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ABSTRACT

Based on their U.S. K-12 schooling experiences, most Generation 1.5 students enter college with some foundation in academic literacies. However, many Generation 1.5ers have difficulties with the more complex and more language-intensive reading and writing tasks they encounter in college. This case study presents findings of the academic literacies experiences of three Generation 1.5 students during their first year of university study. With the use of the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) as the theoretical frame, the study focuses on the academic literacies difficulties these students experienced as well as the strategic practices they utilized to overcome these difficulties and complete the academic literacies tasks. Data for the study was collected using semi-structured participant interviews, transcription, member checks, literacies logs, course artifacts, and literacies samples. Analysis of the data collected was done with the use of a systematic coding scheme to identify emergent themes and patterns and determine frequency counts in the data. The results of this study highlight four important characteristics of the academic literacies experiences of first year Generation 1.5 learners. First, the situatedness of academic literacies is the cause of some difficulties Generation 1.5 learners have with them, rather than their Generation 1.5 learner status. Second, the Generation 1.5 learners in this study possessed notions of academic literacies which revealed a less linear approach to and interpretation of the academic socialization process.
than their instructors. Third, the differences among the participants’ levels of academic literacy proficiency, as indicated by their difficulties with and strategic practices of academic literacies, point to the diversity within this group of learners. Finally, the U.S. K-12 schooling experience that the Generation 1.5 learners in this study had served as an advantage to them in different ways as they negotiated new academic literacies contexts in their first year of university study.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Demographic Shift in the International Student Population at the University

“The wave of immigration in the past two decades has had such a profound effect on our society that it can almost be regarded as the equivalent of a demographic revolution. And nowhere is that impact more obvious than in our schools” (Friedlander, 1991, p. 1).

Over the past several years, there has been a shift in the international student demographics at the university level in the United States. In the past, second language learners were seen as ESL students who possessed a strong academic background and proficiency and literacy in their first language (L1). Moreover, their primary goal in coming to the U.S. was to study. Once they completed their studies, they returned to their home countries.

Currently there is a mounting trend of immigrant, or Generation 1.5, students joining the population of traditional ESL students at the university. Generation 1.5 students can be defined in a variety of ways. According to Harklau et al. (1999), two distinguishing features of these students can help identify this particular group of learners. The first distinguishing feature is “resident status and generational status” (p.4). Most Generation 1.5 learners have been born in a country other than the U.S., but then came here at a young age with the intention of remaining residents in the U.S. The
second distinguishing feature of Generation 1.5 learners is their educational background (p.4). Most of these learners have completed some or most of their elementary and/or secondary education in an American school. The importance of identifying this group of learners is that because they have been raised and educated for part of their lives in the U.S., it may easily be assumed that these learners are proficient in English, the target language; however, this is not necessarily so. These students do not have the same educational backgrounds as traditional English as a Second Language (ESL) students or the same level of proficiency and literacy in English or their L1s. While traditional ESL students usually possess at least a strong L1 literacy, Generation 1.5 learners are often caught between languages and literacies. A lot of Generation 1.5 learners lack literacy in English and their L1s. Furthermore, traditional ESL students attend school in their home countries prior to coming to the U.S. for post-secondary education, so that they have had continuity in their education. On the other hand, Generation 1.5 learners, attend school for some time in their home countries, then come to the U.S. to finish it before going on to post-secondary education, resulting in a fractured type of education. Based on their U.S. K-12 schooling experiences, Generation 1.5 learners possess some familiarity with academic literacies, which provides them with knowledge of and familiarity with academic literacy in English, which they continue developing during their university studies.

The research that defines Generation 1.5 learners focuses somewhat on their learning strengths. For example, according to Reid (1997), Generation 1.5 learners possess learning strengths based on their language and educational backgrounds, and have been identified as “ear learners” rather than “eye learners”. Eye learners are those
who learn through what they see; ear learners are those who learn by what they hear. Traditional ESL students have been considered eye learners because they learn English primarily by reading, taking in the language through the written word and learning the formal rules of the language in a systematic way often through grammar textbooks. In contrast, Generation 1.5 learners have been considered ear learners because they learn English primarily by listening, taking in spoken language and forming rules of the language in an unsystematic way through their subconscious processing of what they have heard, and then practicing these rules through oral trial and error. Because of this way of learning English, Generation 1.5 learners are usually much more orally fluent than traditional ESL learners, while their literacy skills are often inadequate.

Much of the literature on Generation 1.5 learners focuses on their learning deficits, and several have been identified. For instance, many are inexperienced readers to begin with, so they have a lack of experience with reading in English (Blanton, 2005; Reid, 1997); lack of experience with extensive academic reading (Roberge, 2002); limited academic and content lexicon (Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Lowry, 1999; Reid, 1997; Santos, 2004); difficulties in managing large amounts of academic reading (Blanton, 1999); and understanding academic writing (Blanton, 1999). Moreover, many find academic writing to be challenging because of a lack of experience with writing and academic genres (Blanton, 2005; Harklau, 1999; Johns, 1999; Reid, 1997; Roberge, 2002); sentence level problems such as syntax, grammar and punctuation (Reid, 1997; Thonus, 2003); language fossilization (Frodesen & Starna, 1999); limited practices for responding to instructors’ feedback (Ferris, 1999; Harklau, 2003); lexicon choice for academic writing (Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Rodby, 1999); lack of a meta-language
(Ferris, 1999); and plagiarism (Wolfe-Quintero & Segade, 1999). However, while these learning difficulties discussed in the literature may apply to some learners, it is not necessarily true for all learners who fall under the classification of Generation 1.5. This is echoed in Harklau et al. (1999), who point out that Generation 1.5 learners “…may be too diverse, too particularistic in their backgrounds, needs and characteristics to hold under any single label or rubric” (p.12).

As already pointed out, Generation 1.5 learners have some special linguistic needs. Unfortunately, these needs are often overlooked or unaddressed in the academic contexts which they negotiate at the university. A primary reason is that instructors often believe these students possess the same needs as traditional ESL or L1 students and treat them as such. As a result, their needs are not addressed, or are addressed inadequately in the ways ESL or L1 students’ needs are dealt with. Furthermore traditional literacy models, which are the framework for most curricula, are designed according to a particular cultural model in mind “…to provide group members with the framework for interpreting educational events, situations and experiences and to guide behavior in the schooling context and process” (Ogbu, 1991, p. 7). However, Generation 1.5 learners encounter in some ways a different model, one which is not necessarily considered by the dominant model, which reflects a traditional definition of literacy.

**Shifting Notions of Literacy**

Traditionally, literacy has been defined as “the ability to read and write and compute in the form taught and expected in formal education” (Ogbu, 1990, as cited in Street & Street, 1995, p. 107). For many years, this particular definition of literacy has been upheld in school curricula, including university courses across the curriculum.
However, as pointed out in Street and Street (1995) and Hull and Schultz (2001), because of several shortcomings of this definition of literacy, there has been a call to revise and expand the definition. One of the main shortcomings of the abovementioned definition of literacy is that it does not consider the multiple literacies experiences that students possess. Street and Street (1995) documented a variety of students’ other literacies experiences outside of school. For example, they cite Reid’s description of literacy in pre-sixteenth century South-East Asia, which consisted of an alphabet that was not taught in schools but was part of the socialization of men and women in that culture. More recent examples they cite are a summary of Fishman’s (1991) study of the literacy experiences of the Amish and Weinstein-Shr’s (1993) study of the literacy experiences in the Hmong refugee community in Philadelphia. In looking at these examples, Street and Street (1995) found that alongside schooled literacy, other literacy experiences exist which are tied to the culture of the group and influence the academic literacy experiences of the students. Moreover, Hull and Schultz (2001) reference a number of studies on the multiple literacies experiences of students in their review article. From these studies they concluded that, “…the resources that students bring to school … provided teachers with a way to imagine changing their pedagogy and curriculum instead of assuming that only students needed to change” (p. 581).

One of the major shifts that has occurred in research on academic literacy learning and socialization has been a move away from a skills-based deficit model of student literacies experiences to a consideration of the complexities of academic literacies practices at the university level. This shift reflects the “new” definitions of literacy mentioned above and is represented by three models of academic socialization – Study
Skills, Academic Socialization, and Academic Literacies (Lea & Street, 2000). The Study Skills Model focuses on a predetermined, autonomous set of writing skills that students must learn in order to become an effective member of an academic discourse community. If students have not learned these skills, or have learned them incorrectly, the “autonomous model” suggests a ‘fix it’ approach to helping students (correctly) learn them. By contrast, the Academic Socialization Model assists students in becoming members of a community of practice by helping students discover their identities and positions in the social institutions that shape literacy and literacy learning through participation in academic literacy. The third model, Academic Literacies, “takes into account the cultural and contextual component of reading and writing practices” (p. 33) and challenges the autonomous view of literacy. More closely defined, the model assumes literacy as a social practice within various contexts where multiple literacies are present and the literacy tasks within these contexts as a variety of communicative practices. From this third model we can see that academic literacies are quite complex. They involve more than just the events of reading and writing, but include literacy practices (Street, 2000) and “other” literacies, as well as issues of power, consideration of literacy contexts and students’ identities. According to this model, all of these characteristics of literacy play a role in its acquisition and suggests a complex process of acquisition. Because of the complex nature of academic literacies, negotiating academic contexts can be quite challenging, particularly for those new to or unfamiliar with these contexts, requiring that they learn to negotiate them in order to be successful in acquiring the academic literacies that comprise them.
Theoretical Framework

Unlike most studies on academic literacies and socialization, this study is rooted in Lea and Street’s (2000) Academic Literacies Model, which views academic literacies as ideological, not autonomous, and present in institutions which are sites of discourse and power. The literacy demands of the curricula in these institutions involve a variety of communicative practices, and switching literacy practices between one setting and another is required. Traditional notions of academic literacy (Bartholomae, 1985) focused on rules, conventions and ways of knowing required for success rather than how students negotiate and make sense of academic learning as they become effective members of academic discourse communities. Yet, shedding light on how students develop new academic literacies practices increases our understanding of the socialization experiences students go through to effectively participate in academic communities. The Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) was thus a natural choice for this study and was chosen as the best frame among others, such as the Skills-Based and the Academic Socialization Models (Lea & Street, 2000), for this study because it presents the possibility of a more complete understanding of the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study. For example, the Skills-Based Model focuses only on the skills students learn when acquiring academic literacies, whereas the Academic Literacies Model focuses on the processes of acquiring academic literacies, and it is essential to understand these processes as they are experienced by Generation 1.5 learners.

Also inadequate for understanding the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners is the Academic Socialization Model (Lea & Street, 2000). The
view of academic literacy within this model is static, that is, there is no variation in literacy from one context to another. Furthermore, the Academic Socialization Model focuses only on the tasks that students are required to complete in order to become effective participants in the academic discourse community. Alternatively, the Academic Literacies Model focuses on the academic literacies as a set of valued practices that novices must not only acquire but come to know as new ways of making sense of their ideas and experiences. As I will argue later in this dissertation, the ALM offers an understanding of the nonlinear and unpredictable process of acquiring academic literacies the three students encountered in their first year of university study. It also helps us to better see what the participants’ notions of academic literacy were and how they sometimes differed from their instructors’ notions of academic literacies.

Another notable characteristic of the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) that was the cause for choosing it as the theoretical frame for this study is the shift in focus away from the instructor’s perspective of literacy to the student’s. While there has been an expansion in the definition of literacy with the inclusion of multiple literacies and the situatedness of literacies, research on academic literacies seems to still give voice more to instructors than learners. This focus, while understandable because of the important role the instructor plays in literacy instruction and learning, seems to have limited the examination of the acquisition and negotiation of academic literacies from the learners’ perspectives.

According to the literature that discusses this issue, very little of what we do as instructors and researchers gives students center stage. For example Kroll (2002) states, “We teachers spend a lot of our professional lives talking about students…and talking to
them, but we need to spend more time talking with them” (p. 21). Furthermore, not only in our conversations, but also in our research do students receive little attention (Alvermann, 1998). However, our students are the basis of instructors’ conversations and research, so it is important that they are given a more prominent place within them. By doing so, as Leki (2001) points out, we can gain more insight into “the nature of people and systems…and perhaps of how to stimulate further reflection…among ourselves” (p. 26). This is particularly important with Generation 1.5 learners, as they are often marginalized and displaced at the university because there is not a structure or curriculum in place to meet the particular academic literacy needs of this group of learners. It is with these views of academic literacy across contexts and the focus on students’ academic literacies that the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) was chosen as the primary frame for this study.

**Statement of the Problem**

As previously mentioned, research on academic literacies has traditionally focused on the product of Generation 1.5 learners’ academic socialization rather than the processes by which they become members of academic discourse communities and learn academic literacy. Yet, shedding light on how these students develop new discourse practices increases our understanding of the socialization experiences they go through to effectively participate in their respective academic communities. Furthermore, most of the research conducted on the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners has focused primarily on traditional academic reading and academic writing practices (e.g., Harklau et al., 1999) rather than on the multiple literacies, such as information and digital literacy, which are now present in academic contexts. Moreover, because of the complex nature
of academic literacies, negotiating the ever-changing academic contexts can be quite challenging, particularly for Generation 1.5 learners in view of their unique backgrounds. However, little research has investigated in depth the various types of academic literacies and contexts that Generation 1.5 learners encounter, including academic literacies tasks, in a university setting. In his paper “Shifting Boundaries in ESL/EFL Writing Instruction” presented at the 2007 TESOL convention, Hedgcock (2007) stated, “We [still] don’t know enough about the context in which multilingual writers write.” I would add that as a field, ESL Composition needs also to study how Generation 1.5 learners negotiate these academic contexts, especially in their first year of university study. As previously mentioned, the existing literature primarily emphasizes the difficulties Generation 1.5 learners have with academic reading and academic writing (e.g., Harklau et al., 1999). However, what academic literacies practices do they already possess that help them negotiate these contexts? What academic literacies practices do they develop as they negotiate them? What are their strengths as well as their weaknesses? And to what extent, if any, are Generation 1.5 learners supported by the academic contexts in which they are expected to learn and succeed?

Furthermore, why examine the academic literacies practices of first year undergraduate Generation 1.5 learners? As Johns (1992) points out in her case study of a first year Generation 1.5 learner, “…the freshman year at a university represents one of the major literacy transformations in a student’s academic life” (p. 184). More than likely students encounter types of academic literacies and academic literacies tasks they may not have experienced in their L1s or their U.S. K-12 schooling experience. Though Harklau (2001) found that the academic literacies in the first year of university study are
not as different from high school academic literacies as commonly assumed, there is too little research to know whether this is the case or what those differences entail. Furthermore, the first year is the year when most college students take required composition courses, e.g., ESL and/or first year composition courses required by universities. Consequently, it is in this year that students’ academic literacy difficulties and academic literacies practices become more apparent and receive their greatest attention in terms of formal study and practice. It is especially important, therefore, to examine the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners in this formative year so as to gain deeper insight into how they negotiate various academic contexts.

