifics. Therefore, the idea of a college course is space. In contrast, CE has a defined location with stability, experiences, and specific content. Therefore, a CE course is place. Although abstract seems to apply more to space, it does so in a generalized sort of way. Because place includes value and meaning, non-physical items, there does seem to be some possibility for abstraction within the concept of place as well.

Therefore, the attempt to discuss place as either abstract and metaphorical or physical and concrete seems to be a failure in understanding the interconnectedness of the functions and impact of place. Looking at the concrete place as immovable coordinates on a map that establish the physicality of a place is part of understanding place. Cresswell (2004) even allows that “place provides a geographically specific set of structures” (p. 45), which could include walls, paths, doors, and other structures that help one maneuver through a particular physical landscape. However, as mentioned earlier, if one redefines or uses place for different purposes, such as
showing ownership, belonging, or social position, then there has to be more to place than
location, and this “more” is where abstract becomes part of the definition of place.

Tuan (1975) moves beyond the physical when he states that "place is known not only
through the eyes and mind but also through the more passive and direct modes of experience,
which resist objectification. To know a place fully means both to understand it in an abstract way
and to know it as one person knows another" (p. 152). Yes, place is known through the eyes and
has a physical element, but it is also known in abstract ways that resist objectification and
privilege meaning and the personal. Taking Tuan’s (1975) ideas a step further, Malpas (1999)
grounds the discussion of abstract and concrete place in more social terms when he states the
following:

the idea of place encompasses both the idea of the social activities and institutions that
are expressed in and through the structure of a particular place...and the idea of the
physical objects and events in the world...that constrain, and are sometimes constrained
by, those social activities and institutions. (p. 35-36)

In regards to CE, Malpas’s (1999) idea of the social activities and institutions and the physical
objects and events would include the school building, education, desks, texts, peer revision, and
discussion. These different elements include both the abstract, the idea of education or
knowledge, and the physical, the layout of the classroom.

The interconnectedness of abstract and concrete within the understanding of place is
necessary when examining the purpose, impact, and development of place. Tuan (1975) uses the
example of his rocking chair to highlight the connection between the physical elements of place
and the impact that the physical has on the abstract. He states that “its [the rocker’s] location
cannot be changed without disturbing, however slightly, the focus of my world” (p. 153). Place
is both location and how one views the world. Moving Tuan’s (1975) idea into education, Reynolds (2007) states that “many educators believe that only when people are ‘moved’ – perhaps literally – can they be persuaded to see form a different point of view” (p. 2). If the connection between place and one’s perspective are dependent on each other, then the placement of CE in the high school setting does matter and needs to be part of the conversation on how students find and produce meaning in the learning space of CE.

**Meaning: Producer or product.** The production of meaning is an important element of place. However, not everyone agrees on who or what produces the meaning. Tuan (1975) asserted that “place is created by human beings for human purposes...[and, therefore,] to remain a place it has to be lived in” (p. 165). With Tuan’s (1975) assertion, place becomes a social construct, and “to say a place is socially constructed is to say that it is not natural and given that human forces made a place then human forces can equally importantly undo it” (Cresswell, 2004, p. 38). If this is the case and humans are the producers and place is the product of meaning, then it should not matter where CE courses exist because the students and instructors within that place can create the place or destroy the existing place as a high school setting and remake it as a college setting.

While this idea could empower the individuals in those places, Malpas (1999) argues that place cannot be just a social construction because “the social does not exist prior to place nor is it given expression except in and through place...It is within the structure of place that the very possibility of the social arises” (p. 35). Malpas’s (1999) argument reflects the same struggle of which came first, the chicken or the egg. The social needs specific place in which to exist; however, that place then becomes aligned with and defined by the people and activities that exist in that place.
The integrated view of place as a producer and product of the social aligns with the integration of abstract and physical elements of place. Because place is difficult to define as one specific concept to the exclusion of all else, it should not be surprising that a layered approach was used to ground this study and its examination of spaces of learning, specifically CE places.

**Location, locale, and sense of place.** As place is connected to both the abstract and the physical, one approach to place that encompasses both is a rhetorical approach. Mountford (2001) suggests applying rhetorical space “more narrowly to the effect of physical spaces on a communicative event” (p. 42). Therefore, I put the discussion of place into the concept of rhetorical space or rhetorical situation, which encourages the inclusion of the physical place as context. By looking at physical place as context, the abstract qualities of place can be discussed more easily because the rhetorical situation is more defined, which allows for more specific analysis of what is happening in a particular place. Addressing the concept of physical places, Agnew’s (1987) identification of location, locale, and sense of place, as previously mentioned, develops the discussion of the movement that happens between the physical and abstract qualities of place and how they all contribute to the meaning found within that place. This development builds on Stedman’s (2002) discussion of social psychology’s view of space and his focus on the following: physical setting, human activities, and human social psychological processes.

Although each uses different terminology, both these concepts of place encourage the application of SOP to areas in which one lives and works since, in both, the “sense of place [SOP] is also shaped by the nature and extent of one’s experience with a place” (Zia, et al, 2014, p. 283). The nature of one’s experience connects to the purpose of the place; for example, if the place is where one lives versus where one works, one’s behaviors would be quite different
because the nature of work is different from that of a living space. Additionally, the amount of time or extent of one’s experience also impacts one’s comfort level and directly impacts the amount of experience one has been able to have in a place. This extension of the understanding of place integrates well with the rhetorical situation. As SOP includes meaning, experiences, and interaction among various physical and social elements, it reflects the layers of the rhetorical situation that include speaker, audience, message, and context. By connecting SOP with the rhetorical situation, the CE classroom becomes more complex as the similarities and differences between the on-campus and high school settings have impact on the individuals and the messages in the different contexts. In my specific situation, this complexity is seen in the high school setting. When students enter my CE classroom, rather than entering a college classroom, they are entering their former sophomore English classroom (and for some it is also their former freshman and junior classroom). These classes, although similar in subject, have different outcomes, levels of rigor, and responsibilities.

Part of the rhetorical situation and an important element in constructing SOP are the participants. As Dentzau (2014) asserts, “to understand ‘place’ is to acknowledge that for the individual it is highly situational and has specific meaning arising from their unique cultural and social identities” (p. 166). Additionally, Reynolds (1993) adds to the role of the participants in constructing SOP by bringing in the issue of ethos; “the idea of ethos as a social construction, in which subjects are formed by their habits of their culture, belies the charges that ethos can be ‘faked’ or manipulated” (p. 328). Although she focuses on the validity of ethos and not specifically SOP, the fact that Reynolds (1993) relies on the habits of the culture to construct one’s ethos within that culture definitively links the place and one’s identity within that place. Therefore, a place cannot be defined without the connection to the people who inhabit that place.
For CE, that means an awareness of high school students who are also identifying as college students within a place that functions as both a high school and college learning place. For this specific study, the participants are high school juniors or seniors in a first year composition CE course, on-campus students in a first year composition course, CE instructors, and college instructors.

**Place and Identity**

In the case of concurrent enrollment, the situation of high school students taking college courses while inhabiting high school spaces creates “unique cultural and social identities” that will help define the space and transform it into place (Dentzau, 2014, p. 166). Consequently, a high school setting cannot be redefined as a college setting without redefining student identities. One core concept in SOP theory is “place attachment as identity,” which relates to “one’s personal location within social life” (Stedman, 2002, p. 563). Using Agnew’s (1987) concept of location as geographic, students’ identities are then shaped by the physical locations or settings of their social interaction. Location’s impact on identity is important for CE because students are supposed to be college students but are in a location that is part of their high school identity and is continually reinforced as their social interaction revolves around high school courses, classmates, teachers, extracurriculars, and numerous other day-to-day interactions that remind them of their high school identity.

Reynolds (2007) supports this shaping of identity and elaborates on it:

identities take root from particular sociogeographical intersections, reflecting where a person comes from and, to some extent, directing where she is allowed to go.

Geographical locations influence our habits, speech patterns, style, and values – all of which make it a rhetorical concept or important to rhetoric. (p. 11)
By examining what is influenced by place, the connection to discourse community becomes evident. Entering a discourse community such as the FYC classroom requires the "correct" vocabulary, documentation style (MLA vs. APA, etc.), and habits that allow a person to participate. Therefore, if students want to and are meant to be college students, then their identities would need to adapt to the new intersection of the CE setting.

An element of SOP that offers a potential for research in concurrent enrollment is the possibility that SOP creates a reflexive relationship where a person’s view of self within a particular environment impacts the environment, which in turn alters one’s perception of self (Zia, et al, 2014, p. 285). An example of this is found within Forest’s (1995) research on gay identity. In 1984, the gay community was able to use symbols of gay identity to incorporate West Hollywood. This political move to create “a ‘gay’ civic culture (Forest, 1995, p. 151) allowed the gay community to redefine or construct “an identity based on more than sexual acts” (Forest, 1995, p. 134). Because the gay community took on a political identity, which then led to change in West Hollywood, their perception of self also changed.

While Forest (1995) examined political identity, his research provides a framework for how one might establish an educational identity. On the smaller scale of a concurrent enrollment class, students and instructors could mimic this reflexive relationship because they both would be doing work for a college course, which would enhance their view as “college students” and “college instructors.” The placement of the college course in a high school setting could disrupt a student’s or instructor’s view of self since the location would not reflect the larger academic discourse community of the university. However, the assignments, increased rigor, college syllabus, and separation from or change from their peers all contribute to their identity as college
students and instructors. These environmental elements become symbols of a college student’s identity, which could strengthen that identity even within the high school setting.