In addition, the academic literacies research that has been carried out with second language learners at the university level has focused primarily on traditional ESL learners and has been conducted mostly in limited contexts within the university curriculum, primarily ESL (e.g., Leki, 1992; Leki & Carson, 1997; Raimes, 1987; Zamel, 1976, 1983, 1995) and first year composition courses (e.g., Braine, 1996; Hillenbrand, 1994; Sadler, 2004). Although there are noteworthy efforts to expand the contexts, such as Belcher and Braine’s (1995) and Zamel and Spack’s (2004) collections of papers about ESL learners writing across the university curriculum, little research has focused on the academic literacies difficulties and practices of Generation 1.5 learners across various fields and disciplines in the first year of university study. In line with the extended definition of literacy that includes multiple literacies and the situatedness of literacies (Barton et al., 2000), through which academic literacies are no longer viewed as being autonomous in nature but rather ideological, there is a need for more research on how Generation 1.5 students’ practices and experiences align with this new definition.
Another motivation underlying this study is the lack of multiple case studies that have been conducted on the academic literacies of non-native English speaking students, particularly Generation 1.5 learners (Casanave, 2002). The multiple case studies on academic literacies at the university have focused either on L1 learners (Chiseri-Strater, 1991; Sternglass, 1997; Walvoord & McCarthy, 1990) or on ESL learners (Leki, 2003b; Sadler, 2004; Spack, 1997). The few single case studies that have focused on the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners (Johns, 1992; Leki, 1999) have produced results that seem to be applicable to only the studies themselves. It has not been until recently that multiple case studies of the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners have begun to appear in the literature (Blanton, 2005; Harklau, 2000; Harklau, 2001). However, there are still too few to provide us with the depth of knowledge necessary to understand the academic literacies practices of Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study. Consequently, it is necessary to conduct more multiple case studies to expand our focus, knowledge and understanding of the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners in their first year. Single case studies, while valuable, do not provide the insights possible when comparisons can be conducted across multiple case studies.

In summary, the complexity of academic literacies and the dearth of research on how academic literacies are negotiated by students such as Generation 1.5 learners who may be new to or uncomfortable with these contexts has resulted in the need for more research on the academic literacies practices of Generation 1.5 learners. In particular, examining the various academic contexts that Generation 1.5 learners negotiate in their first year of university study could reveal more about the complexity of the literacies and
tasks within these contexts and a better understanding of the academic literacies practices of Generation 1.5 learners. Therefore, a multiple case study that examined the academic literacies practices three Generation 1.5 learners experienced across various academic contexts as well as their efforts to overcome these difficulties and complete the tasks in their first year of university study was carried out.

**Purpose of the Study**

In order to better understand how Generation 1.5 learners negotiate academic contexts in their first year of university study, a multiple case study based on the understanding of academic literacies as ideological, multiple and situated practices (Barton et al., 2000; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Lea & Street, 2000) was carried out.

The following research questions were used to fulfill this objective:

1. What were the academic contexts the Generation 1.5 learners negotiated in their first year of university study? That is, what types of academic literacies genres and tasks were included in the academic contexts the participants negotiated in their first year at the university?

2. What academic literacies difficulties did the Generation 1.5 learners in this study face in completing the academic literacies tasks they encountered in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

3. What academic literacies practices did the Generation 1.5 learners utilize to overcome the academic literacies difficulties they encountered with various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

4. What were the sources of academic literacies practices the Generation 1.5 learners in this study utilized to assist them in negotiating the various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

**Description of the Study**

Three Generation 1.5 learners enrolled in their first year at a tertiary institution in a midsized urban city in the Midwestern United States were purposefully selected and
consensually participated in the study. All of them had been in the U.S. for at least two
years prior to their first year at the university, during which time they studied in a U.S. K-12 context. The participants were from Vietnam, Taiwan and Kuwait and possessed varying degrees of L1 and L2 literacy. In their first year of university work, two of the three participants were placed into ESL composition courses; the other was placed into a First Year (English 110) composition course.

The study design included a case study methodology and employed a process of data triangulation to establish reliability and validity of the data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Data collection occurred over two academic quarters, approximately six months in length, in the belief that a prolonged engagement with the case study participants would increase the reliability and validity of the data collected (Stake, 2000). Data sources included literacy logs, participant interviews, transcription and member checks, literacy samples, and course artifacts. Data for the study was analyzed for emergent themes and/or patterns related to the purpose of the study, and perspicuous interview segments were chosen for analysis and inclusion to illustrate these themes and patterns.

It is important to note the personal involvement that I had with this study. At the start of it, I was in my fourth year of teaching ESL composition at the university where the research was completed. During this time, I had the opportunity to work with Generation 1.5 learners, and had seen the various struggles these students face with academic literacies. For example, I witnessed these students’ to understand the instructors’ expectations with tasks, such as writing a summary or reading a newspaper article. I also noted varying degrees of motivation to complete the tasks that required writing multiple drafts of papers and attending office hours after each class meeting and
more writing tutorials than the minimum requirement. I worried over the degree of perseverance required as my students repeated a course several times until passing. I also experienced the frustration of working with a curriculum not designed to meet the academic literacy needs of Generation 1.5 learners as well as discovering that curricula for other writing courses were also not designed to meet their needs. Yet these students are held to the same expectations as other students in the courses.

Based on these experiences, I felt compelled to learn more about the academic struggles Generation 1.5 learners face at the university and what resources, if any, were available to them to help overcome these struggles. Consequently, my personal interest in and experience with this group of learners was the primary impetus for this study, which was carried out not only to discover more about them and their academic literacy, but also to advocate for a better awareness of these students and their academic literacies experiences, so that those teaching and developing courses at the university might have a deeper understanding of how to help them as they transition into new and various academic contexts.

**Significance of the Study**

Given the dearth of research on the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners across the curriculum, it was important to gain deeper insight into the academic literacy practices of Generation 1.5 learners as they negotiate various academic contexts in their first year of university study. This study, then, contributes to our understanding of the academic literacies practices and the negotiation of academic contexts of Generation 1.5 learners in the first year of university study, thus further illuminating the complexity of literacy (Barton et al., 2000) and the challenges novices encounter. By learning what
these practices are we can develop our understanding of how to teach academic literacies. This in turn can facilitate Generation 1.5 learners’ progress (Bialystok, 1981) and raise their awareness regarding the practices they use and the effectiveness of them (O’Malley & Chamot, 1993). This can also help us to see how they negotiate the various academic contexts in their first year of university study. With the importance of understanding students’ academic literacies practices in mind, the discussion of academic literacies practices focuses almost entirely on traditional ESL or foreign language learners and on ESL instructional contexts rather than on contexts across the curriculum (Anderson, 1991; Folse, 2004; Leki, 1995). It is important to look at the academic literacies practices of Generation 1.5 learners and their academic literacies tasks across the curriculum to broaden our knowledge of the specific difficulties they face and practices they utilize as they develop their academic literacies at university.

Moreover, this study is significant because of the understanding it provides of how Generation 1.5 learners develop new academic literacies practices as they go through the academic socialization process rather than focusing just on what they should know in order to become members of an academic discourse community. Research on academic literacies has traditionally focused on the product of students’ academic socialization rather than the processes by which they become members of academic discourse communities. Yet, shedding light on how students develop new academic literacies practices increases our understanding of the socialization experiences students go through to effectively participate in their respective academic communities. With the use of the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000), this enables us to view the students' processes rather than the products they are expected to “master” in order to
become members of academic discourse communities and increases our understanding of the academic socialization and academic literacy learning experiences of Generation 1.5 learners.

Another area of significance of this study is the greater understanding it can bring regarding the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners across the curriculum in their first year of university study. As previously discussed, most of the research on the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners focuses on their academic reading and academic writing in limited academic contexts at the university, that is, within one specific course (Harklau et al., 1999). Hence, there is a lack of research on the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners across the curriculum.

Moreover, the study is significant in that it gives voice to the primary focus of my research – the students. As Leki (2001) points out, by focusing our research on students, we can gain more insight into “the nature of people and systems…and perhaps of how to stimulate further reflection…among ourselves” (p. 26). This is especially true for Generation 1.5 students, a still under-researched population at the university.

Finally, this study may offer insight to those who instruct Generation 1.5 learners in academic contexts as well as those who train teachers in teacher preparation programs. These findings highlight certain issues in teaching, curriculum development and teacher training that instructors can consider and possibly change to help Generation 1.5 learners as they negotiate academic contexts. As Hull and Schultz (2001) point out in their study of students’ literacies, “…the resources that students bring to school … provided teachers with a way to imagine changing their pedagogy and curriculum instead of assuming that only students needed to change” (p. 581).
Theoretical and Methodological Assumptions

Several theoretical and methodological assumptions guided this study:

1. Academic literacies are ideological. They are present in institutions, which are sites of discourse and power. The literacy demands of the curricula in these institutions involve a variety of communicative practices, and switching literacy practices between one setting and another is required.

2. Academic literacies are multiple, including “other” literacies, such as information and digital literacy.

3. In addition to academic literacies being multiple, they are also viewed in this study as being situated in the context in which they are present. They may be similar to or different from literacies in other contexts.

4. The case study participants would be Generation 1.5 learners.

5. The case study participants would respond candidly to the interview questions about their academic contexts, tasks, difficulties and academic literacies practices.

6. The case study participants would be reading and writing academically across contexts throughout the course of the study.

7. The case study participants would be engaged in “other” academic literacies across contexts throughout the course of the study.

8. The results of this study would be viewed in relationship to the three Generation 1.5 learners in the study to gain a deeper understanding of the academic literacies experiences of these participants.
Definition of Terms

Because of a wide variety of definitions for terms within the literature on academic literacy and L2 learners, the following list of definitions of terms is being provided to reduce ambiguity and confusion. The definitions chosen for the terms included in the list are working definitions for this study alone.

1. Academic Literacies – This includes multiple academic literacies, such as academic reading, academic writing, information literacy and digital literacy.

2. Academic contexts – courses case study participants took during the study, e.g., First Year composition.

3. Academic Literacies Genres – types of academic literacies assignments case study participants were assigned during the study, e.g., annotated bibliography

4. Academic Literacies Model - In this model, literacies are viewed as a social practice influenced by the power and discourses of institutions within the academic culture. This model acknowledges that various types of literacy, or multiple literacies, are required in various settings, and that students need to know when to switch literacies practices according to the setting. Writing within this model is viewed as a means of making meaning and establishing an identity as a writer rather than merely as a means of learning how to write correctly (Lea & Street, 2000).

6. Academic Literacies Tasks – teachers’ expectations for course assignments, such as “write a 500 word summary/response essay on one of the course readings”. Academic literacies tasks in this study also include the skills that are necessary to complete a course assignment.
7. **Academic Socialization Model** - According to Lea and Street (2000), in this model academic literacy is defined as the social practice required for students to become effective members of a community of practice. Academic literacy is viewed as being the same from one context to another.

8. **Academic Reading Genres** – This includes various genres of texts found in various fields and disciplines in a tertiary context, such as textbooks, course packs and lab manuals.

9. **Academic Writing Genres** – This includes various genres of writing found in various fields and disciplines in a tertiary context, such as summaries, comparison/contrast essays, and research papers.

10. **Digital Literacy** – the ability to use technologies such as course management software, lab equipment, Word, Excel, Access, PowerPoint, Internet, e-mail, electronic dictionary/translator, field-specific calculators, film, and sitcoms used for academic literacy purposes.

11. **ESL** – English as a Second Language
12. **Generation 1.5 Learners** - Students who were born abroad, immigrated to the U.S. and graduated from a U.S. public high school. They more than likely are bilingual or multilingual. They more than likely have neither been educated elsewhere nor had an interrupted education prior to coming to the U.S., resulting in a lack of development of their native language literacy. They have a refugee or permanent resident visa status. Other terms for this type of learner include “in-migrants”, which refers to students from U.S. territories, such as Puerto Rico; “parachute kids”, which refers to students who come alone to the U.S. to live with extended family members and attend K-12 schools; native born non-native speakers, which refers to students who are U.S. born but come from linguistic enclave communities; transnationals, which refers to students who have experienced complex patterns of back and forth migration; speakers of other Englishes; and immigrants students from English-medium schools abroad (Roberge, 2002). Also referred to as immigrant students in this study.

13. **International Students** – Students who have been born abroad and received their high school education in their home country and have come to the U.S. to pursue post-secondary education. They more than likely are bilingual, possibly multilingual. Because they have been educated prior to coming to the U.S., they generally possess a strong foundation of L1 literacy. They have a J1 or F1 visa.

14. **L1** – Students’ first language

15. **L1 Writing** – First language writing

16. **L2** – Students’ “second” language, that is, English

17. **Literacy Events** – According to Street (2000), literacy events are observable events that involve reading and writing and underlying conventions and assumptions.
18. **Literacy Practices** – According to Street (2000), literacy practices are the practices that are valued by the context they are a part of.

19. **Non-Native Learners/Students** – ESL and/or Generation 1.5 learners/students

20. **Information Literacy** – the ability to use the library and other databases, and choosing keywords to search by.

21. **SLW** – Second Language Writing

22. **Study Skills Model** – According to Lea and Street (2000), this model of academic literacy focuses on a predetermined decontextualized set of writing skills that students must learn. If students have not learned these skills, or have learned them incorrectly, the model suggests a ‘fix it’ approach to helping students (correctly) learn these skills. The specific skills emphasized are surface level writing skills, such as grammar, mechanics, and spelling. Writing is viewed as a technical and instrumental skill; global issues of writing, such as content, development, and organization, are not a focal point.

23. **University** – Post-secondary education, in a university context, where Master’s, Doctorate and professional degrees-requiring completion of the Bachelor’s degree first are offered.

**Overview of Chapters**

This dissertation operates as a multiple case study that examined the academic literacies experiences of three Generation 1.5 learners, including academic literacies tasks across various academic contexts as well as the practices they utilized to overcome these difficulties and complete the tasks in their first year of university study. It comprises six chapters. Chapter 1 is an overview of the notion of academic literacies and Generation 1.5 learners, including the need for research, study design, significance, assumptions,
limitations and definitions of terms. Chapter 2 reviews the literature on Generation 1.5 learners, academic contexts, and academic literacies practices and provides a context and theoretical frame in which the findings from the study are situated. Chapter 3 describes the methodological framework which shaped the design for this multiple case study. The first chapter of results and data analysis and interpretation, Chapter 4, presents profiles of the three Generation 1.5 learners, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack, who consensually participated in this study, and an in-depth look at the various academic contexts, genres and tasks they negotiated in their first year of university study. Chapter 5 presents a comparison of the academic literacies difficulties and academic literacies practices of the case study participants across the academic contexts discussed in Chapter 4; it also presents sources of their academic literacies practices. The concluding chapter, Chapter 6, presents answers to the research questions of how the Generation 1.5 learners in this study negotiated the academic contexts in their first year of university study. It also includes implications for instructors in various academic contexts at the university and directions for further research.
CHAPTER 2  
LITERATURE REVIEW  

Introduction  

In order to understand how Generation 1.5 learners negotiate academic literacies tasks in academic contexts in their first year of university study and where this understanding fits within the larger framework of discussions, including pedagogical and theoretical issues and debates surrounding aspects of the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners, this chapter reviews the research on academic literacies and Generation 1.5 learners. The first section of the chapter presents the theoretical framework for this study, including multiple literacies, such as academic reading, academic writing, information and digital literacy, and situated literacies, as well as three models of academic literacies. The next section includes a discussion of academic literacies tasks often found within academic contexts and studies done on academic literacies tasks in university settings. The third part of the chapter discusses Generation 1.5 learners – who they are, who they are in comparison to L1 and traditional ESL learners, the difficulty with defining them, and what their academic literacies strengths and weaknesses are.  

Academic Literacies: Multiple and Situated  

Traditionally, literacy has been defined as “the ability to read and write and compute in the form taught and expected in formal education” (Ogbonnaya, 1990, as cited in Street &
For many years, this particular definition of literacy has been upheld in school curricula, including university courses across the curriculum. However, as pointed out in Street and Street (1995) and Hull and Schultz (2001), because of several shortcomings of this definition of literacy, there has been a call for and response to revise and expand the definition. One shortcoming of the abovementioned definition of literacy is that it does not consider the multiple literacies that students possess. Research on New Literacy Studies (NLS) has extended our view of literacies by examining “other” literacies, including out-of-school literacies, and examples of these that examine “other” literacies are discussed in Street and Street (1995). For example, they present Reid’s description of literacy in pre-sixteenth century South-East Asia, which consisted of an alphabet not taught in schools, but was part of the socialization of men and women in that culture. More recent examples they include in their article are a summary of Fishman’s (1991) study of the literacy experiences of the Amish and Weinstein-Shr’s (1993) study of the literacy experiences in the Hmong refugee community in Philadelphia. In looking at these examples, Street and Street (1995) found that alongside schooled literacy, other literacies experiences exist which are tied to the culture of the group and influence the academic literacies experiences of the students. Moreover, Hull and Schultz (2001) also reference a number of studies on the multiple literacies experiences of students in their article. From these studies they concluded, “…the resources that students bring to school … provided teachers with a way to imagine changing their pedagogy and curriculum instead of assuming that only students needed to change” (p. 581).