Other common conceptions about identity also give context to how identity is developed and established. One of these conceptions is that “identities are meanings a person attributes to the self as an object of the social situation or social role” (Burke, 1980, p. 18). In the CE setting, students’ social situations or roles are that of college students. While similar to the reflexive relationship, identity is connected to one’s role more so than one’s environment. Another conception Burke (1980) recognizes is that identities are relational and “an identity…is given meaning in relation to counteridentities” (p. 19). Burke (1980) explains that someone who identifies as “son-husband-teacher…knows how to relate variously to his father, mother, wife, students” because his own role allows him to understand the counter-roles (p. 19). In CE, students’ roles as high school students and college students could be useful as students can know what a role requires by what another role is or is not. For example, if high school students know the rigor of high school work, then they should expect their role as a college student to include work that is more rigorous than what they are currently doing.

Although reflexive relationships contribute to understanding the development of identity, they do not give specifics. In order to identify as a college student, what qualities would students embody? Burke and Reitzes’ (1981) study on identity and role performance identified four dimensions of meaning for college students: academic responsibility, intellectualism, sociability, and personal assertiveness (p. 86-87). Burke (1980) also highlighted five common conceptions of identities: identities are meanings, identities are relational, identities are reflexive, identities are a source of motivation, and identities operate indirectly (p. 18). These different ways of
categorizing identity help explain the connection between identity and behavior, which will be more fully explored in the following section.

**Place and Behavior**

In connection to student identity and SOP are the behaviors that develop from identity. Stedman (2002) introduces the idea of “behavioral implications of sense of place” (p. 561). Zia, et al (2014) also agree that people’s activities and behaviors should communicate something about their SOP (p. 284). Along with place attachment as identity, “place satisfaction as attitude” includes the ability of a place to meet basic needs “ranging from sociability to services to physical characteristics (Stedman, 2002, p. 564). For the CE classroom, sociability addresses interpersonal relationships between students and between students and the instructor, services address the educational purpose and work of the course, and physical characteristics address the tools like texts, desks, etc. required to complete tasks within the CE space. Both identity and attitudes are important to place because of how they affect behavior. Therefore, students’ behaviors should reveal something about their place of learning.

Burke and Reitzes’ (1981) and Burke’s (1980) dimensions of identity offer specifics to examine regarding the similarities and differences between CE students’ identity and behavior and that of other college students. For example, the focus on the social dimensions of a classroom offers a look at whether the CE setting impacts the social situation of the classroom, and if this social situation redefines social roles from high school students to college students. The focus on academic responsibility prompts examination of how their identity impacts their behaviors (responsibility/work) and how their behaviors impact their identity. Additionally, looking at motivation and reflexivity prompts examination of the relationships between identity, image, and performance or behaviors.
The interconnectedness of identity, image, and behavior mimics that of the rhetorical situation. If one element of the rhetorical space changes, then that impacts the entire situation, like how a shift in identity also shifts one’s image or behaviors. Therefore, if CE and on-campus courses are meant to be equivalent, as the legislation dictates, the identity, image, and behaviors of college students in these two spaces should, in theory, also align or fall within standard expectations. The legislators do not take into consideration this shift in the rhetorical situation and therefore does not take into consideration the impact of this shift and the differences that may occur because of it. One important difference overlooked is the very construction of these courses as spaces of learning. Therefore, if the rhetorical situation of the two spaces is initially different (research question 1), does that impact student behavior (research question 2), and if the students’ behaviors are different, then what role does place play in these supposedly mirror courses (research question 3)?

The rhetorical situation and the research questions highlight the importance of the interconnectedness among space, identity, attitudes, and behaviors. The connection between these elements and “how symbolic meanings, attachments, and satisfaction affect place-related behaviors” (Stedman, 2002, p. 565) is important in understanding SOP because “SOP itself is not observable – it must be interpreted from behavioral data” (Zia, et al, p. 284, emphasis in original). Therefore, because SOP is about one’s attachment to a place, “the physical setting and its attributes take on the role of object or locus for beliefs, attitudes, and identity” (Stedman, 2002, p. 565). The importance of sense of place not only lies in the physical setting but also in how that setting creates a place that develops meaning and identity for its inhabitants. Therefore, in regards to CE, can a high school space also be a college space? The behavior of the students in
this space can help answer that question and help students, instructors, and legislators understand CE’s place and role within college instruction.

While Burke (1980) focuses on identities and behaviors, Reynolds (2004) introduces another consideration with behaviors – time. While giving a nod to the impact of physical space and make-up, Reynolds (2004) elaborates on people’s ability to adapt and that “spatial practices...evolve from movements or placements we take for granted, or boundaries that seem clear or uncontested, and they develop into the habitual ways we move through the world” (p. 14). Therefore, within any given place, people’s behaviors and actions are taken for granted as they figure out and then repeat their movements or behaviors. This claim would seem to imply that people just need time to adapt to the discourse community and to solidify behaviors as habits. However, what if the physical space supports two different sets of expectations, like CE? On the one hand, already being familiar with the physical space could allow students to adapt more quickly because the physical space is not new or unfamiliar. On the other hand, that familiarity could make it more difficult to change habits because high school habits are already ingrained in this high school space; students have already have a sense of the rhetorical situation in this space, and it could take longer to deconstruct that rhetorical space in order to create a new one.

Tuan (1975) also addresses the issue and importance of time and its necessity for SOP. Rather than immediately gaining an SOP, one needs to take time because “experience takes time. Sense of place is rarely acquired in passing. To know a place well requires long residence and deep involvement” (Tuan, 1975, p. 164). To expect high school students to immediately be college students seems unrealistic then. It might even be said that to expect college students to immediately be college students is also unrealistic. This situation relates back to Bartholomae’s
(1985/2011) concept of inventing the university and how students are put in the position of “faking it” until they have learned the expectations, vocabulary, and knowledge to be part of an academic discourse community. Although this seems to relate to college students both in CE and on the college campus, the inability for high school CE students to truly enter and remain in the physical college setting could negatively affect their ability to acquire a sense of place.

The behavioral outcomes and their impact on/creation of SOP are grounded in two areas that should be taken into consideration: the factors that form SOP attachments and the resulting behaviors that are created from a strong sense of place (Zia, et al, 2014 p. 285). From these two factors, the question becomes “How do we expect individuals with a strong sense of place to act in various situations?” (Zia, et al, 2014, p. 285). This question itself implies that there is a connection between SOP and actions. This relationship is important when attempting to have CE courses replicate on-campus courses because if SOP impacts actions, then how can different places offer the same course and a similar experience?

Considering SOP and its impact on learning spaces will help all constituents – legislators, administrators, instructors, and students – create CE programs that support instructors and students while meeting the expectations of college courses. Because legislation and CE programs are growing and developing, place needs to become part of the discussion to ensure that the differences between the spaces of learning do not impede the development of rigorous college courses on high school campuses. Tinberg and Nadeau (2011) have already raised the question of what happens in a college course that is transplanted into the college setting; research on place and CE is essential in not only finding the answer to that question but then taking those findings and examining what implications they have for concurrent enrollment.
Chapter III: Methodology

With the popularity of CE courses, continued research is essential in understanding the impact of alternative settings on the rigor and alignment between concurrent enrollment and on-campus courses. The high school setting offers similarities and differences to the learning space that go beyond grading scales, assignments, and course numbers. Yancey and Morrison's (2006) research shows that the differences between the spaces of high school and college are more ingrained in the cultures of those communities. Therefore, it is necessary to examine both spaces of learning – the university and the high school – to understand how the setting impacts students’ introduction to the university’s academic discourse community.

Research Questions

I wanted to discover for myself and for others engaged in the CE debate how place impacted the college courses placed within the high school setting. In order to examine the impact of place, my research focused on the following research questions:

1. What are the similarities and differences between CE courses and on-campus courses in FYC?

2. What is the difference, if any, in the identity and behavior of FYC CE students and instructors while in a high school course versus an FYC CE course?

3. Based on the findings regarding FYC CE and on-campus courses, what are the implications for the validity of CE courses and the place it currently inhabits?

Setting

In order to answer these research questions, the different settings of high school and college were used. The courses observed were the following: two FYC on-campus courses at a private university in Northwest Ohio, one CE course at a rural high school in Northwest Ohio,
and one CE course at an urban high school in Northwest Ohio. The settings for my own experience with FYC also included the same private university in Northwest Ohio and another rural high school in Northwest Ohio.

Participants

Along with my own experiences, three instructors and thirty-three students participated in the study. The CE courses contained all high school juniors, some who were taking the course for college credit and some who were not. While my own CE course included high school juniors, it also included seniors. The students in the FYC on-campus courses were college students and none were dual enrollment students in the sections I observed; however, the on-campus course that I taught included students ranging from a high school junior to a woman returning to school after twenty years. The diversity of my on-campus course was valuable because a range of students with different experiences and levels of education reinforced the importance of the rigor and expectations of the course rather than viewing the course as transitional for a particular group of students. This focus on the course reinforced the “college” element of the course because being college students in FYC was the one centralizing point for all the students.