In response to the call to revise the traditional definition of literacy, the definition has been extended to include “other” or “multiple literacies” as well as the
contextualization or the “situatedness” of it (Barton et al., 2000). It is these two theories of literacy from which the theoretical framework for this study was developed, emerging directly from the examination of the academic contexts and difficulties and academic literacies practices of three Generation 1.5 learners negotiating these contexts, thus owing its development to them. It is through these lenses of literacy theory that study is framed in order to more clearly see and understand the academic literacies practices of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study. These are discussed in more detail in the following pages.

**Multiple Literacies**

The first lens that was used to frame this study was that of multiple literacies. This particular lens was chosen because of the expectation that multiple literacies would be present in all the academic contexts the participants negotiated throughout the study in order to have a better understanding of what specifically these multiple literacies were within the different contexts as well as the multiple literacies of the case study participants themselves. Multiple or multiliteracies is a term used to refer to the complexity of literacy in an ever-changing world. Cope and Kalantzis (2000), two members of The New London Group, in their introduction to their book *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*, present the two arguments embedded in the term that highlight the complexity of literacy in our ever-changing world: “the multiplicity of communications channels and media” and “the increasing salience of cultural and linguistic diversity” (p. 5). This complexity of literacy or multiliteracies highlights the importance of negotiating these in various contexts. According to Cope and Kalantzis (2000), “To find our way around this emerging world
of meaning requires a new, multimodal literacy” (p. 6). It is with this that this understanding of literacy was utilized in order to gain more insight into the multiliteracies in the contexts the participants negotiated as well as the multiliteracies of the participants.

**Situated Literacies**

Another theory of literacy, that of situated literacies, was chosen as the lens through which to view the study, to better understand the academic literacies practices of three Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study. This particular lens was chosen because of the different natures of the academic contexts the participants negotiated during the study in order to gain a better understanding of these contexts and how the multiliteracies of the contexts, as well as those of the participants, were interlinked with each other within them. Situated literacies refers not only to the contexts in which multiliteracies are present but also to the link between the contexts and literacies (Barton et al., 2000). The contexts in which literacies are situated include literacy practices, which are how people use literacy, literacy events, which are what emphasize the situatedness of literacy, and texts, which are a product or representation of how people use literacy. These three characteristics are what make up the proponents of situated literacy. Because the type of literacy that was examined in this study was academic literacy, it was important to include a discussion of the three models of academic literacies, as they also framed the study and shaped the interpretation of it. These are discussed in more detail in the next section.

**Models of Academic Literacies**

One of the major shifts that has occurred in research on academic literacies on account of multi and situated literacies has been a move away from a skills-based deficit
model of student literacies to a consideration of the complexities of academic literacies practices at the university level. This shift reflects the “new” definitions of literacy mentioned above and is represented by three models of academic literacies – Study Skills, Academic Socialization, and Academic Literacies (Lea & Street, 2000). Each of these models is necessary to understand various aspects of academic literacy, and that point to a growing awareness of the complexity of academic literacies. The following paragraphs will discuss each of these in more detail.

**Study Skills Model**

According to Lea and Street (2000), the Study Skills Model is an autonomous view of literacy that focuses on a predetermined set of writing skills that students must learn in order to develop their writing. If students do not possess these skills, or have learned them incorrectly, the model suggests a ‘fix it’ approach to helping students (correctly) learn them. In other words, the model places emphasis on students’ skill deficiencies. The specific skills highlighted in the Study Skills Model are surface level writing skills, such as grammar, mechanics, and spelling. Writing, then, is viewed as a technical and instrumental skill. The theoretical assumptions of this model are that writing is merely surface language, like grammar and spelling. Therefore, the primary implication of this model for writing instruction is teaching students to write in the “right” way by focusing mostly on local issues of writing, such as grammar, mechanics and punctuation. Global issues of writing, such as content, development, and organization, are not a focal point, neither is academic reading.
**Academic Socialization Model**

The second model of academic literacy is the Academic Socialization. This is an approach that assists students in becoming members of a community of practice through the development of their academic writing by learning the academic writing conventions of the academic discourse community in order to move from an outsider position to that of an insider within this community. This is based on Lave and Wenger’s (1991) idea of communities of learning where situated learning within a community of practice consists of “…legitimate peripheral participation in ongoing social practice; the process of changing knowledgeable skills is subsumed in processes of changing identity in and through membership in a community of practitioners; and mastery is an organizational, relational characteristic of communities of practice” (p. 64). According to this model, literacy is viewed as being somewhat autonomous in that students are taught the “right” way to write which is in accord with writing conventions of the academic discourse community. However, amongst itself, this community has not yet agreed upon the “right” way to write. According to Lea and Street (1998), with this particular model, there is the appearance that “…the academy is a relatively homogeneous culture, whose norms and practices have simply to be learnt to provide access to the whole institution” (p. 35), which is not necessarily so. This raises the question of how students acculturate into heterogeneous academic discourse communities, which leads to the third model of academic literacies.

**Academic Literacies Model**

The third model, the Academic Literacies Model, which is the theoretical framework on which this study is based, is an ideological view of literacy which includes
cultural and contextual aspects of writing (Lea & Street, 2000). More closely defined, the model assumes literacy as a social practice within various contexts where multiple literacies are present and the literacy tasks within these contexts as a variety of communicative practices. Like with the Academic Socialization Model, this model also focuses on students’ identities as writers and the development of these, which is a shift away from students’ writing deficiencies to seeing the positive influence of students’ native languages on their writing skills and helps in their identity development as writers.

In her study on transculturation, Zamel (1997) includes students’ observations of the positive influence their native language literacy had on their acquisition of the target language. For example, one Chinese student states,

> It was precisely my Chinese that had enabled me to write in English as I was doing…In recollection, I could see how my Chinese had facilitated my acquisition of another language…What I had read and written in Chinese had not been wasted, had certainly not become interference (p. 348).

Another student writes,

> My awareness of English synonyms arouse my curiosity about Vietnamese and forces me to strive for the delicate connotations of my native words. Writing in English gives me a chance to step out and review my mother tongue. My progress in English has miraculously and simultaneously improved my Vietnamese…I could express myself confidently in English and Vietnamese, and allow myself to absorb the beauty of both languages (p. 349).

Both of these examples show how the students use their L1s as a resource for acquiring literacy in English and help reveal why the Academic Literacies Model is useful in examining the academic literacy experiences of learners. Although because of the interrupted L1s of Generation 1.5 learners, it may be difficult to see how their L1 literacy influences their L2 literacy acquisition (see Frodesen, 2002).
Furthermore, the Academic Literacies Model presents an ideological view of literacy in that it sees literacy as a social practice influenced by the power and discourses of institutions within the culture. This lens acknowledges multiliteracies that are required in various contexts and raises awareness of switching literacy practices according to the context. With this model, writing is viewed as a means of creating and representing students’ understanding of it rather than teaching students how to write “correctly” so as to belong to the academic community, and acknowledges the relationship between students’ identities and their academic literacies. From this third model we can see that academic literacies are quite complex. They involve more than just the autonomous events of reading and writing, but include ideological literacy practices (Street, 2001) and “other” literacies, as well as issues of power, consideration of literacy contexts and students’ identities. According to this model, all of these characteristics of literacy play a role in the acquisition of it, thus making it complex. Because of the complex nature of academic literacies, negotiating academic contexts can be quite challenging, particularly for those new to or unfamiliar with these contexts, requiring they learn to negotiate them to be successful in acquiring the academic literacies that comprise them.

**Summary**

In summary, the first section of this literature review has presented in more detail the theoretical frame for this study, which includes multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000), situated literacies (Barton et al., 2000), and the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000). Shedding light on how students develop new literacies practices increases our understanding of the academic socialization and academic literacy experiences students have to participate in academic communities. The Academic
Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) was a natural choice for this study based on the characteristics of multiple literacies, the situatedness of literacy, and the shift in focus away from the instructor’s perspective of literacy to the student’s, which is particularly important with Generation 1.5 learners as they are often marginalized and displaced at the university because there is not a structure or curriculum in place to meet the particular academic literacy needs of this group of learners. It is with these views of academic literacy across contexts and the focus on students’ academic literacies that the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) was chosen as the frame for this study. The next section of this chapter includes a discussion of academic literacies tasks often found within academic contexts and studies done on academic literacies tasks in university settings.

Academic Literacies: Tasks and Contexts

In order to better understand the complexity of academic literacies, one area of research has examined the specific types of academic literacies tasks in contexts across the curriculum. The literature presents in various ways different types of academic literacy tasks for undergraduate students at the university, both macroscopically, discussing tasks apart from a specific context within the realm of the university curriculum, and microscopically, from discussing writing across the curriculum to focusing on only one course and examining the tasks within this context. To better understand academic literacies tasks at the university, Rosenfeld et al. (2001) conducted a survey on the academic literacies tasks important for undergraduate students. The results show the ability to complete tasks in the following areas: in regards to reading, locating information, basic comprehension, learning, integration, in regards to writing, content,
organization, development and language. While some of these tasks may be included in some contexts at the university, others may not. However, because these contexts are not identified in the study, it is difficult to know which tasks belong to which contexts. Moreover, there may be other tasks that were not included in the results of this study but are included in these contexts. Lists of tasks such as this apart from specific contexts (e.g., fields/disciplines, courses) gives the impression that academic contexts are homogenous (Braine, 1995); however, as other studies have shown and are discussed in more detail below, academic contexts are not necessarily homogenous. A focus on academic literacies tasks alone reduces academic literacies to what Lea and Street (2000) refer to as autonomous as is reflected in the Study Skills Model, where students learn a predetermined set of (writing) tasks. If students have not learned these tasks, or have learned them incorrectly, the model suggests a ‘fix it’ approach to helping students (correctly) learn these tasks. In other words, the model focuses on students’ deficiencies.

One other exclusion from this list of tasks and a limitation to the study is the common academic literacies genres found at the university. Because these tasks were not tied to a specific academic context, it was impossible to know what the common academic literacies genres were. Studies that examined academic literacies tasks in specific academic contexts more microscopically are discussed in the next section.

Academic Literacies Tasks across the Curriculum

In one of the first surveys of writing tasks for undergraduate students across the curriculum, including courses on business management, civil engineering, electrical engineering, psychology, chemistry, computer science and English, Bridgeman and Carlson (1984) found that courses with little writing still required a degree of it, such as
lab reports and summaries, and descriptive writing skills, such as describing a lab procedure, were more important in engineering, computer science and psychology than argumentative writing skills, which were found to be more important for undergraduate students in general.

Like Bridgeman and Carlson (1984), Horowitz (1986) conducted a survey of academic literacy tasks, focused primarily on writing, in undergraduate courses across the curriculum. Although he did not identify the specific courses from which the results came, as did Bridgeman and Carlson (1984), the results from his survey revealed seven categories of academic writing tasks. These were summary of/reaction to a reading, annotated bibliography, report on a specified participatory experience, connection of theory and data, case study, synthesis of multiple sources, and research project. Horowitz (1986) also found the nature of the writing tasks included controlled and free writing and short-answer questions.

One other noteworthy study on academic literacies tasks is that of Hale et al. (1996) that extended previous studies by examining writing in eight undergraduate courses (chemistry, civil engineering, computer science, business, economics, history, psychology and English) at eight universities, rather than just one, as was done in previous studies. The method of this study was not only survey, like the other studies, but also document analysis in order to examine differences between the tasks, such as in-class versus out-of-class tasks. Findings from the study show that writing was found to a certain degree in all of the courses. The most common writing genres were library research papers and reports, summaries, plans/proposals, and book reviews. Genres of in-class writing were short tasks and essays and were more common in the science, math
and engineering courses and primarily involved restating information read. Longer writing tasks (essays) were found in English courses and primarily involved exposition, with cause/effect and problem/solution being the most often observed along with classification/enumeration, comparison/contrast, and analysis, which mirrors the results of Horowitz’s (1986) study to some degree. Only a degree of argument was found in the writing tasks for the English courses, which contradicts to some degree what Bridgeman and Carlson (1984) found in their study. What the findings from this study as well as the other three mentioned here highlight is that while there are some similarities in academic literacies tasks across academic contexts at the university, there is also a variety of academic literacies tasks, thus showing that academic contexts are unique discourse communities. This is further emphasized in the discussion of academic literacies tasks in individual courses that are representative of the primary course groupings, such as hard sciences, behavioral/social sciences, and humanities in academic contexts at the university in the next section.

**Academic Literacies Tasks in Specific Course Contexts**

In his analysis of academic literacies tasks in undergraduate biology, sociology and English courses, Williamson (1988) found that the primary writing tasks in biology were note taking and lab reports, those in sociology were the research and thought papers, reflective journals and field notes, and those in English were journals, which included responses to literature and literary creation and the laboratory paper. Similar to Williamson (1988), Carson (2001) also looked at a course in the hard sciences, behavioral/social sciences, and humanities. In her analysis of academic literacies tasks in undergraduate biology, psychology and history courses, Carson (2001) found the
following: Timed, multiple choice exams and quizzes were the primary in-class tasks that students in all three courses completed. The out-of-class tasks consisted of an essay assignment in history, where students were to synthesize information, and experiments in psychology.

On the other hand, Jackson et al. (2006) examined courses within only one of the course groupings, that is, hard sciences, which is interesting because of the assumption that this context is not a unique discourse community, as it appears to be with the separate examination of courses in the behavioral/social sciences and humanities (see also Braine, 1995). Despite this assumption, what Jackson et al. (2006) found in their study is very similar to what others found in their examination of individual hard science courses (Williamson, 1988; Carson, 2001). They found that academic literacies tasks among undergraduate students in science include clearly written and well-organized writing and the ability to express mathematical relationships in their writing. They also found that the most frequently written genre was lab reports, and course textbooks were the most common source of academic reading. So from the discussion of academic literacies tasks in individual courses we can see that while there are some similarities in academic literacies tasks in parts of these contexts at the university, there is also a variety of academic literacies tasks, thus showing that even within academic contexts there are unique discourse communities. However, it is not enough to merely understand academic contexts, genres and tasks. It is also important to examine students’ responses to these, that is, what are their academic literacies practices in light of these contexts, genres and tasks. This will be done in the following section.
Learners’ Academic Literacies Practices

From the discussion of the multiple and situatedness of academic literacies and the academic literacies tasks across the curriculum as well as in individual courses, we saw that while there were some similarities in academic literacies tasks in parts of these contexts at the university, there was also a variety of academic literacies tasks, thus showing that even within academic contexts there are unique discourse communities. However, it is not enough to merely understand academic contexts, genres and tasks. It is also important to examine students’ responses to these, that is, what are their academic literacies practices in light of these contexts, genres and tasks. Barton and Hamilton (2000) define academic literacies practices as “…the general cultural ways of utilizing written language which people draw upon in their lives. In the simplest sense, literacy practices are what people do with literacy” (p. 7). In addition to this, academic literacies practices also refer to the practices students utilize to overcome difficulties with and complete academic literacies tasks in the academic contexts they negotiate in their university experience. It is with this definition in mind that the following section presents studies of the academic literacies practices of undergraduate learners at the university.

Some of the literature includes studies that have been conducted on the academic literacies practices. For example, Block (1986) classifies academic reading practices in her study of ESL readers according to the following categories: general practices, which include the following types: anticipate content, recognize text structure, integrate information, question information in the text, interpret the text, use general knowledge and associations, comment on behavior or process, monitor comprehension, correct
behavior, and react to the text. The other category of academic reading practices was local and included the following: paraphrase, reread, question meaning of a clause or sentence, question meaning of a word, and solve vocabulary problems. In Raimes’ (1987) study of ESL college student writers, she found L2 writers utilized several different practices, such as planning, rehearsing, rescanning, rereading, and revising and editing, to respond to an informal and formal writing task. In their analysis of the academic literacies practices in an undergraduate history course, Carson et al. (1992) found students required the following: In regards to reading, vocabulary was very important. The results showed that the course tasks required reading and reading-related skills, including the assigned textbook readings, exam questions, and course notes. In addition, it was imperative for students to have vocabulary acquisition practices, including dictionary usage skills and the ability to recognize and use context clues. In regards to writing, writing and writing-related skills, such as organizational cues, vocabulary acquisition skills, note taking skills, and the ability to display knowledge in writing, were all imperative to successfully participate in the course. A survey study which looked at the students’ academic literacies practices across the curriculum conducted by Leki and Carson (1994) found practices like task management, such as managing text, managing sources, and managing research. Other practices they found were rhetorical skills, such as organization, transitions, and coherence, language proficiency, including grammar and vocabulary, and thinking skills, such as developing and expanding ideas, arguing logically, and analyzing. As a seeming extension of Raimes’ (1987) study, Leki’s (1995) study focused on the academic literacy experience and practices of ESL students in various courses across the curriculum at the start of and
throughout the first year of their university experience and examined the academic literacies practices that participants in her study brought with them and how this was altered and developed during the course of the study. In her study she found a myriad of practices, which included relying on past writing experiences, using current experience or feedback to adjust practices, using current or part ESL writing training, and accommodating teachers’ demands.

While studies like these are important because they provide a broad overview of practices for particular academic contexts, it is also important to look closely at these practices and how they vary from one learner to the next because of learning differences. An important source of specific academic literacies practices of undergraduate students at the university is found in published case studies focusing on courses across the curriculum as well as on L1, ESL and Generation 1.5 learners. The case studies, both individual and multiple, on academic literacies at the university have focused primarily on L1 learners (Carroll, 2002; Chiseri-Strater, 1991; Haas, 2001; Ivanic, 1998; McCarthy, 1987; Sternglass, 1997) and on ESL learners (Kainose, 2004; Leki, 2003b; Munoz, 2004; Sadler, 2004; Smoke, 2004; Spack, 1997; Sternglass, 2004). The scant individual case studies that have focused on the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners (Johns, 1992; Leki, 1999) have results that seem to be indicative to the studies themselves. It has only been until recently that multiple case studies of the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners have begun to appear in the literature (Blanton, 2005; Harklau, 2000, 2001). However, there are still too few to provide us with the depth of knowledge necessary to understand the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners in
their first year of university study, thus, it is necessary to conduct this type of research with these learners.

The next section of this chapter focuses on the academic literacies of L1, ESL and Generation 1.5 Learners. An overview of the similarities and differences among these three groups of learners can be found in Table 2.1 below.

**Academic Literacies of L1, ESL and Generation 1.5 Learners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1 Learners</th>
<th>ESL Learners</th>
<th>Generation 1.5 Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born in the U.S.</td>
<td>Born Abroad</td>
<td>Born abroad, come to the U.S. during K-12 experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak and write English as an L1</td>
<td>Speak and write another language as an L1, also possibly other languages</td>
<td>Speak and write another language as an L1, also possibly other languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninterrupted L1 development</td>
<td>Uninterrupted L1 development</td>
<td>Interrupted L1 development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire and learn English</td>
<td>Learn English in formal language classes</td>
<td>Learn English by exposure to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient in/familiar with formal and informal spoken and written English</td>
<td>More proficient in written English than spoken English; more familiar with formal than informal English</td>
<td>More proficient in informal spoken English than formal written English; more familiar with informal than formal English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye and ear learners</td>
<td>Eye learners</td>
<td>Ear learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete K-12 schooling in U.S.</td>
<td>Complete K-12 schooling in home country</td>
<td>Complete part of K-12 schooling in home country; complete other part of K-12 schooling in U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full understanding of U.S. culture, educational school systems</td>
<td>Little understanding of U.S. culture, educational school systems</td>
<td>Some understanding of U.S. culture, educational school systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-language for discussing language</td>
<td>Meta-language for discussing aspects of language learning</td>
<td>No meta-language for discussing aspects of language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning academic English</td>
<td>Learning academic as well as other types of English</td>
<td>Learning academic English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background in academic literacies in English</td>
<td>Background in academic literacies in L1; no background in academic literacies in English</td>
<td>Some background in academic literacies in English; some background in academic literacies in L1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Academic Literacies of L1, ESL and Generation 1.5 Learners (Continued)
Table 2.1: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulties with fluency in writing from lack of writing experience</th>
<th>Difficulties with fluency in writing, interference from L1, misuse of idiomatic expression</th>
<th>Phonetic quality to their writing – inclusion of idiomatic and non-standard English expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Errors with verbs, nouns, pronouns, subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>Errors with verbs, noun-pronouns, articles, prepositions in writing</td>
<td>Errors with verb endings and singular and plural nouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of the similarities and differences among these groups of learners is included in the pages that follow.

**Academic Literacies of L1 Learners**

L1 learners are those students who were born in the U.S., speak English as their first language, and completed the majority, if not all, of their elementary and secondary schooling in a U.S. K-12 setting. Longitudinal case studies conducted on the academic literacies practices of L1 learners (e.g., Carroll, 2002; Haas, 1994; Ivanic, 1998; Sternglass, 1997) show the developmental process of these learners during their entire university experience. However, because the time frame of this study was only one year of university study, the discussion of case studies on L1 learners here will include only those that are limited to this time frame as well. Two well-known case studies on L1 learners that are examples of these are McCarthy (1987) and Chiseri-Strater (1991). In McCarthy’s (1987) case study “Stranger in a Strange Land”, a student named Dave found that academic literacies tasks varied from one context to the next and required different academic literacies practices. Thus, the overall means of “survival” to complete the varied academic literacies tasks was the academic literacies practices he discovered after two years at the university. This was “first to figure out what …teachers want. And then
…give it to them if you’re gonna get the grade” (p. 233). Chiseri-Strater’s (1991) case study reports on the writing of two students, Anna and Nick, in a year of university study. The academic literacies tasks in their writing course included reading essays and stories, writing response journals, and a final paper. What Chiseri-Strater (1991) found in her examination of the academic literacies practices of Anna and Nick in response to the tasks is that they were not the same from one academic context to the next and were not viewed or valued in the same way in other contexts as they were in their writing course. Consequently, this caused tension for both of these learners. According to Chiseri-Strater (1991), Anna and Nick struggled in their own ways, apart from any reported support from the academy, to resolve the tension to some degree that existed between the academic literacies tasks and their own academic literacies practices.

From Dave’s understanding we can see that his academic literacies practices were based primarily on the instructors’ expectations and secondarily on performance evaluation, which is completely different from how Anna and Nick negotiated academic literacies. While Dave’s was that of a strategy of compliance, Anna and Nick’s was that of a strategy of resistance and avoidance (Giroux, 1983). Dave found that following what his instructors wanted was the way to successfully negotiate the academic contexts; however, Anna resisted ways of learning presented in her art course, and Nick resisted instructors’ suggestions for revising his writing and avoided difficult topics in his writing.

**Academic Literacies of ESL Learners**

ESL learners typically have well developed academic backgrounds from the elementary and secondary school experience in their home countries. Likewise, they are proficient and literate to some degree in their L1s. Case studies of the academic literacies
of L2 learners highlight some of the specific academic literacies difficulties these students face with the types of academic literacies tasks discussed in the section on academic contexts, genres and tasks. In addition, they include discussions of academic literacies practices these students utilize to help them overcome the difficulties. One of the best-known case studies of L2 learners was that done by Spack (1997). In this longitudinal case study she examined the academic literacies difficulties and practices of the educational background of an L2 learner, Yuko, who, unlike the case study participants in McCarthy’s (1987) and Chiseri-Strater’s (1991) studies who were relatively familiar with the academic context in the U.S., was from Japan and consequently unfamiliar with this context. What she found in the first year of the study was that Yuko’s difficulties were based on her lack of background knowledge and vocabulary, both seemingly common difficulties for L2 learners. The practices Yuko used to overcome these difficulties were choosing writing topics that allowed her to utilize her background knowledge about the topic, particularly her knowledge of Asia, avoiding difficult readings when she had a choice so as not to get overwhelmed by the lexicon, and reading differently according to the genre, purpose and emphasis given to the text. What the results of Spack’s (1997) study highlight is how Yuko learned and developed academic literacies practices from the various academic contexts which she negotiated during the three years of the study.

Leki (2003b) conducted a case study of an undergraduate ESL nursing student, Yang, and the difficulties this student had with the required written literacies tasks in the program, including article summaries, research papers, health assessments, and nursing care plans. What Leki (2003b) found was that Yang was proficient in completing the
course tasks she had some familiarity with; however, with those literacy tasks she was encountering for the first time, e.g., health assessments and particularly the nursing care plans, Yang struggled with issues of cultural knowledge and sociolinguistic expectations. What these findings show is that the more familiarity any writer has with the genres of academic literacies indicative to the academic context, the more proficient they may be in accomplishing the academic literacies tasks they encounter. These findings echo those of Spack (1997), in that Yuko became more successful with the academic literacies tasks she encountered because of continued exposure to and practice with them. In this regard, then, the academic literacies tasks within academic contexts at the university may appear to be more heterogeneous in a limited time frame. If we prolong our gaze, as Spack (1997) did, we may find that the academic literacies tasks are more homogeneous than what we may realize. In the next section the academic literacies practices of the third group of learners, Generation 1.5, are discussed.

**Academic Literacies of Generation 1.5 Learners**

In addition to the shifting trends previously mentioned in defining, viewing and researching academic literacies, there has also been a shift in the international student demographics at the university. In the past, international students were ESL students from overseas who possessed a strong academic background and proficiency and literacy in their L1. Moreover, their primary goal in coming to the U.S. was to study. Once they completed their studies, they returned to their home countries. L2 learners now include a group called Generation 1.5.
Regarding this group, there does not seem to be one clear cut definition for them.

The term Generation 1.5 was first used by Rumbaut and Ima (1988) to refer to Southeast Asian refugee youth. They defined this group of students as being

… neither part of the ‘first’ generation of their parents, the responsible adults who were formed in the homeland, who made the fateful decision to leave it and to flee as refugees to an uncertain exile in the United States, … nor … part of the ‘second’ generation of children who are born in the U.S., and for whom the ‘homeland’ mainly exists as a representation consisting of parental memories and memorabilia… Rather, the refugee youths in our study constitute a distinctive cohort; they are those young people who were born in their countries of origin but formed in the U.S. (p. 22).

Since their introduction of the term Generation 1.5, it has been found that Generation 1.5 students possess a variety of characteristics, and because of the diversity of this particular group of learners, the term Generation 1.5 often does not include everyone. Some terms used to refer to groups that share similar characteristics to Generation 1.5 learners are in-migrants, which refers to students from U.S. territories, such as Puerto Rico; parachute kids, which refers to students who come alone to the U.S. to live with extended family members and attend K-12 schools; native born non-native speakers, which refers to students who are U.S. born from linguistic enclave communities; transnationals, which refers to students who have experienced complex patterns of back and forth migration; speakers of other Englishes; and immigrants students from English-medium schools abroad (Roberge, 2002). Despite the use of other terms to refer to this group of learners, to date, there is not one that can truly capture the educational and linguistic diversity these students possess.

Two well-known case studies on the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners highlight the learning difficulties they have. For instance, Leki (1999) conducted
a case study of the academic literacies practices of a Generation 1.5 learner in his first year of university study. What she found was that despite the U.S. high school experience he had, her case study participant faced some incredibly difficult challenges in his first year at the university. These difficulties included a lack of orientation and guidance to the first year of university study. Because of no fault of his own, he started late at the university and missed out on the new student orientation. This led to him not receiving the advising that first year students need and making connections with other international students at the university. In his courses during the first year, he found that his English was not valued in the work that he did. Moreover, he found himself displaced – neither did he not fit in with the ESL students in the ESL course he was taking, nor did he fit in with the American students in his dorm because of the accent with which he spoke English. Consequently, he approached his experience as more of trying to beat the educational system, “to fixate on grades and on requirements on grades”, rather than learn how to learn in college (p. 37). From the results of Leki’s (1999) study we can see that it was not necessarily the fact that her case study participant was a Generation 1.5 learner that he had extreme difficulties in college. It was more the fact that the system in which he was “operating” had also failed from the very beginning to help acclimate him to the university experience.

In Blanton’s (2005) multiple case study of two Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study we see that the interrupted literacy experiences of these two learners interferes with their acquisition of academic literacies. For both participants, once they came to the U.S., the development of their L1 literacies stopped and was, in a sense, replaced by the development of literacy in English. Consequently, both
participants had extreme difficulties in learning the genres and completing the various tasks that were assigned to them in the first year. Part of the reason for this is the under or lack of development of these participants’ L1 literacies. Another part of this reason is that the contexts which the participants negotiated in their first year of university study did not acknowledge their interrupted literacies, but assumed that they were developed. Therefore, these participants could “handle” the academic literacies tasks they encountered in their first year. However, this was not the case, and speaks to the need for sensitivity to the needs that Generation 1.5 learners bring to the learning experience.

**Academic Literacies Practices of Generation 1.5 and L1 Learners**

A key distinction between Generation 1.5 learners and L1 learners is their literacies backgrounds. While L1 learners have a clearly established native language that they use for academic purposes, Generation 1.5 learners lack literacy in English and their L1s. They possess several learning strengths based on their educational and literacy backgrounds, and have been identified as ear learners rather than eye learners (Reid, 1997). Eye learners are those who learn through what they see; ear learners are those who learn by what they hear. Eye learners learn a language primarily by reading, taking in the language through the written word and learning the formal rules of the language in a systematic way often through grammar textbooks. In contrast, ear learners learn a language primarily by listening, taking in spoken language and forming rules of the language in an unsystematic way through their subconscious processing of what they have heard, and then practicing these rules through oral trial and error. Because of this way of learning English, Generation 1.5 learners are orally fluent in English.
A feature of Generation 1.5 learners’ language discussed in various studies on these learners is their differing proficiencies in their spoken and written L1. Some of these students are orally proficient in their L1; however, they possess “no” written or an interrupted L1 literacy, that is they can orally communicate with others who possess the same L1 with little difficulty; however, because of underdevelopment, they are unable to communicate with others through writing in their L1. This has been the case with students who come from cultures that place more emphasis on oral literacy than written literacy, such as in the African cultures. On the other hand, other Generation 1.5 learners are multilingual and/or multiliterate because of influences, such as family literacy influence, colonialism and religious practices (Panferov, 2002). Hence, they do not have a dominant L1.