Instrumentation and Data Sources

In order to answer research questions one and two, survey instruments, and observation, and my personal experiences were utilized. The purpose of the surveys was to include participants’ voices regarding questions related to identity, relationships, responsibility, and work within a high school and college setting. By including students and instructors, this qualitative approach “enable[d] marginalized communities to publish their own culture and experiences in their own voices, resisting the knowledge constructed about them” (Canagarajah,
2012, pp. 115). In education, instructors and students should have an opportunity to participate in educational research as they are often marginalized, especially within educational policy. Elmore (2003) highlights this point in his research regarding No Child Left Behind when he states that “One of the most robust findings in [his] 25 years of research in policy implementation is that policymakers usually know shockingly little about the problems for which they purport to make policy” (p. 6). In regards to educational policy, educators and students are members of the educational community that implement policy and legislation and therefore should have a voice within the research and policy processes. Additionally, Yonezawa and Jones (2009) “discuss the underutilization of students as a critical partner in educational improvement” (p. 205).

Conducting research that allows for student and instructor voices is one way to work towards adding voices that can speak to actual experience regarding what happens in the learning space. Additionally, having experienced the college setting and the high school setting myself, adding the other participants’ voices was one way to counter my bias and assumptions. The surveys used open-ended questions that allowed students and instructors to respond more freely on the themes addressed within the survey. Because qualitative research is “an approach for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (Creswell, 2014, pp. 4), it was the best approach since SOP comes from the experiences of individuals and groups.

In the survey construction, Burke and Reitzes’ (1981) and Burke’s (1980) dimensions of identity offered themes for research that also connected to SOP’s rhetorical situation that linked identity, experiences, and context (Dentzau, 2014; Mountford, 2001; ReynoIds, 1993; Tuan, 1975; Zia, et al, 2014). The four themes targeted in the survey were: identity, interpersonal relationships, responsibility, and work. The surveys used these four areas to examine students’
and instructors’ views of identity and behaviors within FYC in comparison/contrast to identities and behaviors in other courses. The questions on both surveys place the identity, relationships, responsibility, and work that the participants had in FYC in direct comparison with other courses, and where applicable, specifically high school courses. For example, after asking students about the amount of time they spend on work for the FYC course, students were asked “How does this amount compare to the amount of time you spend/spent on work for high school courses?” (Appendix B). In order to identify how setting may impact these themes, discovering the similarities and differences of the courses was important for analysis and impact of SOP.

In addition to the surveys, the classes were also observed. Observation was done for one instructional period for each of the courses. The observation time ranged from 50-60 minutes. With qualitative research, “one of the key elements of collecting data...is to observe participants’ behaviors during their engagement in activities” (Creswell, 2014, pp. 19). Therefore, while the surveys allowed the participants to have a voice within the research, the observation provided a window into students’ behaviors, work habits, and interpersonal interaction that provided additional information that worked in conjunction with the survey responses. Royster and Kirsch (2012) promote lived experience within research because “a sense of place — the physical, embodied experience of visiting places — can become a powerful research tool” (pp. 92). The physical element of place and being in the place one researches offers complexity to the strategic contemplation that Royster and Kirsch (2012) address as they discuss alternative options for research. Therefore, by combining observations and surveys, I was able to use SOP not only as part of the research topic, but as a way to gather that research.
Data Collection Procedures

In April 2017, I emailed high school administrators from two Northwest Ohio high schools requesting participation and introducing the study (Appendix C). I also sent out introductory emails (Appendix D) to the corresponding ENGL 104 instructors at both the high schools and the university. After receiving verbal and/or email agreement to participate in the research project, the observation dates were set for April 2017. After establishing the visits, I then delivered, to the schools, packets of information for the research: parent letters (Appendix E), student letters (Appendix F), consent forms (Appendix G), and assent forms (Appendix H).

On the day of the visit, I collected consent and/or assent forms from all students and instructors who agreed to participate. The surveys were then distributed to the participants who then took approximately 10 minutes to fill them out. I collected the surveys and then observed the class as the instructor progressed with the lesson for the class period. The length of each observation lasted one class period, approximately 50 minutes. As the instructor carried out the day’s lesson, I took handwritten notes about what I observed: how students were grouped, how students worked together, interaction between students, interaction between students and instructors, verbal comments, physical behaviors, body language, and physical setting. My purpose in recording these observations was to note behaviors within the lived experience of CE in order to better address the research questions.

On-going Methodological Decisions

One unexpected alteration to the research was the instructor for the university courses became ill and was unable to be present for the observation day and survey completion. I was still able to follow the steps in collecting students’ consent forms and surveys. However, as the instructor was not present, other instructors, ones who had not been participants in the learning
space, were in charge of the class for the observation periods. Therefore, although not part of the specific learning community, I asked one of the substitute instructors to answer the survey. This instructor is a full-time faculty member, a regular teacher of FYC, and has experience with CE. While this decision impacted the questions and observations regarding interpersonal relationships, it was important to include this on-campus instructor in order to have a more complete view of participants in both CE and on-campus courses.

The other element of the research that shifted with the change in instructors is that although I was still able to observe the classes, I was also, by necessity, participatory in the activities for the particular lesson. By interacting with students through questions and answers regarding progress with the assignments and what feedback students needed in order to progress with the final portfolio for the course, I gained the opportunity to actually speak with students and not just rely on observation and survey data within this setting.

**Data Analysis**

After observing all four classes, I coded the observation notes using Tesch’s (1990) eight-step coding process as a guide to organize and understand the qualitative data (as cited in Creswell, 2014). This process focused on close reading, note-taking, topic clustering, and descriptive wording in order to analyze, understand, and organize the data in an effective manner. The categories that emerged from the observation data were the following: communication, responsibility, and environment. While communication addressed research question one, responsibility and environment addressed both research question one and research question two. These three categories related to location, locale, and sense of place. The physical space established setting, while the actions and interactions within the settings showed what
happens to place when humans experience it and have experiences within it (Cresswell, 2014; Zia, et al, 2014; Tuan, 1975).

Once the observational data was coded, the surveys were analyzed by the predetermined sections on the survey: identity, interpersonal relationships, responsibility, and work. Within each section, the responses prompted emerging codes following the same process that was used for the observation notes.

Using both predetermined codes and emerging codes is not unprecedented (Creswell, 2014, pp. 199). Working from humanistic geography’s concept of location, locale, and sense of place, some categories presented themselves because of the focus on identity and behavior. Emerging codes were also necessary in order for participants to have a voice as well. By using emerging codes, the creation of descriptive words was shaped and developed by the students’ and instructors’ own vocabulary they used within the survey responses. After all the data was coded, the predetermined and emerging codes made clear connections to research questions one and two, and sometimes both.

Research question one focused on the similarities and differences between CE and on-campus FYC courses. The predetermined code that offered the greatest insight into this research question was interpersonal relationships. As seen in Table 1, students’ responses regarding interpersonal relationships offered some similarities and differences between the courses and focused more on the make-up of the courses rather than their own identities or behaviors within the courses.
Table 1

*Prior Relationships in CE and On-campus Courses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENGL 104 Students: On-Campus (Total number = 18)</th>
<th>ENGL 104 Students: CE (Total number = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students who previously had the instructor in class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students who didn’t know the instructor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response to question about instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students who knew classmates prior to this course</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students who didn’t know classmates</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they knew classmates, how they knew them</td>
<td>live in the same hall/floor previous class socially extracurricular</td>
<td>previous classes/grades (multiple years) friends extracurricular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also noted in Table 1, both groups showed new relationships with the instructors with only a couple of on-campus students having had the instructor previously. For students’ relationships with other students, more of a distinction was found between CE and on-campus courses, which identified one clear difference between the two spaces.

While the instructors’ information on interpersonal relationships did not indicate prior knowledge or relationships regarding students, their surveys did indicate a difference between ENGL 104 and other courses; ENGL 104 required more out-of-class interaction with students. This type of requirement sets ENGL 104 apart from other courses, whether they were high school or college courses. My own experiences echoed this increased interaction with students outside of the class. While I have conferenced with students in my high school courses, most of that conferencing happened in class. Additionally, while I received emails from my high school students, most of the communication centered around more direct information such as due dates.
or missed classwork. The out-of-class interaction with my ENGL 104 students was more intensive with one-on-one conferencing regarding drafting or revising essays. Along the same vein, emails with ENGL 104 students often included in-depth and specific questions regarding sections of text from on-going writings.

Along with interpersonal relationships, the responses within the categories of responsibility and work also offered answers for research question one. In connection to overall responsibilities, on-campus students indicated three main differences in responsibility from high school to college: college gave more independence, was more difficult, and required financial responsibility. CE students also discussed increased independence, but rather than framing it in terms of freedom, they viewed it as having less guidance from the instructor. Additionally, they felt that college required more awareness of time and was more serious overall due to the importance of grades and money. The fact that students identified multiple differences between high school, and college responsibilities indicated an awareness in different requirements in different spaces.

Narrowing responsibilities to the work done in the courses, both groups indicated an average of four hours of work per week for the ENGL 104 course. While the students agreed on the amount of time, some differences were noted. In regards to the specific assignments in high school as compared to college, on-campus students highlighted the focus on literature and reading in the high school course. Additionally, the on-campus students indicated that the assignments were harder because of increased rigor in grading and higher expectations for their level of performance. CE students discussed less about the type of assignments and more about the characteristics of the college assignments in contrast to high school assignments.
Although not necessarily set up as a difference from high school courses, the instructors showed awareness of distinct expectations of what the college course required from the students and themselves. This awareness aligns with research question one because the instructors’ views related to their responsibilities focused more on concrete structures of ENGL 104, such as university and course policies. Additionally, other work considerations that aligned with teaching this course included grading, conferencing, and giving feedback on process work and revisions. The instructors also had expectations for the amount of time students should spend on work each week based on the coursework, and the results are in Table 2.

Table 2

\[\text{Expected Student Workload}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE Instructor</th>
<th>CE Instructor</th>
<th>On-Campus Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 hours in class; 5 hours out of class (on major assignments)</td>
<td>2 ½ hours on average (more when writing)</td>
<td>3 hours outside of class for every 1 hour in class; 9 hours each week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the expectations for time students should spend on coursework were different among the three instructors, they all expected additional work outside of the course time. Concrete structures of ENGL 104 were also evident in my own experiences. While not addressing the work outside of class, I noted similarities and differences between CE and on-campus spaces, which are highlighted in Table 3.
Table 3

*CE and On-campus Daily Schedules*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Activities that impact attendance</th>
<th>ENGL 104: Dual Credit High School Course</th>
<th>ENGL 104: On-Campus Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sports</td>
<td>sports</td>
<td>program activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field trips</td>
<td>field trips</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school assemblies</td>
<td>school assemblies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather delays/cancellations</td>
<td>weather delays/cancellations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>5 days/week</td>
<td>1 day/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 min./day</td>
<td>3 hours/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of daily activities and schedule held some interesting similarities and differences. The space of the high school made more allowances for the students' and the school’s other activities: assemblies, delays, and field trips. Similarly, the university also allowed for students’ other activities, such as program meetings or activities. While these allowances seem to be similar, one difference was that while on-campus students missed class because of an event within their program, their absence was more of an individual act rather than because of a campus-wide adjustment. Additionally, the day-to-day schedule for CE also showed increased face-to-face contact with students, which was also indicated by the other CE instructors who worked the CE course into the high school schedule.

These categories of responsibility and work not only applied to research question one, but also presented some answers for research question two, and the potential differences in how students behave and identify themselves in high school, CE, and college courses. Responsibility connected to students’ identities and behaviors as students identified what they felt they needed to do within ENGL 104. The most noted responsibilities for the two groups were identified in Table 4.
Table 4

Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGL 104 Students: On-Campus</th>
<th>ENGL 104 Students: CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quality of work</td>
<td>completing work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completing work</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic needs</td>
<td>quality of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>ownership of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three themes of overlap regarding responsibility as a college student that can be seen in Table 4 are quality of work, completing work, and time, when referring to turning in work and general time management. Differences included basic needs and outside concerns for on-campus students and ownership of learning for CE students. For CE students, responsibility or work requirements that also connected to identity and behavior was increased intelligence or ability indicated by the students descriptions of college assignments as “more advanced,” “more in-depth and intellectual,” and “deeper thinking.”

As the instructors addressed issues of responsibility and work, they also shifted in focus from course to identity. The CE instructors viewed their responsibilities in connection to treating or preparing students for college classes and creating an environment similar to what they would experience in college. The on-campus instructor addressed planning lessons and in-class instruction but also included professional development meetings, serving on committees, attending meetings, and conducting research. While these responsibilities may seem aligned to the coursework, the responsibilities directly related to the instructors’ identities and how they viewed themselves based on the work they did. This connection between responsibility and work and identity was clear when the CE instructors based their identity on how their actions/behaviors impacted their students. For example, both CE instructors indicated that to be a
college instructor meant having higher expectations for CE students and more demanding assignments for CE courses than with their high school students and in their high school classes. In contrast, the on-campus instructor referenced tenure status, teaching, scholarship and professional development, and service to the institution and community as the basis for her identity as a college instructor. While not specifically aligned to students or one course, the on-campus instructor’s identity was also reliant on the work she did within the college setting.

In regards to students and their identities within learning spaces, Table 5 shows the four most common categories that emerged.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGL 104 Students: On-Campus</th>
<th>ENGL 104 Students: CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Hardworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>High Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>Distinct from high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post high school</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some similarities exist between the CE and on-campus students. Although not to the same degree, both groups identified themselves as hardworking, responsible, and in some way different from a high school identity when asked what characteristics defined them as college students. One difference between the groups was that on-campus students viewed themselves as “dedicated” while CE students viewed themselves as “high performing” or in some way having greater ability or intelligence.

Limitations

While the surveys and observations addressed the aforementioned research questions, my assumptions within the research could be one limiting factor within the overall research. Because I assume that being a high school student is different from being a college student, this
assumption impacts my research questions and the areas of research I focused on, such as discourse community, culture, learning space, and the impact that these different spaces have on students, instructors, and course alignment. One way I attempted to balance these assumptions was through the supporting research within the Literature Review.

Going beyond my assumptions to instrumentation, the surveys also had limitations. Specifically, the responsibility and work categories on the student surveys seemed to overlap as student responses elicited similar information. Follow-up interviews or surveys would have helped to clarify some of these repetitive responses in order to understand student responses more fully or to give more context for the questions. While the instructor surveys offered more distinct responses, follow-up interviews or a second survey would have also offered more in-depth understanding to the instructors' responses through an opportunity for elaboration. Specifically for the on-campus instructor survey, not having the instructor for the specific courses I observed and surveyed limited the alignment between student and instructor responses.

Along with the surveys, the observations also offered a limited view of the courses. Since most of the ENGL 104 students were working on revisions, the interactions among students and instructors was more limited. Completing multiple observations throughout the semester would have potentially shown the development of the student-student and instructor-student relationships within the courses. One observation offered a snapshot of the setting and its inhabitants but did not allow for a full picture of the SOP and how it had developed.

In the analysis of the data, one limitation was in my own interpretation and descriptive word choices as I analyzed the qualitative data. A different researcher may have identified different emerging categories, which could have impacted the findings.
In relation to the analysis of the data, the data set also created some limitations within the research. The high schools were self-picked because of the specific requirement of having an FYC concurrent enrollment course, which immediately limited the possible research sites. Additionally, finding more schools to participate was limited by time constraints as both high schools and universities were approaching the end of the school year.

By choosing to work with high schools that partnered with the same university, which was the university I also worked with for CE, I already knew the potential instructors who I would be observing. One limitation of this was that I could have been biased towards these instructors as we have completed professional development together and were trained through the same CE program. Furthermore, because we received similar training, that could have increased the likelihood that our views of CE would be similar, which could impact the application of results to other programs.

In conjunction with limitations from other programs, an additional limitation was the application of my findings to other geographical locations. All the participating schools were in a similar geographic location although they did include urban and rural settings. Another potential limitation was that the CE courses were held for an entire year while the on-campus courses were only for a semester. However, this issue was one that I was looking at with my research since the learning space for CE courses have scheduling options that do not exist at the college level.

One final limitation was my own focus on students rather than instructors. Although instructors were included in my research and factor into the development of SOP in the CE setting, my research and its implications were more aligned with the student population. Therefore, the results related to instructors lack the development found in the student results, in part due to the small sample size, especially in comparison to the number of students.
The surveys and observations offered information regarding identity and behaviors within first year composition in two different spaces of learning. However, what does this information offer for the larger discussion of concurrent enrollment and sense of place? By analyzing this data within the framework of the research questions, the impact of place on CE begins to take shape.
Chapter IV: Results

The purpose of this study was to discover what similarities and differences exist between CE and on-campus courses and between identity and behavior of FYC CE students and instructors in CE courses and in high school courses. This information was then used to examine the impact these findings had on the validity of CE courses. The surveys and observations identified some similarities and differences between these participants within different learning spaces.

Research Question 1: What are the similarities and differences between CE courses and on-campus courses in FYC?

Finding 1: Time. Identifying the set-up and structure of CE and on-campus courses established concrete similarities and differences between the courses. The impact that space had on schedule and modes of communication offered the most significant distinctions between the structures of the two spaces. My CE course, and those observed, followed the schedule of the high school. This option was the most realistic within the high school structure because of both teacher and student schedules. Deviating from the schedule for one course would disrupt both the teacher and student schedules and their ability to teach/take other courses. While this option was the most feasible, it created a distinct shift from that of the university course I taught and those I observed. My on-campus course was scheduled as a night course that was offered once a week for three hours. While this time may not be the norm for most college classes that meet two or three times a week during a normal semester course, as the on-campus classes I observed did, it is not an unusual situation. This difference in meeting time was significant because it directly impacted the modes and frequency of communication, another important element of discourse communities.
While modes and frequency of communication is an element of discourse communities, it is also important in moving from the abstract concept of space to a more concrete place. As more time is spent in a space, this time allows for increased interpersonal interactions and increased familiarity with the locale. Tuan (1977) emphasizes the importance of time spent in a space because as one knows a space better – through time spent in the space – it is endowed with value and becomes a place that encompasses a sense of place. Therefore, the time students spend in a particular space impacts the development of SOP because of what they do in that space and the amount of time they spend doing those behaviors (Zia, et al, 2014).

Finding 2: Communication. During the observations of the CE and on-campus classes, communication was one theme that emerged from the data. In the on-campus classes, both instructors and students had clear expectations for the structure of communication, which develops from recognizing the connectedness between physical space and communication (Mountford, 2001). Although there was an expectation of face-to-face communication, indicated by attendance being taken, more focus was on continued communication outside of the class through electronic means. The instructor specifically addressed communicating through email in order to ask questions and to share work. Additionally, students were concerned that the LMS, Blackboard, would not show their final grades because the assigned instructor for the course did not post grades through that system. This concern offered an interesting situation of how a shift in mode of communication impacted students. If students were used to checking grades online, which seemed to be the case in their other college classes based on the question about it, it was interesting how that form of communication was the privileged form rather than asking if they would get an email or could call the university for their grades. These concerns and reliance on electronic communication were not as essential or expected in the CE courses.
Malpas's (1999) ideas regarding social activities and institutions and their connection to structure of a place offer a reason for why CE students did not share the same concerns as the on-campus students. The CE students and the place of CE did not rely on the same institutional structures for communication as the on-campus students did. Therefore, the communication supported through the university but not through the CE courses shaped or privileged certain modes of communication over others.