The literacy background of Generation 1.5 learners is important to highlight because of the influence it has on learning another language. For example, Bernhardt and Kamil (1995) point out that according to the Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis (LIH), “Reading performance in a second language is largely shared with reading ability in a first language” (p. 17). In their discussion of this, they highlight work done by Cummins, which also supports this hypothesis. They conclude, “…literacy concepts once learned and used seem to transfer across languages” (p. 18). So, for Generation 1.5 learners who are multiliterate, according to this hypothesis, this characteristic can work in their favor when developing literacy skills. However, for those who possess “no” written or an interrupted literacy in their L1, developing a written literacy in another language can be more challenging, because there are seemingly no literacy concepts to transfer.
Academic Literacies Practices of Generation 1.5 and ESL Learners

Generation 1.5 learners are seemingly different from ESL learners in some important ways. For example, they often have interrupted academic backgrounds and L1 literacy development. Like ESL learners, they are born abroad; however, they often involuntarily immigrate (Ogbu, 1991) to the U.S. or other countries with or without their families, not necessarily to pursue post-secondary education but for political or other reasons. Following their completion of post-secondary education, Generation 1.5 learners typically remain in the U.S. Some differences between international and Generation 1.5 learners include grammar, reproduction of the sound system; an understanding of cultural patterns, and fossilization. Slager (1956) was one of the first to find in his work that compared international students and Generation 1.5 learners, that Generation 1.5 learners need special work on grammar. Other researchers of Generation 1.5 and ESL learners since Slager have found that Generation 1.5 learners have difficulties with reading in English because of the structure whereas ESL learners typically do not because of their understanding of the structure of English from years of learning in their countries prior to coming to the U.S. (Reid, 1997). Moreover, the writing of Generation 1.5 learners typically has a phonetic quality to it because of the “ear learnedness” of these learners compared to ESL writers who struggle with fluency in their writing (see Silva, 1997).

Academic Literacies Strengths of Generation 1.5 Learners

The research that defines Generation 1.5 learners focuses on their learning strengths based on their educational backgrounds. Prior schooling in U.S. K-12 schools provides these students with an understanding of how the American school system works
and an exposure to the language and culture that international students typically do not have. As a consequence, Generation 1.5 learners are often found to be more orally proficient than their counterparts and possess a better understanding of the American culture. Experience in U.S. K-12 schools also provides these students with the opportunity to develop their academic literacies by developing a familiarity with the writing process approach and academic essay organization otherwise known as the five paragraph essay. This provides them with some level of knowledge and familiarity with the writing system in English which is a key concept of writing at the college level. With this familiarity, they have something on which to build when they get to college. As a consequence, Generation 1.5 students are often thought to be better prepared for higher education than native-born students. Furthermore, even though some Generation 1.5 learners may not possess strong writing skills, there are aspects of English that they know. As previously stated, a consequence of an exposure to the language that traditional ESL students have not had, Generation 1.5 learners are often found to be more orally proficient in English than their counterparts, which helps them with tasks that require strong listening and speaking skills, such as listening to course lectures and actively participating in class discussions.

**Academic Literacies Difficulties of Generation 1.5 Learners**

As discussed above, some of the research that defines Generation 1.5 learners focuses on their learning strengths, but the majority of it primarily focuses on their learning deficits. For instance, many Generation 1.5 learners have a lack of experience with reading in English (Blanton, 2005; Reid, 1997); lack of experience with extensive academic reading (Roberge, 2002); lexicon (Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Lowry, 1999;
Reid, 1997; Santos, 2004); managing large amounts of academic reading (Blanton, 1999); and understanding academic writing (Blanton, 1999). Moreover, many find academic writing to be challenging because of a lack of experience with writing and academic genres (Blanton, 2005; Harklau, 1998; Johns, 1999; Reid, 1997; Roberge, 2002); sentence level problems such as syntax, grammar and punctuation (Reid, 1997; Thonus, 2003); language fossilization (Frodesen & Starna, 1999); limited practices for responding to instructors’ feedback (Ferris, 1999; Harklau, 2003); lexicon (Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Rodby, 1999); lack of a meta-language for discussing grammar (Ferris, 1999); and plagiarism (Wolfe-Quintero & Segade, 1999).

In light of their U.S. K-12 educational experience and unique literacies background, experience with academic literacies for Generation 1.5 learners in secondary school does not necessarily equal “success” with academic literacies at the tertiary level. When they arrive at college, not all, but many often struggle with academic literacies indicative to this context. “Successful” Generation 1.5 learners may encounter difficulties with the demands of academic reading and writing and in comprehending more advanced class discussions (Gray et al., 1996). This may be because many come to college lacking experience with they academic literacies they encounter in college (Blanton, 2005). It may also be because they do not understand assignment expectations. Consequently, in writing, they struggle with producing academic text forms, using academic language, and displaying knowledge in writing. In addition, their writing often shows difficulties with grammar and syntax and fossilized forms of the language (Blanton, 2005; Harklau, 2003; Sing hall, 2004; Stegemoller, 2004). Generation 1.5 learners often struggle in their use and incorporation of outside sources in their writing.
and in their ability to conceptualize course assignments that require writing (J. Bloch, personal communication, March 3, 2005). Furthermore, they often struggle with knowing how to tackle the titanic amount of academic reading with skills hampered by a limited understanding of the structure of English and underdeveloped reading skills in their L1s (Reid, 1997; Roberge, 2002; Stegemoller, 2004), and they have difficulties with raising and answering questions related to course readings (J. Bloch, personal communication, March 3, 2005).

Yet another situation these learners often face is paradoxical. While the strong oral fluency of Generation 1.5 learners has been noted as an academic strength for them, it also presents an academic struggle for them. Because of these learners’ educational backgrounds and spoken fluency, it may be easily assumed by instructors that they are proficient in all language skills, resulting in false assumptions about their learning abilities and their learning needs. Moreover, the students’ strong oral proficiency may cause them to develop certain language rules, which may require unlearning before they can proceed with developing strong academic literacies skills (Reid, 1997).

While the learning difficulties of Generation 1.5 learners discussed in the literature may be accurate for some learners, it is not necessarily true for all learners who fall under the classification of Generation 1.5. Despite the numerous attempts to define these learners, Harklau et al. (1999) point out that Generation 1.5 learners “…may be too diverse, too particularistic in their backgrounds, needs and characteristics to hold under any single label or rubric” (p.12).
Academic Literacies Practices of Generation 1.5 Learners

Case studies of the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners highlight some of the specific academic literacies difficulties these students face with academic literacies tasks. In addition, they include discussions of academic literacies practices these students utilize to help them overcome the difficulties. There have been a few individual case studies that have focused on the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners (e.g., Johns, 1992; Leki, 1999). Johns’ (1992) case study of the academic literacy practices of an exceptional Laotian student in her first year at the university highlighted her academic literacies practices. She found this student to be exceptional in regards to the strategic repertoire this student utilized to help her accomplish the variety of academic literacies tasks and difficulties she encountered in her first year. Some of the difficulties with academic literacy freshman typically encounter in their first year include lack of purpose for note taking, writing assignments that differ from one class to the next, challenges in studying for exams, little guidance or scaffolding from course instructors, and unwritten expectations of prior content and/or content knowledge in introductory courses (Johns, 1992). The practices Johns’ (1992) case study participant utilized when encountering these difficulties included taking her education seriously, connecting and applying the literacy tasks to meet her own needs and interests, making analogies, and predictions, planning, looking for underlying structures and concepts in course material, ways of strategic thinking, and the integration of academic lexicon into these structures and concepts. Although Johns (1992) does not explicate on the specific types of academic literacy tasks her case study participant encountered in her first year at the university, the results of her study are revealing in that they highlight the exceptional
academic literacies practices this particular Generation 1.5 learner utilized to complete the tasks she encountered.

It has only been recently that multiple case studies of the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners have begun to appear in the literature (e.g., Blanton, 2005; Harklau, 2000; Harklau, 2001). In order to look at similarities and differences across cases of Generation 1.5 learners, Harklau (2001) conducted a multiple case study of the academic literacies practices of four Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study. What she hoped to gain was a better understanding of the academic literacy experiences of Generation 1.5 learners that might be applied to a larger collection of these learners. She also hoped to discover how the participants’ academic literacies practices in the first year of university study compared to those they utilized in high school. What she found was that some of the practices were similar to those the participants encountered in high school. These included the use of multiple-choice tests and textbooks. However, other academic literacies that the participants encountered were different from what they experienced when they were in high school. These were literacies such as note taking, essay writing and course syllabi, which further supports the situatedness of literacy (Barton & Hamilton, 2000).

Summary

In this section the academic literacies of L1, ESL and Generation 1.5 learners were reviewed for the purpose of highlighting their academic literacies difficulties and practices. What this discussion reveals is three-fold: First, academic literacies difficulties are seemingly a result of the lack of familiarity with academic contexts, genres and tasks, despite prior knowledge of academic literacies, which points to the
situatedness of literacy (Barton & Hamilton, 2000). Second, academic literacies practices
develop over time, with continued exposure to and practice with academic literacies
tasks. Finally, from the extended discussion of Generation 1.5 learners, who are the focal
group of this study, we can see just how varied the definitions and academic literacies of
this group of learners are. With this diversity in mind, it is important to conduct research
with members from this group of learners that continues to spotlight the differences and
similarities between them so as to avoid normalizing members of this group to a
particular description and in the process overlooking their specific academic literacies
practices.

**Chapter Summary and Overview**

In this chapter, the research on the academic literacies experiences of Generation
1.5 learners was reviewed in order to understand how Generation 1.5 learners negotiate
academic literacies tasks in academic contexts in their first year of university study and
where this understanding fits within the larger framework of discussions, including
pedagogical and theoretical issues and debates surrounding aspects of the academic
literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners. This included various aspects related to
academic literacies, including multiple literacies, such as academic reading, academic
writing, information and digital literacy, and situated literacies, a discussion of academic
contexts and genres and tasks often found within these contexts, and a discussion of
Generation 1.5 learners – who they are, who they are in comparison to traditional ESL
and L1 learners, the difficulty with defining them, and what their academic literacies
strengths and weaknesses are. This literature review was not only a presentation of the
research on Generation 1.5 learners, academic contexts, including genres and tasks, and
academic literacies practices, but also a context and theoretical frame in which the findings from the study are situated in Chapters 4 and 5. In the following chapter, the methodological framework which shaped the design for this multiple case study, including the methods of data collection, analysis and interpretation of the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners, is discussed in detail.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Overview

This chapter provides the methodological framework which shaped the design for this multiple case study, including the methods of data collection and analysis of the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners. The research objective for this study was to examine the academic literacies experiences of three Generation 1.5 learners in various undergraduate courses in their first year of university study to provide a better understanding of these learners, the types of academic literacies tasks they completed during the study, the difficulties they faced in completing these tasks, and the academic literacies practices they engaged in overcoming these difficulties. The following research questions were used to fulfill this objective:

1. What were the academic contexts the Generation 1.5 learners negotiated in their first year at the university? That is, what types of academic literacies genres and tasks were included in the academic contexts the participants negotiated in their first year at the university?

2. What academic literacies difficulties did the Generation 1.5 learners in this study face in completing the academic literacies tasks they encountered in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

3. What academic literacies practices did the Generation 1.5 learners utilize to overcome the academic literacies difficulties they encountered with academic literacies tasks in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?
4. What were the sources of academic literacies practices the Generation 1.5 learners utilized to assist them in navigating the various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

The methodological framework used to shape the design of this multiple case study is described in more detail in the following sections. The first part of the discussion includes the rationale for the use of qualitative methods in this study, a description of the multiple case study approach, and a rational for its use in this study. This is followed by a description of the case study participants, including the selection criteria, and the recruitment site the participants were in at the time of the study. Next, a description of the data collection timeline for the study followed by a description of the data collection methods, analysis and interpretation are included.

**Study Design**

As mentioned above, the research objective for this study was to examine the academic contexts, challenges, and practices of three Generation 1.5 learners in various undergraduate courses in their first year of university study. My primary concern was to provide a better understanding of these learners, the types of academic literacies tasks they completed during the study, the difficulties they faced in completing these tasks, and the academic literacies practices they utilized in overcoming these difficulties. Because the theoretical framework of this study was that academic literacies are ideological, multiple and situated, it was necessary to choose a methodological design that accounted for this view of academic literacies. It was also important to choose a design that allowed for a more in-depth examination of the academic literacies experiences of the three Generation 1.5 participants in the various academic contexts they negotiated in their first
year of university study. This in-depth examination could not be conducted through the use of quantitative methodologies because of the lack of depth in understanding of these participants’ experiences that could have been obtained by a quantitative study; instead, a qualitative design had to be invoked for this study. The specific design for this study included three case studies and methodological and data triangulation to establish reliability, credibility and generalizability of the data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The choice of case study design for this study was “…the interest in process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific variable, in discovery rather than confirmation” (Merriam, 1998, p. 27). The objective for the study was to examine how the Generation 1.5 learners negotiated the academic contexts they were a part of during the study. Moreover, case studies were chosen as the methodology for this study “…because it is believed that understanding them will lead to better understanding, perhaps better theorizing, about a still larger collection of cases” (Stake, 2000, p. 437). As mentioned in Chapter 2, only recently have multiple case studies of Generation 1.5 learners appeared in the research literature. In the next section of this chapter, a description of the case study participants and the recruitment site the participants were in at the time of the study are included.

Participants

The case study participants were three Generation 1.5 learners enrolled in their first year at a tertiary institution in a midsized urban city in the Midwest of the U.S. According to Stake (2000), the choice of cases we study is of the utmost importance and should represent aspects of the population of possible cases, such as the most accessible. With this and the diverse definitions of Generation 1.5 learners in mind, the student
participants in this study were purposefully selected by the researcher based on the following criteria, which were established by definitions of Generation 1.5 learners from the literature (Harklau et al., 1999):

**Case Study Participant Selection Criteria**

- characterization as a Generation 1.5 learner, who is a non-native speaker of English, a U.S. resident and has been educated in the American school system prior to entering the university;

- enrollment in an undergraduate ESL composition or basic writing course designed to meet the needs of non-native or beginning writers at the university;

- oral fluency in English at a level where student participants are articulate enough to talk about their academic literacies practices in English. The spoken English proficiency of the student participants will be determined from informal conversations with the students;

- enrollment in undergraduate courses at the university;

- willingness and ability to participate in the study; and

- willingness to be audio taped during the interviews.

Recruitment of student participants began in November 2005 through a recruitment letter delivered to Generation 1.5 learners who placed into one of the three undergraduate ESL composition courses required by the university. Based on previous enrollment of Generation 1.5 learners in the ESL composition courses at the university where the study was conducted, it was thought that this would be the only means necessary for recruitment. However, during the recruitment quarter, in which I solicited the help of my colleagues in ESL Composition to distribute flyers to Generation 1.5 learners in their classes, there were not many Generation 1.5 learners enrolled. Accordingly, it was necessary to advertise the study outside the ESL Composition Program. A conversation
with the Office of International Education (OIE) on campus provided me with the idea to advertise to student organizations on campus. Subsequently, flyers as well as e-mail messages advertising the study were delivered to mailboxes of and e-mailed to various ethnic student groups across the campus. A total of 54 students responded to the advertisement. Meetings were then scheduled with the interested students who fit the above listed criteria to review the details of the study, their responsibility as a potential study participant, and present the consent form. Interested students were asked to consider this information and then contact the researcher via e-mail by a specified date to indicate their interest or lack thereof in the study. Because several of the respondents were not qualified to participate in the study, that is, they were graduate students rather than undergraduate students, traditional ESL students rather than Generation 1.5 students, upper division undergraduates rather than first year, the number of qualified interested students fell from the original 54 to 12. Furthermore, because of the large Asian student population at the recruitment site, it was not surprising to find that the majority of the students who responded to the advertisement were Asian. However, because of the importance of choosing cases that represented a certain population of the cases (Stake, 2000) and the diverse definitions of Generation 1.5 learners, as presented in Chapter 2, more diversity among the participants was sought with regards to gender, ethnicity, language background, academic major/minor, and composition course placement. From the 12 students, I chose three who best represented the diversity among Generation 1.5 learners. The same three student participants were studied throughout the course of the study. Because reciprocity is an important element of all qualitative research to ensure participants receive fair treatment, the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study were
provided two incentives for participation in the study. Participants were offered 30 minutes of writing tutoring each week during Winter and Spring Quarters 2006 and paid a total of $100 each at the completion of the study. Below is a description of the three case study participants.