In contrast to the university's privileged mode of communication, being able to have class every day meant that the most common form of communication between CE students and instructors was face-to-face. Additionally, being in the same building for the majority of the day also meant that students had more access to the instructor, and it was easier to instigate face-to-face communication. Along with this type of communication, my students were still able to make use of email and Moodle to communicate or check homework or resources. The end result of this for my CE students was that they had greater ease in communicating with me 24/7.

In contrast, my on-campus class met face-to-face one day each week. My office hours were right before the class time, so students had one day when they could meet me face-to-face unless they made arrangements with me to meet on another day. Like my CE students, they could also email and use Blackboard. However, for my on-campus students, email and Blackboard were essential modes of communication since we only met once a week. Assignments, reminders, resources, and peer revision all took place online, and if students chose not to use these online elements, they often fell behind in the writing process. CE students could use the online resources, but if they chose not to, the impact on their overall process was negligible. For other on-campus classes, they met more frequently, so I cannot speak to the importance that the out-of-class correspondence had on students' work and success in the course.
Finding 3: Interpersonal relationships. In conjunction with communication and its impact on the courses, interpersonal relationships within the two spaces also offered some information on how setting impacts other facets of a class. In one observation of a CE course, students were vocal about their relationship with their FYC instructor, especially in comparison to other instructors. Students indicated an increased level of respect for their instructor, and it often connected to the students’ perception of what they had learned in the course. Because the comments connected to what students learned and their perception of the instructor, these comments related to the observational category of environment. Students clearly saw their environment as a place of learning, which then defined the course as distinct from other courses they have taken. Some student comments were, “This is the only class I learn things in,” “I’m in this class because of the teacher,” and that in the ENGL 104 class, they had learned “more than [they have] learned in all [their] other classes combined because [their] teachers are trash.” With the teacher and class environment establishing ENGL 104 as a place of learning, it separates itself from other courses, specifically high school courses, as having different and more desirable goals or outcomes, according to the students.

This connection between teacher, environment, and course perception is somewhat surprising when looking at the survey responses about interpersonal relationships. Based on my experiences with my CE course, I knew all of my students and had them in an English class prior to their participation in my ENGL 104 course. Therefore, a pre-existing relationship that they were happy to continue by signing up for ENGL 104 would seem to indicate a positive view of me or of my class. However, in the CE courses I observed, none of the students had had the instructor for a previous class. That lack of previous relationship was actually reflected in the on-
campus courses as well. It would seem then that prior instructor-student relationships would not necessarily have an impact on the courses in these different spaces.

While prior relationships could impact the “new” CE place of learning, the lack of prior relationships may not have as great of an impact in constructing SOP. Both Tuan (1975) and Cresswell (2014) assert that place is a social construction by humans. Therefore, when humans enter a space, they produce the SOP because of how their actions and interactions construct meaning. This social construction would be new for both on-campus and CE students because while the physical location might be one they have inhabited before, the learning space would most likely not be replicated. For example, students could have a class in the same physical classroom, but if the student make-up is different, then the social construction would also be different, which would impact SOP.

This new social construction would be impacted by interpersonal relationships, and while instructor-student relationships were more likely to be new for both on-campus and CE students, a greater distinction was found with interpersonal relationships among students. While only 5 out of 13 students knew any of their classmates in the on-campus course, all the CE students knew their classmates before taking ENGL 104. Although both groups knew students in similar ways, the CE students indicated knowing each other in multiple ways and for longer periods of time. The development of a sense of place would most likely be impacted by these relationships because the ENGL 104 courses that I observed encouraged and often required student interaction through process work and peer feedback. These prior relationships offer the opportunity for shaping the CE course as a familiar place or class even if the instructor and physical classroom are new. This ready familiarity was lacking in the on-campus class, which established these
courses as different because students may require more time to adjust or adapt to an on-campus class than a CE course.

Finding 4: Responsibility and work. Aside from interpersonal relationships, responsibility and work also addressed the similarities and differences in CE and on-campus courses. While both CE and on-campus students indicated an increased amount of work in ENGL 104 compared to high school courses, where students did that work differed. On-campus students said that they had more work to do outside of class in college, whereas in high school courses they rarely did work outside of class. CE bridged the two settings in regards to this issue because CE students also indicated increased work, but they also said they had more class time to do it. This situation would likely be linked to the increased amount of time in class that the CE courses indicated. They had the same amount of required work as on-campus but an additional semester and 2-3 extra class periods each week.

Perhaps surprisingly with increased work, students disagreed on which policies were stricter as a similar number of students indicated high school as having more difficult policies and college having more difficult policies. Additionally, both groups also felt that similar work was required under both courses. One CE student even stated that the courses were “in the same school, [with the] same teachers, and [had the] same class length;” the differences were more work and stricter grading for the college course.

While increased time in class marks a distinct difference between the learning spaces, it seemed that many similarities existed between the type of work done in the CE and on-campus courses. However, one difference between how CE and on-campus students viewed their coursework that stood out was the way CE students labeled the type of work done in class. This labeling gave insight into their perception of the differences between CE and high school
courses. Repeated comments and labels from the CE students were that the work in the college course was "more important" and "more significant" than the work in non-college courses, so they expected to spend more time doing it. These labels created a hierarchy within course options, with CE courses gaining prestige. This hierarchal construction added to the SOP of CE because it also carried over from an identifier for the course to an identifier for the students.

**Research Question 2: What is the difference, if any, in the identity and behavior of FYC CE students and instructors while in a high school course versus an FYC CE course?**

**Finding 1: Location and identity.** The difference between CE and on-campus student identity offers an interesting view of how location may influence identity. CE students highlighted their intelligence or academic ability as part of their identity. Looking into this difference in relation to location offers an explanation for the difference between CE and on-campus identity. On-campus, ENGL 104 is a class the majority of incoming students take as a first year requirement. Therefore, the students in the on-campus course are part of the majority in regards to why they are taking this course. Also, the students who do not have to take this course are ones whose test scores (ACT/SAT) have allowed them to test out of the class by showing a higher level of achievement/skill/ability through their test score. Therefore, those who do not have to take ENGL 104 would be seen as more capable than those who have to take it. Therefore, taking into account Stedman’s (2002) connection between place attachment and identity, on-campus students would identify with the majority of the students who were also taking ENGL 104.

However, in the high school setting, as a college course, ENGL 104 is only available to those whose test scores were high enough to be able to take the class for college credit, a much smaller population than on-campus. Therefore, the student population taking the course is seen
as the higher achieving students or more accomplished students. Ability tracking that often happens in high school could also contribute to this view of self. As tracks are labeled as remedial, college prep, and college, being in a college class, such as CE, could impact how CE students identify their own intelligence. Taking a college class while still in the high school location would set CE students on the top educational tier. By taking part in what may be seen as an elevated course, this placement could be what impacts students’ view of self as smart or intelligent.

In the on-campus classes, rather than viewing themselves as higher achieving, students viewed themselves as dedicated or motivated regarding their work as students. Since they viewed themselves as post-high school, the freedom and responsibility they also indicated seemed to impact the way they viewed their work in their college classes. Without the control of parents and high school rules, students’ view as dedicated or motivated shows awareness that they could choose not to be students. Therefore, by choosing to continue their education after high school, they are showing motivation and dedication to their future plans and course of study. One student response that showed a connection between this identity and location was “you’re alone at college (your parents can’t make you do your homework, you must find the motivation).” The concept of independence and motivation is clear as the student indicated the absence of parents and increased responsibility. Another student echoed this idea by stating “in high school your parent took care of you and you were locked in a building 8 hours a day” as opposed to in college where the individual is responsible to “get work done, go to class... study to learn, and be involved.” The place of learning impacted the personal responsibilities the student held, and in order to meet those new responsibilities, the student would need to have personal motivation.
Reynolds’s (1993) connection between place and ethos helps explain what is happening for students connecting identity and location. Because people are shaped by “their habits of their culture” (p. 328), ethos and identity are socially created, which places this identity development within a particular place and culture. Ethos as a social construction then includes the physical location but also, as Malpas (1999) discusses, the social activities of that place, which would help explain why location would impact students’ identity.

While the student role defined identities for both CE and on-campus students, CE students seemed to have developed their identity based more on this role. How students identified responsibilities highlighted this difference. CE students were more likely to view responsibility as linked to learning or ensuring one’s learning. One student stated the following:

As a college student I am more responsible for turning my assignments in on time, sometimes teaching myself the material in the book and making sure my assignments are done to my best ability. I am no longer dependent on teachers or my parents as much as I used to be.

The focus on being more responsible for learning and doing schoolwork highlights how this CE student was defined by the responsibilities of a student. This view of self was referenced by other CE students who said that their responsibilities were to “keep track of work,” “ask for help if [they] need it,” and do “projects more independently.” For these CE students, their responsibilities as college students were all aligned to the role of the student and the increased responsibility within the academic setting.

On-campus students also saw increased responsibility within the academic setting: “attend[ing] class,” “get[ting] homework done,” and “managing study/academic life.” However, they also included responsibilities for basic needs as in being responsible for oneself, food, and
sleep. Additionally, they also indicated responsibility to concerns outside of the classroom, such as: “tak[ing] care of my child, go[ing] to work,” “maintaining my job,” and “pay[ing] bills.” The development of identity outside the academic setting showed that although CE and on-campus students may share some increased responsibilities, the on-campus students’ lives outside of the classroom showed a focus on more than school. I wonder if this awareness of different responsibilities is really an awareness of the different discourse communities that a person is part of (Harris, 1989).