### Case Study Participant Profiles - Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Andrew</th>
<th>Tiffany</th>
<th>Zack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Language(s)</strong></td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Taiwanese, Chinese</td>
<td>Hindi (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Languages</strong></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese, English</td>
<td>English, Arabic, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year in U.S.</strong></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in U.S. High School</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in U.S. at Start of Study</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Experience</strong></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Community College, University</td>
<td>Community College, University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Year During Study</strong></td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Pre-Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Film Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.1  Case Study Participants**

Andrew (a pseudonym) was from Vietnam and bi-literate in Vietnamese and English. He grew up in a somewhat literate home environment where he observed only his mother practicing written literacy. Andrew came to the U.S. at the start of his junior year in high school and attended a public school; he then transferred to a private school his senior year. He did not take ESL courses at either high school because they were not offered; instead, he was mainstreamed directly into English Language Arts courses. I came to know Andrew and his academic literacies ability in English in his first quarter at the university, when he was a student in my advanced ESL composition course. Andrew,
a Generation 1.5 learner in this course, struggled in particular with finding and using outside sources in his writing, a key component of the course curriculum.

Tiffany (a pseudonym), the second case study participant, was from Taiwan. Unlike Andrew, Tiffany was multi-literate (Taiwanese, Mandarin, English and Japanese) and grew up in a home in which she was exposed to different types of literacies, including the reading of fiction, non-fiction and academic texts. Like Andrew, Tiffany came to the U.S. at the start of her junior year and studied in a public high school her junior year and a private high school her senior year. Her experiences in American secondary schools included reading a range of academic texts and opportunities to write academic texts (e.g., “the research paper”) that required her to use sources to support her ideas. However, the amount of academic reading and writing she did was relatively minimal (see Applebee, 1984; Hillocks, 2002).

The third participant, Zack (a pseudonym), was from Kuwait but of Indian ethnicity, spoke Hindi as a first language and foreign languages that included English, French and Arabic. At the start of the study Zack had been in the U.S. for two and a half years, during which he attended a public U.S. high school his junior and senior years. Zack immigrated here with his family because of the “opportunity to have a better life”. Zack recalled observing his parents reading the newspaper and news magazines when he was growing up. When he first arrived at his U.S. high school, Zack was given a test to determine his English proficiency. Based upon the test results, he did not take ESL courses either year; instead, he was mainstreamed into English Language Arts courses.
Recruitment Site

During the time of the study, all three participants were in their first year of university study. During this time, two of the three participants placed into ESL composition courses; the other placed into the First Year composition course. The site from which the participants were recruited offers ESL composition courses to improve the academic composition skills of undergraduate ESL students. Within this program, there are a total of three ESL composition courses offered to undergraduate students. In the beginning ESL composition course (EDU T&L 106), students are introduced to many of the aspects of academic writing they will need in their other university courses. Specifically, the course covers rhetorical techniques such as summarizing, defining, synthesizing, comparing, and arguing. Specific grammatical forms that are related to these rhetorical forms are discussed. In addition, students look at issues such as plagiarism that are important for all students to understand. In the intermediate course (EDU T&L 107), students gain practical experience with, as well as increased awareness and mastery of, academic writing conventions related to summarizing, paraphrasing, documentation, and analytical writing in response to sources. In the advanced course (EDU T&L 108.01), students read both nonliterary and literary texts in order to use them in a series of academic papers and for on-line discussion (from the ESL Composition Description of Undergraduate Courses, updated April 5, 2004).

Two of the case study participants were recruited from the ESL composition courses offered in the quarter prior to the start of data collection. During the first half of the study, Andrew and Zack took First Year composition (ENG 110); Tiffany took an advanced ESL composition course (EDU T&L 108.01). In the second half, Tiffany took
a First Year composition course (ENG 110). Prior to the study Andrew had completed an advanced ESL composition course (EDU T&L 108.01); Tiffany had completed an intermediate ESL composition course (EDU T&L 107); Zack did not have to take any ESL composition courses because his SAT score was high enough to exempt him from sitting for the placement test. The next section includes a description of the data collection methods and analysis.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

**Overview**

This study of how three Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study negotiated various academic contexts was carried out over a period of Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter in 2006, that is, a period of approximately six months. Data collection for this study started at the beginning of Winter Quarter, 2006 and ended at the conclusion of Spring Quarter, 2006. Autumn Quarter 2006 served as the recruitment period for the study, that is, during the participants’ first quarter at the university. The two quarter-long data collection period was a prolonged engagement with the participants to discuss their academic literacies practices. Throughout the data collection period, I focused on the participants’ academic contexts, tasks, difficulties and academic literacies practices. As I became more proficient in utilizing the data gathered in the first quarter of data collection, I learned how to rely on it in order to be able to focus more on the academic literacies practices of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack in the second quarter of data collection. This helped me to begin focusing on recurring themes and patterns in the data and to begin compiling a list of codes that would eventually be used to code and analyze
the data. The specific data collection methods and analysis are discussed in more detail in the section that follows.

**Procedures**

Data for the study was collected, analyzed and interpreted by means of several sources, including participant interviews, transcription, member checks, academic literacies documents, and course artifacts to ensure a triangulation of methods, as can be seen in the table below.

**Data Collection and Analysis Record**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data to be Collected</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What were the academic contexts the Generation 1.5 learners negotiated in their first year at the university?</td>
<td>Participant Interviews (24); Interview Transcripts (24); Member Checks (24); Course Artifacts</td>
<td>Systematic coding; emergent themes, patterns; frequency counts</td>
<td>Barton et al. (2000); Bridgeman &amp; Carlson (1984); Carson (2001); Cope &amp; Kalantzis (2000); Horowitz (1986); Jackson (2006); Lea &amp; Street (1998); Rosenfeld et al. (2001); Williamson (1988)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Data Collection and Analysis Record (Continued)
Table 3.2: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What academic literacies difficulties did the Generation 1.5 learners in this study face in completing the academic literacies tasks they encountered in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?</th>
<th>Literacy Logs (60); Participant Interviews (24); Interview Transcripts (24); Member Checks (24); Literacy Documents; Course Artifacts</th>
<th>Systematic coding; emergent themes, patterns; frequency counts</th>
<th>Bialystok (1981); Blanton (1999); Blanton (2005); Block (1986); Carson et al. (1992); Creswell (1998); Ferris (1999); Harklau et al. (1999); Hartman &amp; Tarone (1999); Lankshear &amp; Knobel (2004); Leki (1992); Leki (1995); Leki &amp; Carson (1994); Lincoln &amp; Guba (2001); Lowry (1999); O’Malley &amp; Chamot (1993); Raimes (1987); Reid (1997); Roberge (2002); Santos (2004); Spack (1997); Thonus (2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. What academic literacies practices did the case study participants utilize to overcome the academic literacies difficulties they encountered with academic literacies tasks in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?</td>
<td>Participant Interviews (24); Interview Transcripts (24); Member Checks (24)</td>
<td>Systematic coding; emergent themes, patterns; frequency counts</td>
<td>Bialystok (1981); Leki (1995); O’Malley &amp; Chamot (1993); Raimes (1987)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The various sources of data collection listed in the table above and discussed in more detail in the sections that follow enabled me to gather rich data about the academic literacies practices of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack in their first year of university study and added “texture, depth, and multiple insights” to the analysis and interpretation of the data (Chapelle & Duff, 2003). The following sections include descriptions of the data
collection process as well as descriptions of the systematic process of analysis and interpretation of the data.

**Instrumentation**

To gather data, two primary types of instrumentation were used in this study – participant interviews and academic literacies logs. The design for these instruments was based on a review of the literature concerning similar types of studies (Carson et al., 1992; Leki, 1995; Leki & Carson, 1997; Reid, 1987). These instruments are discussed in more detail below, together with other data sources.

*Participant Interviews.* One of the primary methods of data collection for this study was participant interviews. The purpose of these was to get to know the participants and their academic literacies better. This was carried out by specifically inquiring about, discussing and questioning the participants’ academic contexts, tasks, difficulties, academic literacies practices and sources of academic literacies practices. The academic literacies logs (Appendix C), which are discussed below, were used as the basis for the interviews. Salient characteristics of the academic contexts, tasks, difficulties, academic literacies practices and/or sources of academic literacies practices derived from these logs were noted and discussed in more detail in the interviews. Information gleaned from the interviews was not shared with other participants or their instructors. Case study participants were interviewed a total of eight times for about an hour each at various times throughout the course of the study in regards to what kinds of academic literacies and tasks they were encountering in the courses they were taking during the study, what difficulties they faced doing these, what academic literacies practices they utilized to overcome these difficulties, and what sources they drew upon.
for the academic literacies practices they utilized to overcome the difficulties. For each interview we met in a small tutorial room located in the basement of the building where the ESL composition program is housed at the recruitment site. The location of this room allowed for very little interruption in the audio taping of the interviews and for easy access to a copy machine where all course artifacts and course work were copied.

In order to allow data to emerge organically from the interviews and “to build upon and explore” (Seidman, 1998, p. 9) the participants’ responses to the interview questions, all interviews were semi-structured. During the initial interview, participants were asked a series of questions about their educational and literacies backgrounds (see Appendix A). In subsequent interviews, participants’ academic literacies logs (see Appendix C) were reviewed and in-depth questions regarding these were asked in response to the academic literacies course task descriptions. Questions at subsequent interviews were shaped according to what emerged from the data of preceding interviews. A wrap up interview was held at the end of each quarter for the purpose of discussing the participants’ reflections on their academic literacies tasks, difficulties, academic literacies practices and sources of academic literacies practices from that quarter.

*Interview Transcripts.* All interviews were audio taped with the participants’ consent. Non-verbatim transcriptions of the interviews were made within two weeks following each interview and were numbered, coded and analyzed for emergent themes and/or patterns related to the academic literacies experiences of the three Generation 1.5 learners, for multiple and single instances in the data to find meaning regarding these literacies, and across cases for similarities and/or differences in the academic literacies
experiences of the Generation 1.5 learners (Creswell, 2003). A list of literature-based codes (see Appendix D) was used to initially identify the academic literacies tasks, difficulties, academic literacies practices and sources of academic literacies practices in the transcripts. For example, codes that organically emerged as the data began to be analyzed were also used (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). (See Appendix D) With this approach, I repeatedly reviewed the transcripts for themes and patterns to create different categories of academic literacies tasks, difficulties, academic literacies practices and sources of academic literacies practices. The transcriptions were also used to conduct member checks, which were used in this study as a means for establishing credibility (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Specifically, case study participants were provided with a copy of the interview transcript via e-mail within a week after completing it and were requested to review it for accuracy, make changes as necessary, and return it via e-mail within a week after receiving it. Time was given at subsequent interviews with case study participants to discuss transcript revisions. Following a review of the recommendations from participants, respective changes were made to the transcripts.

*Analytical Field Notes.* In addition to audio taping, analytical field notes were taken during the interviews. I took these by hand on a piece of paper and kept them with a hard copy of the complementary interview transcript. The primary purpose of the field notes was to document issues that were highlighted and/or questions that were raised during the interview and were of particular importance to the study. These were reviewed following the interviews, and the issues and questions highlighted in them were incorporated into the study. Another purpose for the analytical field notes was to record any follow-up questions that I had from a previous interview. I would then record these
questions in my field notes and bring them with me to the next interview and use these to start off the interview before discussing the most recent academic literacies logs with the participants. A final purpose of the field notes was to document the contents of the interviews in the event that the audio equipment malfunctioned. This also helped generate questions about the interview content and any salient characteristics of the academic contexts the participants negotiated during their first year of university study. At the end of each interview as well as while analyzing and interpreting results, I was able to use these notes to also inform my analysis and interpretation.

*Academic Literacies Logs.* Another instrument, academic literacy logs (Appendix C), was used as a means of keeping track of student participants’ academic literacies practices in various courses across the university. The academic literacies logs were created by the researcher with the use of the research questions for this study in order to gain a better idea of the academic contexts, including the academic literacies tasks, the participants negotiated during the study. They provided a space for the participants to record the courses they were taking each quarter and the types and amounts of academic literacies the participants completed each week of the study for a total of 20 weeks. The logs were kept by the student participants and collected by the researcher throughout the study. Another purpose of the academic literacies logs was to raise the case study participants’ awareness of their own academic literacies practices, not only to help examine how they negotiated academic contexts, but also to illuminate their practices in order for them to have the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of these and make adjustments to them where and when necessary. By discussing what they recorded in their literacies logs, participants were able to focus their attention on what they
understood and what they needed to know about their academic literacies practices. Awareness of their academic literacies practices allowed them the opportunity to learn more about them.

*Course Artifacts.* Course artifacts, such as course syllabi, assignment descriptions, grading rubrics, etc. were collected from the case study participants during the study for the purpose of developing a clearer idea of what specific academic literacies tasks the participants were performing and the context in which these academic literacies tasks were being carried out. These were collected from the participants at the first and fourth interviews of the study; some of the artifacts were also collected in subsequent interviews in the event that the participants did not have these artifacts at the time of the first interviews. At this time, course artifacts were gathered and photocopied for the researcher to keep. The original documents were promptly returned to the participants.

*Literacy Samples.* Samples of student participants’ academic literacies materials were also gathered throughout the study from them, such as articles they read and essays they wrote. The participants were asked to bring their documents to the interviews, at which time all of their work was photocopied for the researcher to keep. The original documents were promptly returned to the student participants. The purpose for collecting these documents was to gain a clear idea of what specific academic literacies tasks the study participants were engaged in throughout the course of the study.

The various sources of data collection described in the preceding sections enabled the researcher to gather rich data about the academic literacies practices of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack in their first year of university study and added “texture, depth, and multiple insights” to the analysis and interpretation of the data (Chapelle & Duff, 2003).
Data Analysis

The purpose of data analysis in this study was to closely examine the academic literacies experiences of three Generation 1.5 learners in various undergraduate courses in their first year of university study so as to provide a thick description of their academic contexts, including the tasks, the difficulties they faced in completing these tasks, and the academic literacies practices they utilized in overcoming these difficulties. It informally began during the participant interviews and interview transcriptions and while reviewing my analytical field notes and the participants’ academic literacies logs, course artifacts and academic literacies documents (Chapelle & Duff, 2003).

Quantification of Qualitative Data. Data were systematically coded with the use of colored highlighters and margin notes in the interview transcripts when case study participants discussed an aspect of academic literacies, e.g., task, difficulty, practice, source of academic literacies practices. After all interviews from the case study participants were coded and counted, the numbers were then used to find similarities and differences between the case study participants in regards to their academic literacies experiences. Although there is some controversy in the literature about quantifying qualitative data (see Rossman & Rallis, 2003), Miles and Huberman (1994) point out that there can be some benefit to including quantitative data in a qualitative study, such as to help in managing the large amounts of data that can result from qualitative inquiry. It is for this reason that data quantification was used as one means of reporting the results of the study.

The systematic process of data analysis included multiple readings of and coding interview participant transcripts. Non-verbatim transcriptions of the participant
interviews were made within two weeks following each interview and, after multiple readings, were coded and analyzed for emergent themes and/or patterns related to the academic literacies experiences of the three Generation 1.5 learners with the use of a systematic coding scheme, for multiple and single instances in the data to find meaning regarding these literacies, and across cases for similarities and/or differences in the academic literacies experiences of the Generation 1.5 learners (Creswell, 2003). A list of literature-based codes (see Appendix D) was used to initially identify the academic literacies tasks, difficulties, academic literacies practices and sources of academic literacies practices in the transcripts. Codes that organically emerged as the data began to be analyzed were also used, based on what Coffey and Atkinson (1996) mean when they say to let the codes “grow out of” the data. (See Appendix D) With this approach, the transcripts were repeatedly reviewed for themes and patterns to create different categories of academic literacies tasks, difficulties, academic literacies practices and sources of academic literacies practices. Below is an example of the systematic scheme used to code for emergent patterns and themes in the interview transcripts taken from one of the interviews with Tiffany (T.6. April 26, 2006).

11:22 C: What kinds of things did you read?

11:28 T: For religion we just had a religious book. It’s called the Life of the Road or something. I don’t remember. It’s just a religious book. We had to read the whole book, and our sister would give us current events from newspaper 10 years ago that relates to our topic, so we got to read newsweek from before. For government, we read Lord of the Flies, Between Brothers. There’s one other book, but I don’t remember. And we had to read the textbook as well. (academic literacies task)

12:08 C: Difficulties with that?
12:10  T:  Lord of the Flies was really depressing.  Brothers was really boring.  I think the difficulty was they were assigned for summer reading, but I never got a list, so I had to read three books in month.  That was really hard.  (reading difficulties)

12:29  C:  How about difficulties with writing?

12:36  T:  Journal wasn’t hard.  I think the hardest part in my high school would be the research paper.  (writing difficulty)

12:44  C:  Why?

12:46  T:  Because I had never done a research paper before, so I didn’t know how to do a research paper.  My English teacher was a professor from a local college, so when I first did my research paper, she told me I wasn’t doing research.  I was reporting.  So I had to redo it all over again.  That was really hard.  I couldn’t tell the difference between researching and reporting.  (writing difficulties, source of practices)

13:21  C:  Any other difficulties?

13:26  T:  Like finding information for my research paper.  (information literacy difficulty)

13:29  C:  Did you have any training in that?

13:34  T:  No, well, she talked briefly in the class, but we didn’t really have wide research engines.  We weren’t connected to the university libraries, so that didn’t happen a lot.  But we only had 11 people in my class, and since she was a professor, she let us use her user name so we can connect to the university.  But mostly we did the search in class.  We had 4 hours per week and we had the whole semester to do the research paper.  (information literacy difficulty, information literacy strategy)

From this example one can see how the literature-based and organic codes were used to identify the patterns and themes of academic literacies tasks, difficulties, practices and sources of academic literacies practices in the transcripts.

As noted earlier, the transcriptions were also used to perform member checks, which were used in this study as a means of establishing credibility (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000).  Case study participants were provided with a copy of the interview transcript via e-mail within a week after completing it and were requested to review it for accuracy,
make changes as necessary, and return it via e-mail within a week after receiving it.

Time was given at subsequent interviews with case study participants to discuss transcript revisions. Following a review of the recommendations from participants, respective changes were made to the transcripts.

While transcribing the interviews, I also referred to the analytical field notes I took before, during and after the interviews to also inform my analysis and interpretation of the data. Description of academic contexts, genres and tasks and unique characteristics of each of the participants were tracked while coding and analyzing the interview transcripts and are presented in the extended participant profiles of the three Generation 1.5 learners along with an in-depth look at the various academic contexts, genres and tasks they negotiated in their first year of university study in Chapter 4. A content analysis of the academic literacies logs focused on the types of academic literacy tasks case study participants engaged in in their courses during the time of the study. Additionally, a content analysis of the course artifacts and academic literacies documents provided by the participants further informed my analysis and interpretation of the data. With the use of a systematic coding scheme, the academic literacies tasks, difficulties, academic literacies practices and sources of academic literacies practices were coded and categorized to discover the frequency of use. Results from the frequency counts revealed the most discussed academic literacies difficulties and practices of the case study participants. This data were used as the basis for discussion of the comparisons and contrasts among the participants and discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

Confidentiality
All data, including photocopied coursework, assignment descriptions, audio taped interviews, etc., and identifying data collected from all participants were kept in a secure place in the researcher’s home office and will be destroyed three years after the end of the study. All participants have been referred to by pseudonym only in the study. The study did not place the participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or damage participants’ financial standing, employability, or reputation. Data collected from the participants was not shared with other participants in the study or their instructors.

**Participant Compensation**

Because reciprocity is an important element of all qualitative research to ensure participants receive fair treatment, the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study were provided two incentives for their participation. Case study participants were compensated for their participation in the study with the offer of writing tutoring each week during the course of the study and by being paid $100 at the completion of the study. Participants could leave the study at any time; however, upon doing so, they forfeited any entitlement to compensation for their participation up to the point of departure. Copies of the completed study will be available to all participants upon request. Preliminary completed drafts of the study were e-mailed to the study participants for their review and feedback to increase the validity and reliability of the data interpretation.

**Chapter Summary and Overview**

The purpose of this chapter was to provide the methodological framework which shaped the design for this multiple case study, including the methods of data collection and analysis and interpretation of the academic literacies experiences of three Generation
1.5 learners in their first year of university study. It includes the rationale for utilizing a qualitative framework along with the multiple case study method in order to accomplish the research objectives of this study. Moreover, it describes the use of coding as a means for identifying recurrent themes and patterns in the data. The following chapter presents profiles of the three Generation 1.5 learners, and an in-depth look at the various academic contexts, genres and tasks they negotiated in their first year of university study. Chapter 5 presents a comparison of the academic literacies difficulties and academic literacies practices of the case study participants across the academic contexts discussed in Chapter 4; it also presents sources of their academic literacies practices. The concluding chapter, Chapter 6, presents answers to the research questions of how the Generation 1.5 learners in this study negotiated the academic contexts in their first year of university study. It also includes implications for instructors in various academic contexts at the university and directions for further research, continuing the examination of the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners.
CHAPTER 4

THE CASE STUDY PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR ACADEMIC CONTEXTS

Introduction

In this chapter and the following, I report the results of the case study analysis which focus on the experiences and new understandings of the participants as they encountered the demands of academic literacies across multiple subjects and disciplines in their first year of university study. The discussion of the results in this chapter provides an answer to the study’s first research question: What were the academic contexts the Generation 1.5 learners negotiated in their first year at the university? What types of academic literacies genres and tasks were included in the academic contexts the participants negotiated in their first year at the university? Discussion of the results is presented according to components of the theoretical frame for this study, the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000), including multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000) and situated literacies (Barton et al., 2000), characteristics of Generation 1.5 learners and case study research. Specifically, Chapter 4 presents profiles of the three Generation 1.5 learners, with a focus on the specific academic contexts and practices they negotiated over two quarters of coursework in a range of fields and disciplines, including the tasks they were assigned within these contexts. By examining the students’ experiences in some detail, I want to examine the participants’ perception of the
academic literacies practices within the situatedness of their efforts to manage a range of academic reading and writing tasks. Chapter 5 examines the three case study students, including the difficulties encountered and the academic literacies practices they appropriated and then utilized to complete and overcome difficulties with the tasks they were assigned within the contexts discussed in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 also includes the participants’ sources of academic literacies practices they appropriated. Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the results by responding to each of the research questions that shaped this study.

**Academic Literacies: Multiple and Situated**

As discussed in Chapter 2, the theoretical frame through which the academic literacies practices of the three Generation 1.5 learners were considered is based on the assumption that literacy is multiple and situated. The concept of academic socialization has been defined as the process learners go through to become an academic insider in communities that share the same language, behaviors and beliefs (Bartholomae, 1985). The Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) is similar to academic socialization in that it also is concerned with how students who are outsiders to academic discourse communities might become academically literate. However, the Academic Socialization Model assumes that the means of acculturation into the academic discourse of fairly homogenous and stable academic cultures. Students’ writing, which is assumed to be acquired unproblematically, represents their knowledge of these communities and serves as one of several means of entrance into them. However, as Lea and Street (2000) argue, discourse communities in the academy are not necessarily homogenous; nor are students necessarily tabula rasa, compliantly and easily acculturating into these homogenous
communities. Rather, they argue that academic discourse communities are contextual, making them and the students’ academic literacies practices within them heterogeneous, complex, nuanced, situated, and involving social processes that can lead to frustrations as well as to successes. This view of academic literacies has resulted in the creation of another model of student academic literacies in higher education – the Academic Literacies Model, which is the primary lens through which I viewed the academic literacies practices of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study. The Academic Literacies Model, which is an incorporation and extension of the Academic Socialization Model, presents literacy as a social practice and literacy tasks as a variety of communicative practices (Lea & Street, 2000). More specifically, the Academic Literacies Model views literacy as ideological and literacy tasks as a variety of social practices within various contexts where multiple literacies are present. This model reveals an increased sensitivity to the students’ perspectives by shifting the focus from students’ academic literacy deficiencies to understanding the influence students’ experiences have on their academic literacies practices and their development as academic writers.

Profiles of Three Generation 1.5 Learners

At the time of the study, the participants -- Andrew, Tiffany and Zack -- three Generation 1.5 learners were enrolled in their first year of college at a large public research university. They were identified as such based on common definitions of Generation 1.5 learners in the research literature (Harklau et al., 1999; Roberge, 2002), that is, a non-native speaker of English and U.S. resident educated in the American K-12 system prior to entering the university. Andrew, Tiffany and Zack came to the U.S. in their junior year of high school and graduated from a U.S. high school prior to their first
year of university study. None of them had ESL courses in high school, but rather were mainstreamed into English Language Arts courses. During the study, as a result of the university’s writing placement exam, Andrew and Tiffany placed into ESL composition courses; Zack placed into the First Year composition course. In general, Generation 1.5 learners are seemingly different from L1 learners because of their unique literacies backgrounds, but they also differ from traditional ESL learners because “They are not learning the language; they are learning to use a particular variety of the language in a particular way” (Leki, 1992, p. 34). Therefore, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack’s unique educational and literacies backgrounds and the particular way in which they learned and used English shaped their self-perceptions and how they negotiated and appropriated academic literacies in their first year of university study.

**Andrew – “I’m not a big fan of reading and writing.”**

Andrew was from Vietnam and grew up in a bi-lingual environment in which his father, mother, sister and he communicated with each other in both Vietnamese and English. He came to the U.S. without his family at the start of his junior year of high school and attended two years of high school in the U.S. Andrew’s exposure to academic literacies in high school was quite limited. The writing that he did consisted of daily half page journal entries for his English Language Arts course on various personal topics chosen by the teacher and one reflection paper for his course on religion. The writing in his English Language Arts course also consisted of learning grammar, which included sentence diagramming and part of speech identification. The reading for Andrew’s high school courses was also quite limited, with the genres consisting of textbooks, short
stories and lectures, although, when asked about it, Andrew asserted he did not really do any of the reading.

I came to know Andrew and his academic literacies abilities in English in his first quarter of university study, when he was a student in my advanced ESL composition course. As a Generation 1.5 learner in my course, Andrew struggled with academic tasks, such as finding and using outside sources in his writing. During his first year of university study, Andrew declared business as his major with a focus on accounting and finance, lived with a native English speaker in one of the dormitories on campus, and received help from him when he encountered difficulties with academic literacies tasks. An overview of Andrew’s perceptions of academic literacies is presented in the following section.

**Part I. Andrew’s Perception of Academic Literacies**

Andrew’s general perception of academic literacies was not very positive. As will be discussed in the following paragraphs, his description of his experiences with his L1 and L2 academic reading and writing demonstrates why he was “not a big fan” of either in both languages. However, his perception of others’ (academic) literacies was fairly positive. Andrew’s perception of himself as an academic reader and writer in his L1 and in English is mixed but generally negative. In our first interview, Andrew discussed his academic literacy proficiency in his L1 and L2. He did not seem to have difficulties with L1 reading; however, L1 writing was more of a problem, particularly academic writing, and can be seen in the following interview segment:

19:11 C: How well do you read and write in your native language?
19:15 A: Read real well. I don’t have trouble with reading. But writing. You mean like writing sentences or like writing essays? Like in academic style?


19:30 A: Writing stuff. I don’t have a problem with writing words, but if you talkin’ about writing like essays for school, analyze some poet or whatever, then I’m terrible at it. (From A.1. January 10, 2006)

Andrew indicates that although he can produce writing on general topics and unfamiliar contexts, he was unsuccessful in fulfilling the demands of writing analytically in formal essays.

Andrew’s perception of his L2 writing was also rather negative. In the following interview segment, Andrew reflects on his L2 writing improvement during the first quarter of the study. He hedges in talking about his writing improvement; however, he states with certainty that he is bad at writing in his L2.

1:03:22 C: How about [improvement in your L2] writing?

1:03:28 A: My writing is maybe improved a little bit, but I’m not sure.

1:03:38 C: Why not?


Although Andrew did not talk about his negative perception of his L2 writing at the beginning of the study, this negative perception of his L2 writing is echoed in subsequent interviews when he began to traverse a range of academic contexts and subjects. Consequently, it is understandable why, as he said, “he isn’t a big fan of writing”.

Furthermore, Andrew’s negative perception of his L2 writing seems to have been colored by a negative writing experience in his L1 and his inability to understand various types of (academic) literacies genres. In the following interview segment, this is revealed in Andrew’s response to my question about the reading he did in his junior year of high school.

12:50  C:  …How did you feel about your ability to read in English that first year [of U.S. K-12 schooling]?  

12:57  A:  Pretty good…My reading and listening were good. But I think that my writing was kinda bad because I’m really bad at writing in Vietnamese also, like in literature. (From A.6. May 10, 2006)

From this we can see that his negative perception of writing in English seems to stem from his negative perception of writing in his L1.

In the following interview segment Andrew discusses the task of reading in English and in his L1. As presented in the first interview segment in this section of the chapter, Andrew states that he does not have difficulties with reading in his L1. Even so, according to the following interview segment, Andrew states that he does not find reading in his L1 (and in his L2) enjoyable.

35:55  C:  Do you read the newspaper?  

35:56  A:  No  

36:00  C:  Not in English? Not in Vietnamese?  

36:04  A:  …I’m not a reader. I’m not a reading person. (From A.5. April 21, 2006)
Andrew’s self perception as being “not a reading person” in regards to reading in his L1 and English had an influence on his academic reading practices as he negotiated various academic contexts during the study, and are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Despite the negative self-perception that Andrew had of his (academic) literacies in L1 and L2, there were people in his life who offered him positive models. These models included his mother, who was an L2 learner like Andrew, and his roommate during his first year at the university, who was a native American English speaker. In the interview segment that follows, Andrew identified his mother as a good writer from his observation of her oral literacy skills.

16:51  A:  …My mom, she good at writing, but she don’t write much.

17:11  C:  How do you know she’s good at writing?

17:13  A:  Well, like when she writes letters, she maybe do some, just her communication skill, um, in daily life is a lot better than me and my dad.  (From A.1. January 10, 2006)

From this we can see that Andrew links oral literacy to written literacy. According to Andrew, since his mother had good oral communication skills, she must also have good written communication skills. Therefore, if one has good oral literacy, one must also have good written literacy. If this is true, then, in Andrew’s case, the inverse seems to hold true as well. Andrew was a shy student in the ESL composition course he took with me and often did not have very much to volunteer in our interviews. Moreover, from the interview segment above, it seems that Andrew did not find his oral literacy to be as good
as his mother’s. So it is possible that Andrew’s perception of his oral literacy could also possibly influence his perception of his written literacy.

Andrew’s perception of his roommate as a good writer is based on his experience of talking with him about the difficulties he was having with a specific writing assignment. Andrew’s reflection on his roommate’s spoken discourse about writing includes the writing-specific lexicon his roommate used when helping Andrew with the assignment, feedback on how to write the assignment, and experience with taking writing courses, as reflected in this interview segment:

10:14 C: How do you know [your roommate is] good at writing?
10:16 A: Um, I asked him some questions about my essay and he just talking like some kind of teacher. ‘This the thesis statement; write this way, this way.’ So I figure he’s good at it cause I think he took some, a lot of writing class in high school, I guess. (From A.2. January 25, 2006)

To Andrew, being able to talk about writing, including identifying parts of an academic essay and expressing one’s knowledge of how to write, indicated to him that his roommate was a “good” writer. Just as Andrew believed that his mother’s oral literacy was indicative of her writing ability, Andrew also identified his roommate as a good writer solely based on his oral literacy, in this case his meta-language about academic writing. Andrew’s comments suggest his perception of what good academic writing is. First, Andrew valued the ability to communicate well with others through written and oral language and the ability to talk about writing. Second, these experiences also reveal his Generation 1.5 or “ear learner” (Reid, 1997) identity, in that Andrew’s notion of
academic literacies is a result of what he has heard from his mother and roommate, rather than from reading his mother’s or roommate’s writing, as an “eye learner” would (Reid, 1997). In other words, rather than reading their writing and determining their level of writing ability, Andrew, as an “ear learner”, based his assessment of their writing on oral communication (about it). This suggests his status as more of a Generation 1.5 learner rather than an L1 or traditional ESL learner.