This development of self apart from being a student was also seen in the observations when on-campus students chose other options or responsibilities by leaving the class early instead of staying. Those who stayed worked one-on-one with instructors, worked with peers, asked questions, and organized their work for the class. The idea of choice is intriguing because CE students are not given this choice. They are confined by the schedule of the high school, and because they are in the high school for their college class, they are bound by the structure and mandatory attendance of that school. Therefore, the structure or freedom of the academic institution also impacted students’ identities and behaviors.

**Finding 2: Location and behaviors.** Identity and behaviors often go hand-in-hand, so it is not surprising that location’s impact on identity would also show an impact on behaviors connected to one’s identity. With the view of being “smart” or “dedicated,” both CE and on-campus students also saw themselves exhibiting behaviors categorized as “hardworking,” “responsible,” and “different from high school.” These similarities are not overly surprising in conjunction with instructor identity aligned with student behavior and expectations. Because instructors are responsible for establishing classroom environment and guidelines, it is not surprising that students would align their identity with the expectations connected to instructor
identity. In particular, the CE instructors aligned their identity to higher expectations for students and more demanding assignments. For example, one CE instructor said that being a college instructor meant "to have higher expectation for the students. Increased rigor. More 'demanding' assignments & readings" as compared to instruction at other levels. This instructor's understanding of what it meant to be a college instructor is clearly aligned with expectations for student behavior. Another CE instructor also aligned her identity as a college instructor with expectations for students by stating that CE students "take more responsibility for their learning. They should already 'get school' so ideally study habits and basic writing skills are there." These increased expectations in behaviors are echoed in the students' view of their own behavior as "hardworking" and "responsible."

While the on-campus instructor did not connect identity to the students, all the instructors' policies showed alignment with the university. For the on-campus instructor, she stated that "there are standard course policies for all sections of ENGL 104," and that she adhered to those. The CE instructors also noted the "course policies given by the university" and even some of the specific assignments for the course, "four essays (narrative, analysis, argument, multimodal)." For the two CE instructors, they also indicated that the FYC policies were stricter than their high school courses. The alignment of policies seemed to be one way to establish or define the student role within a college course, regardless of location. Defining the student role regardless of location is important because although Reynolds (2007) emphasizes that geographical locations influence one's identity, she also highlights the importance of social habits, which deals with more than just a physical location. For a college course, part of the social habits are created through adherence to university and course policies.
This situation could also explain why CE instructors focused more on their identity linked to higher expectations and increased rigor for their students whereas the on-campus instructor's identity was not as connected to the identity of the students because all students should be able to perform at the level of the course.
Chapter V: Conclusion and Recommendations

First year composition CE and on-campus courses offered numerous differences. The CE course showed greater frequency of interaction and face-to-face opportunities than on-campus. Additionally, CE students were more likely to have developed relationships with their peers prior to being in the college course. In regards to identity, CE students were still quite grounded in their role as students while on-campus students had a more expansive view of their responsibilities and the roles they filled. Even with these differences, one similarity was how students viewed the work they did in the college course as having higher expectations and more rigorous requirements than work in high school courses.

After analyzing the similarities and differences and the impact of place on identity in both CE and on-campus courses, research question 3 can be addressed: Based on the findings regarding FYC CE and on-campus courses, what are the implications for the validity of CE courses and the place it currently inhabits?

Looking at the implications for CE courses and their place of instruction, perhaps CE is the answer of moving the academic discourse community of the university into the high school setting and challenging Blau’s (2006) assertion that the high school is not an intellectual community. The CE students’ views of themselves and the work they are doing seem to support the concept that they are entering a new and academic discourse community when they enter the CE classroom. Students do view themselves as separate from high school students, which does show some awareness or expectation for work and responsibilities beyond that of high school. Having students become more aware of their role as college students is one step toward establishing a college course in a high school setting. One way to heighten this awareness is through viewing identities as relational. Burke (1980) explains that understanding how identities
are relational is important because a person’s own roles allow him to understand the counter-roles: father – son, teacher – student, etc. In CE, students’ roles as high school students and college students could be useful as students can know what a role requires by what another role is or is not. For example, if high school students know the rigor of high school work, then they should expect their role as a college student to include work that is more rigorous than what they are doing as a high school student. By having students become more aware of the different roles they fill, they can be more aware of how their role shifts within different spaces. One way to increase this awareness is through CE and on-campus instructors.

Instructors in both spaces can help students achieve this awareness by first recognizing that students are not “knowing subjects” who recognize the habits of or participation in different discourse communities (Reynolds, 1993, p. 329). Therefore, FYC is an important space of academic discourse as students enter the university and begin to develop their authority as speakers and writers. Instructors have to be the ones who create the guidelines, knowledge, practices, and habits of the intellectual discourse community. How can CE instructors establish college practices within the high school setting? Denecker (2013) addresses a foundation for this movement from high school to college by asserting the need for “open, respectful, and productive dialogue among instructors on both sides of the composition threshold” (p. 41). These types of relationships are already being explored (Dennihy, 2015; Farris, 2010). This dialogue is important as some of the high school instructors will also be straddling both sides of composition as high school and CE instructors. Additionally, this type of relationship could create partnerships that support the high expectations of a college course regardless of where that course is taking place by building a sense of place that includes the habits of an intellectual community.
While development and greater understanding of students' and instructors' roles is one way to create a college space in the high school setting, one defining element noted by all participants was that the college class, regardless of where it was located, had higher expectations. These higher expectations related to quality of work, time invested in the work, and personal accountability and responsibility. Therefore, in regards to the validity of college courses in the high school setting, the research shows that it is valid, but with one very important caveat – higher expectations need to be in place for all participants and in areas of work and responsibility. Therefore, for CE courses to find success and legitimacy as aligning with their on-campus counterparts, high expectations should be central in constructing an SOP that meets the demands of the legislation and the academic discourse community.

The reason that high expectations must exist is because that element was evidenced in student and instructor responses about identity, responsibility, and work, all elements that factor in to the experiences that move a setting from location to locale to SOP. The development of the students’ and instructors’ roles, as previously discussed, is important for establishing these higher expectations because the instructors indicated setting more rigorous requirements and policies and students referenced the more rigorous requirements in connection to grading, time management, placement of class as more important than others, and their own increased intelligence that must meet those requirements.

Along with increasing awareness of students’ and instructors’ roles, one way to also ensure high expectations and increased rigor is through careful and deliberate implementation of programs and courses that adhere to the high expectations that seem to be central to creating a college space in a high school setting. One way I would recommend doing this is through adherence to standards, like those found within accreditation bodies, like NACEP, that push CE
programs to develop rigorous standards and practices that “adhere to the highest standards so students experience a seamless transition to college and teachers benefit from the meaningful, ongoing professional development” (NACEP, n.d.). These standards address the roles of both students and instructors and how having high standards for the programs will benefit both groups as they work within the college classroom.

As high schools, universities, and accrediting bodies work to implement effective CE programs, more research needs to be done on how students in CE courses transition to on-campus courses after they finish high school. This research could offer some interesting data on their performance in college as a full-time college student and possibly address concerns of whether CE students and the work they have done in CE classes matches up to a “real,” on-campus college experience. This data could then help instructors identify areas in their own teaching that do not align with the expectations and rigors of the college space in order to create an SOP that more closely reflects and embodies the intellectual community of the university.

Although this research and its findings are a bit surprising because of my own assumptions and biases, I am encouraged by what these findings offer for the continued discussion and development of CE courses. As current legislation and educational climate indicate, CE and other early college opportunities are not going to go away. With that in mind, I am cautiously hopeful about the future of an increased push for intellectual communities within high school settings through concurrent enrollment courses.
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Appendix A

Questions for The University of Findlay’s
College Writing 1 English Faculty

Instructions: Please answer the following questions honestly. If a more in-depth response or explanation is needed, please use the space provided to write in your response. If you need more space to write than is provided, please use a separate sheet of paper. To remain anonymous, please do not write your name on this survey. Also, please do not identify your school, other students, teacher, or other school personnel by name. Information from this survey will be reviewed only by the researcher and her research advisory committee at the University of Findlay. Reports on the survey will not identify specific instructors, students, or schools. The questions in this survey are designed to help identify and better understand how place factors into identity, interpersonal relationships, responsibility, and work in concurrent enrollment (CE) in comparison to on-campus courses. **For purposes of this survey, concurrent enrollment is sometimes abbreviated as CE.

Identity

1. What does it mean to be a “college” instructor? How might this be different from instruction at other levels?

2. How many times have you taught ENGL 104?

3. How many days per week does your ENGL 104 class meet? How long is each class period?

Interpersonal Relationships

4. How often do you contact/converse with students outside of your ENGL 104 class? Estimate amount of time per week.

5. How does this contact compare to your interaction with students in other courses you teach? Is it higher? Lower? Comparable?

6. What is your previous relationship with this group of students?
7. What are your responsibilities as a college instructor?

8. If you teach in another setting, how does your responsibility in the other setting compare to your responsibilities of teaching a college course?

9. What course policies do you follow?

10. How are these policies similar to and/or different from other courses you teach? (e.g. late policy, classroom expectations/guidelines, etc.)

Work

11. Estimate how much time you spend on the following for each assignment:

   Planning _____________
   Grading _____________
   Other _____________ (Please identify what this includes.)

12. How much time do you expect your students to spend on class work in a week?

   CE instructors only

13. Do you notice any other similarities/differences between the college courses you teach and the high school courses you teach? Please explain.
Appendix B

Questions for The University of Findlay’s College Writing I Students

Instructions: Please answer the following questions honestly. If a more in-depth response or explanation is needed, please use the space provided to write in your response. If you need more space to write than is provided, please use a separate sheet of paper. To remain anonymous, please do not write your name on this survey. Also, please do not identify your school, other students, teacher, or other school personnel by name. Information from this survey will be reviewed only by the researcher and her research advisory committee at the University of Findlay. Reports on the survey will not identify specific instructors, students, or schools. The questions in this survey are designed to help identify and better understand how place factors into identity, interpersonal relationships, responsibility, and work in concurrent enrollment (CE) in comparison to on-campus courses. **For purposes of this survey, concurrent enrollment is sometimes abbreviated as CE.

Identity

1. What characteristics define you as a college student?

Interpersonal Relationships

2. Did you know the other students in this course before you took this course with them?

3. If yes, what was your interaction with them before this class? Did you have other classes with them? Were/are you in extra-curricular activities with them?

4. Have you taken a course from your current instructor before? If yes, for what courses?

Responsibility

5. What are your responsibilities as a college student?
6. How are these responsibilities similar/different from your responsibilities as a high school student?

7. How are the policies in this course similar to and/or different from high school courses?

Work

8. On average, how many hours a week do you spend on work for this course?

9. How does this amount compare to the amount of time you spend/spent on work for high school courses?

10. How do your assignments in the college course compare to assignments in high school English courses?

Other

11. If there is anything else you would like to add, please do so here.
Appendix C
Administrator Email

Dear [Administrator’s name],

My name is Jamie Erford and I am a graduate student at the University of Findlay. As a writing teacher with experience in both the high school and university setting and a current graduate student at the University of Findlay doing research for my thesis, “Sense of Place and Concurrent Enrollment: Creating College Places in High School Settings.” I am conducting a study about the impact of learning space in first year composition (FYC) and concurrent enrollment (CE) courses in comparison to their on-campus counterparts.

I am hoping to work with your College Writing I instructor, [instructor’s name], to gather my research. My purpose is to better understand the similarities and differences between the high school setting of CE in relation to on-campus courses. As a high school and CE teacher, I bring a range of experience and interest to this project, and am hopeful that the data I collect can help my own and others’ understanding of learning space, especially within the ever-growing realm of College Credit Plus.

The study consists of a one-day observation of the instructor’s ENGL 104 class and a survey asking students and instructors about identity, work habits, and interpersonal relationships within the college writing class. All parts of the study would be completed within one class period.

All of the data collected will be anonymous, and I will use pseudonyms in the writing and dissemination of my findings in order to insure subjects’ and the school’s anonymity. Participating in the study is entirely voluntary and the subject may withdraw at any time. I have attached the consent form that all subjects would receive, and it has been approved by The University of Findlay Institutional Review Board, which guarantees that research involving human subjects follows federal regulations.

I hope that you can help me with my research, and I look forward to hearing from you. Please let me know your decision at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions regarding this project feel free to contact me through email, by calling 419-358-7941, or contacting the Primary Investigator and my thesis chair, Dr. Christine Denecker, at denecker@findlay.edu or at 419-434-6661.

Thank you,

Jamie Erford
MARW Graduate Student
University of Findlay
Appendix D
Instructor Email

Dear University of Findlay College Writing I Instructor:

As a writing teacher with experience in both the high school and university setting and a current graduate student at the University of Findlay doing research for my thesis, I am conducting a study about the impact of learning space in first year composition (FYC) and concurrent enrollment (CE) courses in comparison to their on-campus counterparts. I want to work with a group of approximately 2-4 instructors and 40-80 students from 4 FYC courses. My purpose is to better understand the similarities and differences between the high school setting of CE in relation to on-campus courses. As a high school and CE teacher, I bring a range of experience and interest to this project, and am hopeful that the data I collect can help my own and others' understanding of learning space, especially within the ever-growing realm of College Credit Plus.

As part of this project, you would complete a questionnaire about your experience teaching CE writing and other courses. I am also asking your students to complete a questionnaire regarding their classes. Additionally, I would also observe your ENGL 104 class for one class period. All questionnaires and observations will be conducted during April 2017.

I hope I can include you as part of this study, and I would be happy to answer any additional questions you might have at this time. If you are interested in learning the results of the study, I would also be happy to share those findings with you. Please feel free to contact me for more information.

Not only do I believe the study will provide insight into the questions I have about spaces of learning, I also believe that the information will help shape our understanding of students and their perceptions of identity within these spaces. If you agree to participate, please sign and return the attached consent form.

Sincerely,

Jamie Erford,
MARW Graduate Student
The University of Findlay
419-358-7941
erfordj1@findlay.edu

Dr. Christine Denecker, Thesis Chair
Professor of English; English Dept. Chair
The University of Findlay
419-434-6661
denecker@findlay.edu
Appendix E
Parent Letter

Dear Parent:

As a writing teacher with experience in both the high school and university setting and a current graduate student at the University of Findlay doing research for my thesis, I am conducting a study about learning space in first year composition (FYC) and concurrent enrollment (CE) courses in comparison to their on-campus counterparts. I want to work with four ENGL 104 courses, totaling 40-80 students. My purpose is to better understand the similarities and differences between the high school setting of CE in relation to on-campus courses. As a high school and CE teacher, I bring a range of experience and interest to this project, and am hopeful that the data I collect can help my own and others’ understanding of learning space, especially within the ever-growing realm of College Credit Plus.

As part of this project, your son or daughter would complete a survey about their experience within ENGL 104 and other courses. Additionally, I would also observe your son/daughter’s ENGL 104 class for one class period. All data collected will remain anonymous. All questionnaires and observations will be conducted during April 2017.

I hope you can include your son or daughter as part of this study, and I would be happy to answer any additional questions you might have at this time. If you are interested in learning the results of the study, I would also be happy to share those findings with you. Please feel free to contact me for more information.

Not only do I believe the study will provide insight into the questions I have about spaces of learning, I also believe that the information will help shape our understanding of students and their perceptions of identity within these spaces. I have provided the consent form with information about the study. After reading the information, if you grant permission for your son or daughter to participate, please sign at the bottom of this page and return the attached consent form with your child.

Sincerely,

Jamie Erford,
MARW Graduate Student
The University of Findlay
419-358-7941
erfordj1@findlay.edu

Dr. Christine Denecker, Thesis Chair
Professor of English; English Dept. Chair
The University of Findlay
419-434-6661
denecker@findlay.edu

*Parental/Guardian Consent:
I have read and fully understand the consent form. I understand that my child/ward will be participating in the study, and I give my consent for him/her to do so.

Signed: ____________________________ Date ____________
Parent/Guardian’s Signature
DATE: April 2017

PROJECT TITLE: Sense of Place and Concurrent Enrollment: Creating College Places in High School Settings

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S) AND CO-INVESTIGATORS:
Primary Investigator: Dr. Christine Denecker, University of Findlay
Student Investigator: Jamie Erford, University of Findlay

INTRODUCTION: As a writing teacher with experience in both the high school and university setting and a current graduate student at the University of Findlay doing research for my thesis, I am conducting a study about learning space in first year composition (FYC) and concurrent enrollment (CE) courses in comparison to their on-campus counterparts. I am looking to work with four ENGL 104 courses, totaling 40-80 students.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:
The research will collect qualitative data related to the place of instruction (in a high school or on a college campus) and the impact of place on identity, work, and interpersonal relationships. The goals of this research are to: (1) examine the impact of place on learning; (2) analyze the findings in relation to current legislation regarding alignment between on-campus college courses and dual enrollment courses (33 Ohio Revised Code, 2011) and practices in dual enrollment related to setting, pedagogy, identity, and interpersonal relationships; and (3) provide discussion for the future role of College Credit Plus courses in alternative/non-campus spaces.

As a high school and CE teacher, I bring a range of experience and interest to this project, and am hopeful that the data I collect can help my own and others’ understanding of learning space, especially within the ever-growing realm of College Credit Plus.

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY PROCEDURES: In April 2017, after receiving permission from school administration and instructors, the Student Investigator will mail out consent forms for participation in the intended research. Consent forms will be collected on the observation day. Dates for observation will then be agreed upon by all parties and will fall between March 2017-April 2017. On the agreed upon date within March/April 2017, the Student Investigator will collect observations (written and typed) from classroom visits and distribute and collect student and instructor questionnaires.

TIME ASSOCIATED WITH STUDY: The length of the observation will not exceed one class period, approximately 50 minutes, and approximately 10 minutes of that class period will be used to have participants fill out the questionnaires. No additional time will be required or requested of the subjects after this class period.

POTENTIAL RISKS:
Risks in this study are minimal. One potential risk for the students is if the teacher somehow saw students’ responses. Because the survey asks about elements of a particular class, some of the students’ comments could potentially offend the instructors. The classroom environment could be impacted by this possibility.

A potential risk for the instructors is embarrassment or anger over having their teaching practices discussed by students. Yet another potential risk for instructors is how other colleagues might react to responses that require comparison with other courses, especially non-college courses. The way the instructors view their college course compared to non-college courses could create tension if a hierarchy is shown between these different types of classes.

**POTENTIAL BENEFITS:**

Participants will benefit by receiving a copy of my thesis that discusses my overall findings. This information can potentially help them, especially the instructors, within CE learning spaces.

Additionally, by learning about how students and instructors view and behave in different learning spaces, the role that concurrent enrollment courses fill can be better understood, which can lead to more effective pedagogical practices. Since these courses are often high school students’ first exposure to college coursework and expectations, the choices an instructor makes can have a lasting impact on students’ understanding of what it means to be a college student and to do “college-level” work, which could impact their success in post-secondary education.

**PROJECT ALTERNATIVES TO PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY:** To choose not to participate.

**CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA:**

The Student Investigator will be the only person to handle the observation notes and the questionnaires. Additionally, since no names or identifying numbers will be on any of the questionnaires, participants will maintain anonymity within the data and on the questionnaires. The student and instructor data will also be separated from each other to further protect subjects’ anonymity, and subjects will be referred to by pseudonyms in the writing and dissemination of findings. The digital data will be stored on an encrypted file on the University of Findlay’s server and the physical notes and forms will be stored in the Principal Investigator’s locked office.

**COSTS AND/OR COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION:** N/A

**CIRCUMSTANCES FOR DISMISSAL FROM THE STUDY:** N/A

**COMPENSATION FOR INJURY:** N/A

**CONTACT PERSONS:** For more information concerning this research, please contact Dr. Christine Denecker at 419-434-6661. If you believe that you may have suffered a research related injury, contact Dr. Christine Denecker at 419-434-6661. If you have further questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact:

IRB Chairperson
The University of Findlay
Findlay, OH 45840
419 434-4640
irb@findlay.edu
Appendix F
Student Letter

Dear Student:

As a writing teacher with experience in both the high school and university setting and a current graduate student at the University of Findlay doing research for my thesis, I am conducting a study about learning space in first year composition (FYC) and concurrent enrollment (CE) courses in comparison to their on-campus counterparts. I want to work with four ENGL 104 courses, totaling 40-80 students. My purpose is to better understand the similarities and differences between the high school setting of CE in relation to on-campus courses. As a high school and CE teacher, I bring a range of experience and interest to this project, and am hopeful that the data I collect can help my own and others’ understanding of learning space, especially within the ever-growing realm of College Credit Plus.

As part of this project, you would complete a survey about your experience within ENGL 104 and other courses. Additionally, I would also observe your ENGL 104 class for one class period. All data collected will remain anonymous. All questionnaires and observations will be conducted during April 2017.

I hope you can be part of this study, and I would be happy to answer any additional questions you might have at this time. If you are interested in learning the results of the study, I would also be happy to share those findings with you. Please feel free to contact me for more information.

Not only do I believe the study will provide insight into the questions I have about spaces of learning, I also believe that the information will help shape our understanding of students and their perceptions of identity within these spaces. If you agree to participate, please sign and return the attached consent form.

Sincerely,

Jamie Erford,
MARW Graduate Student
The University of Findlay
419-358-7941
erfordj1@findlay.edu

Dr. Christine Denecker, Thesis Chair
Professor of English; English Dept. Chair
The University of Findlay
419-434-6661
denecker@findlay.edu
Appendix G
Consent Form

DATE: April 2017

PROJECT TITLE: Sense of Place and Concurrent Enrollment: Creating College Places in High School Settings

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S) AND CO-INVESTIGATORS:
Primary Investigator: Dr. Christine Denecker, University of Findlay
Student Investigator: Jamie Erford, University of Findlay

INTRODUCTION: As a writing teacher with experience in both the high school and university setting and a current graduate student at the University of Findlay doing research for my thesis, I am conducting a study about learning space in first year composition (FYC) and concurrent enrollment (CE) courses in comparison to their on-campus counterparts. I am looking to work with four ENGL 104 courses, totaling 40-80 students.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:
The research will collect qualitative data related to the place of instruction (in a high school or on a college campus) and the impact of place on identity, work, and interpersonal relationships. The goals of this research are to: (1) examine the impact of place on learning; (2) analyze the findings in relation to current legislation regarding alignment between on-campus college courses and dual enrollment courses (33 Ohio Revised Code, 2011) and practices in dual enrollment related to setting, pedagogy, identity, and interpersonal relationships; and (3) provide discussion for the future role of College Credit Plus courses in alternative/non-campus spaces.

As a high school and CE teacher, I bring a range of experience and interest to this project, and am hopeful that the data I collect can help my own and others’ understanding of learning space, especially within the ever-growing realm of College Credit Plus.

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY PROCEDURES: In April 2017, after receiving permission from school administration and instructors, the Student Investigator will mail out consent forms for participation in the intended research. Consent forms will be collected on the observation day. Dates for observation will then be agreed upon by all parties and will fall between March 2017-April 2017. On the agreed upon date within March/April 2017, the Student Investigator will collect observations (written and typed) from classroom visits and distribute and collect student and instructor questionnaires.

TIME ASSOCIATED WITH STUDY: The length of the observation will not exceed one class period, approximately 50 minutes, and approximately 10 minutes of that class period will be used to have participants fill out the questionnaires. No additional time will be required or requested of the subjects after this class period.
POTENTIAL RISKS:
Risks in this study are minimal. One potential risk for the students is if the teacher somehow saw students’ responses. Because the survey asks about elements of a particular class, some of the students’ comments could potentially offend the instructors. The classroom environment could be impacted by this possibility.

A potential risk for the instructors is embarrassment or anger over having their teaching practices discussed by students. Yet another potential risk for instructors is how other colleagues might react to responses that require comparison with other courses, especially non-college courses. The way the instructors view their college course compared to non-college courses could create tension if a hierarchy is shown between these different types of classes.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS:
Participants will benefit by receiving a copy of my thesis that discusses my overall findings. This information can potentially help them, especially the instructors, within CE learning spaces.

Additionally, by learning about how students and instructors view and behave in different learning spaces, the role that concurrent enrollment courses fill can be better understood, which can lead to more effective pedagogical practices. Since these courses are often high school students’ first exposure to college coursework and expectations, the choices an instructor makes can have a lasting impact on students’ understanding of what it means to be a college student and to do “college-level” work, which could impact their success in post-secondary education.

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES TO PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY: To choose not to participate.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA:
The Student Investigator will be the only person to handle the observation notes and the questionnaires. Additionally, since no names or identifying numbers will be on any of the questionnaires, participants will maintain anonymity within the data and on the questionnaires. The student and instructor data will also be separated from each other to further protect subjects’ anonymity, and subjects will be referred to by pseudonyms in the writing and dissemination of findings. The digital data will be stored on an encrypted file on the University of Findlay’s server and the physical notes and forms will be stored in the Principal Investigator’s locked office.

COSTS AND/OR COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION: N/A
CIRCUMSTANCES FOR DISMISSAL FROM THE STUDY: N/A
COMPENSATION FOR INJURY: N/A
CONTACT PERSONS: For more information concerning this research, please contact Dr. Christine Denecker at 419-434-6661. If you believe that you may have suffered a research related injury, contact Dr. Christine Denecker at 419-434-6661. If you have further questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact:

IRB Chairperson
The University of Findlay
Findlay, OH 45840
419 434-4640
irb@findlay.edu
VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION: Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to participate or to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason. In the event that you do withdraw from this study, the information you have already provided will be kept in a confidential manner.

Since this study deals with instructors and students, be aware that the subject does not jeopardize grades nor risk loss of present or future faculty/school/university relationships.

CONSENT: Federal regulations require precautionary measures to be taken to insure the protection of human subjects on physical, psychological, social, and other issues. This includes the use of "informed consent" procedures.

I, __________________________ (PRINTED NAME OF SUBJECT) have been adequately informed regarding the risks and benefits of participating in this study. My signature also indicates that I can change my mind and withdraw my consent to participate at any time without penalty. Any and all questions I had about my participation in this study have been fully answered. I understand I will receive a copy of this consent form for my records.

________________________________________
SUBJECT SIGNATURE: __________________________ DATE

I have witnessed the consent process and believe the subject has been fully informed, understands the research study, and has agreed to participate in the study.

________________________________________
WITNESS PRINTED NAME: __________________________

________________________________________
WITNESS SIGNATURE: __________________________ DATE
Appendix H

RESEARCH ASSENT FORM

Project Title: Sense of Place and Concurrent Enrollment: Creating College Places in High School Settings

IRB #: 1095

Principal Investigator and Co-Investigator
Primary Investigator: Dr. Christine Denecker, University of Findlay
Student Investigator: Jamie Erford, University of Findlay

Date: April 2017

We want to tell you about a research study we are doing. A research study is a way to learn information about something. We would like to find out more about learning space in first year composition (FYC) and concurrent enrollment (CE) courses in comparison to their on-campus counterparts. You are being asked to join the study because you are currently enrolled in an ENGL 104 course through the University of Findlay.

If you agree to join this study, you will be asked to be observed for one class period and to fill out a questionnaire that will also be completed within that class period.

Risks in this study are minimal. One potential risk for the students is if the teacher somehow saw students’ responses. Because the survey asks about elements of a particular class, some of the students’ comments could potentially offend the instructors. The classroom environment could be impacted by this possibility.

We do not know if you will be helped by being in this study. We may learn something that will help other children with placement in concurrent enrollment and first year composition classes.

You do not have to join this study. It is up to you. You can say okay now, and you can change your mind later. All you have to do is tell us. No one will be mad at you if you change your mind.

Before you say yes to being in this study, we will answer any questions you have.

If you want to be in this study, please sign your name. You will get a copy of this form to keep for yourself.

(Sign your name here)                        (Date)