Andrew’s perception of effective writing is also based on knowing a great deal of grammatical knowledge. In the following interview segment, Andrew discusses studying for the TOEFL during his senior year of high school. Part of the preparation included learning to write an academic essay.

16:25  A: …I pretty much… just read books on TOEFL and essay, but I didn’t really do the essay. I just learned the grammars and listening.

16:45  C: Why didn’t you do the essay?

16:48  A: ‘Cause like I don’t really like writing that much ‘cause it takes time. And the other stuff doesn’t matter. But if you know a lot of grammar, you can expand your writing. (From A.6. May 10, 2006)

Andrew’s comment suggests that he believes that one does not need to write in order to improve one’s writing; one only needs to improve one’s grammar. To better understand what Andrew meant, in a subsequent interview, I asked him to elaborate on his ideas about expanding one’s writing with one’s knowledge of grammar. He responded as follows:
‘Cause I can write what I want to express, but in order to know what you want to write, you need word to describe it, and there are so many different words. You can use words to describe one thing that are different from formal writing, it’s just normal. So what I mean is if you know a lot of words, you can change your style and make your essay more interesting. (From A.7. May 24, 2006)

This suggests that Andrew believed that expanding one’s writing refers to increasing one’s lexicon, which was one of the most frequent difficulties he encountered with the academic reading tasks during the study. Andrew’s identification of these issues may be because he is a Generation 1.5 learner, who, according to the literature, has difficulties with the areas of grammar and lexicon (Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Lowry, 1999; Reid, 1997; Santos, 2004; Thonus, 2003). In short, Andrew’s understanding of improving one’s academic writing focuses primarily on the mechanics of the language, including increasing one’s knowledge of English grammar and lexicon; however, as will be discussed in the section on academic reading and writing difficulties in Chapter 5, Andrew does not seem to know how to successfully apply his understanding of improving academic writing to his own struggle. His negative self-perception of his academic literacies is compounded by the fact that he reported not receiving adequate instruction to develop practices, such as to expand and revise his writing.

From the discussion of Andrew’s academic literacies experience in his L1 and L2, family literacy experience, experience living with a native English speaker, and beliefs about language usage improvement, we can have a better understanding of Andrew’s perceptions of academic literacies. This includes Andrew’s lack of comfort with (academic) literacies genres, the connections he makes between oral and written literacies, and his belief that improvement in language usage comes from targeted
language learning, namely grammar and lexicon. This information can help us to better understand how he negotiated the academic contexts he moved in and out of during his first year of university study, which is discussed in the next section of this chapter.

**Part II. Andrew’s Academic Contexts**

In the discussion of the literature on academic contexts in Chapter 2, it became clear that these contexts are unique discourse communities, especially in regard to the genres and tasks that comprise them. We also saw that even within academic contexts, there are self-contained discourse communities. This was also evident in the contexts Andrew negotiated during his first year of university study, which are listed and described in Table 4.1 below.

**Andrew’s Academic Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter 2006 Courses</th>
<th>Spring Quarter 2006 Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year Composition 110</strong></td>
<td><strong>Biology 101</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a skills based course to develop students’ skills in expository writing, reading, critical thinking through written and oral expression, and retrieve and use written information analytically and effectively</td>
<td>- an introductory course to facilitate students’ learning about biology by doing biology; by experiencing and discussing the process of doing biology (and science in general). The course objectives include reviewing science as a way of knowing contrasted with other knowledge systems. Focus is given to the themes of evolution, genetics and energetics. The course goal is to increase students’ abilities to reason within the field of biology and other areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Andrew’s Academic Contexts (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math 132</th>
<th>Computer Science &amp; Engineering 200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- an introductory course to help student comprehend mathematical concepts and methods adequate to construct valid arguments and understand inductive and deductive reasoning, scientific inference and general problem solving</td>
<td>- an introductory course to familiarize students with the breadth of business software applications to provide a working knowledge of spreadsheets and databases. The course objectives include understanding computer basics; effectively using spreadsheets to solve problems, presentation graphics software, and database management software to solve problems; and understand how the Internet works, basic principles of networking and building webpages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemistry 121</th>
<th>Economics 200*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an introductory course to help students understand the basic facts, principles, theories and methods of modern science; learn key events in the history of science; provide examples of the inter-dependence of scientific and technological developments; and discuss social and philosophical implications of scientific discoveries and understand the potential of science and technology to address problems of the contemporary world</td>
<td>- an introductory course to help students learn how economic principles are applied to the analysis of managerial and public policy decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economics 200*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an introductory course that focuses on choices made by individuals, firms and the government by analyzing the predictable outcomes of these choices and their effects on economic efficiency and the well-being of society and discussing applications of the theory to current events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Andrew dropped this course in Winter Quarter 2006 and retook it in Spring Quarter 2006.
Table 4.1 indicates that Andrew took both required introductory and skills-based (writing) courses during the two quarters of study, which are designated by 100 and 200 course numbers. We can also see that he took more courses in Winter Quarter than he did in Spring Quarter. As a point of reference at Andrew’s university, all first year students must register for a minimum of 15 credit hours of course work per quarter. Each course is generally worth 5 credit hours, so most students take a minimum of three courses per quarter. Andrew stated that he took four courses in Winter Quarter to graduate as soon as possible because of the high cost of tuition at the university he was attending. Despite this, it seems that taking four courses in one quarter was a significant challenge for him, as he took only three in Spring with one of the courses, Economics 200, a repeat of the same course he had taken in Winter. According to Andrew, he dropped this course in Winter because of his poor performance on one of the midterms, but wanted to take it before transferring to a less expensive university because of his familiarity with the course content.

As pointed out, Andrew’s courses in his first year included six introductory courses and one skills-based (writing) course. The content of the introductory courses included historical background and foundational knowledge of the field/discipline. Unlike most of the introductory courses Andrew took, the content of his skill-based (writing) course and one of his introductory courses, Biology 101, provided opportunities for him to develop his academic writing skills. A course like First Year composition provided Andrew, a Generation 1.5 student, the opportunity to utilize his favored method of learning, that is, “ear learning”, whereas other courses required him to heavily depend on his written literacy skills to complete course tasks and learn course material, which is
often difficult for Generation 1.5 learners to do because of their inexperience with academic literacies (Blanton, 2005).

Andrew’s Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks

From the discussion of the literature on academic literacies tasks in Chapter 2, we saw that while there are some similarities in academic literacies across academic contexts at the university, there is also variety, which further highlights the uniqueness of academic literacies within academic discourse communities. This was also evident in the academic literacies tasks Andrew encountered during his first year of university study, which are listed and described in Table 4.2 below. The numbers in parentheses following the genres and tasks indicate what Andrew reported doing to accomplish the tasks, such as reading 10 to 20 pages per week in his math textbook. The tasks in the contexts Andrew negotiated represent the Academic Literacies Model, as they include a variety of communicative practices as well as multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000) and situated literacies (Barton et al., 2000).

### Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks - Andrew

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter Courses</th>
<th>English 110</th>
<th>Math 132</th>
<th>Chemistry 121</th>
<th>Economics 200*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reading Tasks</td>
<td>Textbook and handbook (20-25 pp./wk); academic essays; notes; handouts; assignment description; proofreading; websites; outside sources (20 pp.)</td>
<td>Textbook (10-20 pp./wk)</td>
<td>Textbook, lab manual and handbook (20 pp./wk); course notes (6-15 pp./wk)</td>
<td>Textbook; course notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks – Andrew (Continued)
Table 4.2: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Writing Tasks</th>
<th>Mini papers (5; 2-3 pp./paper); course notes; analytical essay (3 drafts; 5 pp.); research proposal &amp; annotated bibliography (3 drafts; 4 pp.); research essay (3 drafts; 9 pp.); poster board presentation; website summary, analysis</th>
<th>Homework problems (1/wk; N=10); course notes; quizzes (1/wk.; N=10); midterms (2); final</th>
<th>Lab reports (1/wk; N=10; 3 pp./report); course notes (6-15 pp./wk); quizzes (1/wk; N=10); lab notes; midterms (2); final; practice exams; lab notebook (10 pp./lab)</th>
<th>Homework problems (1/wk; N=10); course notes (1 p./wk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information literacy Tasks</td>
<td>Primary, secondary source searches (10 sources)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Literacy Tasks</td>
<td>Word processing; electronic bilingual dictionary; websites – for outside sources; e-mail – to communicate with instructor</td>
<td>Use of field-specific calculator; course website – download course notes, answer keys</td>
<td>Use of field-specific calculator; course website; Web-CT – download course notes, answer keys</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter Courses</td>
<td>Biology 101</td>
<td>Computer Science &amp; Engineering 200</td>
<td>Economics 200**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reading Tasks</td>
<td>Textbook and lab manual (3-60 pp./wk); course notes; field guide; newspaper articles (N=24)</td>
<td>Textbooks (120-180 pp./wk); course notes</td>
<td>Textbook (40-60 pp./wk); course notes; practice book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Writing Tasks</td>
<td>Lab reports (3/wk; N=30); course notes; quizzes (1/wk; N=10)</td>
<td>Course notes; quizzes (1/wk; N=10); midterm (1); final (1)</td>
<td>Homework problems (1/wk; N=10); midterms (3); final (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks – Andrew (Continued)
As can be seen in Table 4.2, different courses that Andrew took during Winter and Spring Quarters 2006 required different academic literacies tasks, or communicative practices, as indicated by the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000). The courses also show literacy as multiple and situated, reflecting some similarities across academic contexts at the university as well as some variety. For example, in his skills-based (writing) course, First Year composition, Andrew read and wrote various genres and completed a range of tasks, such as a poster board presentation. Some content-oriented courses, such as his business and science courses, included more homogeneous genres and tasks, requiring Andrew to complete similar tasks, such as note taking, homework problems, labs, quizzes, midterms, and final exams. All of the courses required large amounts of reading. These literacies tasks are discussed in more detail in the sections that follow.

Reading Tasks. While there were a range of sources for reading in the various academic contexts Andrew negotiated in his first year of university study, Table 4.2 shows the textbook was the primary genre assigned as reading in all the courses he took. The primary purpose for reading in the introductory courses as determined by the instructors was to develop a foundation of knowledge of the course topics Andrew was
studying during the Winter and Spring Quarters. This academic reading involved what Myers (1992) lists in his discussion of textbook reading skills, which are “arranging facts in order; separating facts from research; taking most knowledge as accepted; and inferring knowledge using cohesive links” (p. 13). The amount of textbook reading Andrew completed for his courses is included in parentheses in Table 4.2 above. According to Andrew, the amounts ranged from no reading to 20-25 pages per week in his skills-based course; 10-60 pages per week in his science courses; and 40-180 pages per week in his business courses. Johns (1995) states that professors in introductory courses, similar to the ones Andrew took in his first year, do little to initiate students at this point in their academic careers into academic discourse communities by having them read representative genres of scholarly work within these communities. Instead, they assign students to read the course textbook as a means of developing foundational knowledge on the course subject. Because a fundamental characteristic of being part of an academic discourse community is shared knowledge of a subject, this type of reading is an important literacy practice for becoming part of the community because textbooks provide students the foundation on which to build other knowledge about the same or related subjects.

Another genre of reading Andrew encountered during his first year included academic essays in his First Year composition course to help students get started earlier on joining academic discourse communities. In a context where first year students are reading academic texts that represent genres specific to academic literacies communities, they might begin earlier to understand the composition of and entrance into these academic discourse communities. This, however, was not necessarily so with Andrew.
In his case, he struggled to comprehend the assigned academic essays in his First Year composition course. In none of the interviews that we did together did Andrew give the impression that he understood the practice of reading academic essays to be part of the process of academic socialization to become an effective member of an academic discourse community. Instead, he simply reported in the interviews that these academic texts were too difficult for him to understand. Andrew’s difficulties comprehending these texts show his non-membership in this particular academic community, which is expected with first year university students. Andrew’s difficulties with academic reading tasks are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Writing Tasks. In Andrew’s first year of university course work, he was assigned academic writing tasks far less often than he was assigned reading tasks. Of course, he wrote in a variety of genres as indicated in Table 4.2. Homework problems, course notes, quizzes, midterms and finals were the written genres most commonly assigned in the courses Andrew took. The most common mechanical task Andrew engaged in within the academic contexts was note taking. The types of notes that Andrew took were from PowerPoint slides of the lecture content. In other words, visual literacy was utilized as a means of presenting and representing information to be conveyed either by means of the computer and/or handouts. Some professors in Andrew’s courses used the PowerPoint slides, with copies of the slides included on the course website for students to access and print out prior to the lecture. For some classes the slides contained all the lecture materials covered in class that day, while in others, important course content was not included on the slides, requiring students to attend lectures to fill in what was missing. Copying as well as the other previously mentioned types of mechanical writing do not
require composing and idea development. This finding coincides with Jackson et al.’s (2006) study, which reports that instructors of beginning undergraduate level science courses did not see teaching writing as their task and thus limited the writing tasks to mathematical calculations. Because of the lack of varied academic writing tasks in Andrew’s introductory science and business courses, the opportunity to practice and develop the writing skills he learned in his First Year composition course in other academic contexts did not present itself, but confirms findings in the literature that the academic writing done in First Year composition courses is different from other types of writing typically done in the first year of university study (see Leki & Carson, 1997).

The academic writing tasks Andrew encountered in his first year were quite varied in genre compared to his academic reading tasks. For example, in his First Year composition course, the academic literacies tasks primarily consisted of various analytical writing tasks. Students wrote multiple drafts of a rhetorical analysis essay, annotated bibliography and project proposal, and analytical research paper. The instructor was the primary audience and evaluator. The purpose of the writing tasks in the course was to provide students with the opportunity to learn new academic writing genres and to prepare them to use similar academic writing genres in their other courses. Throughout the quarter in which Andrew took this First Year composition course, there were several writing tutorials and peer evaluation opportunities, which he took advantage of by attending two writing tutorials. On the other hand, the writing tasks in Andrew’s business and science courses required him to demonstrate his understanding of and competence with the course content primarily with fill-in-the-blank, multiple choice and short answer exercises. The primary writing task in these courses was copying
information from PowerPoint slide displays and/or overhead transparencies during course lectures in his math, chemistry, economics, biology and computer science and engineering courses and from a field guide for an assignment in his biology course. In summary, it is clear that Andrew did few writing tasks that required him to compose and develop his own ideas. This suggests that Andrew was given few opportunities to practice and develop the writing skills he leaned in his First Year composition course and to transfer them into other academic contexts during his first year of university study.

Information Literacy Tasks. “Information literacy” is defined in this study as the ability to use the library to search for outside sources, to use the online library catalog and databases, and to choose keywords to guide searches. Most of the academic contexts Andrew negotiated during his first year of university study did not include information literacy tasks. Only two courses required students to carry out these tasks, as can be seen in Table 4.2. These were his First Year composition and biology courses. Even so, the types of information literacy tasks required in these courses varied greatly. In Andrew’s biology course, for example, the task was to find four articles from The New York Times related to the topic of biology and write a discussion paper on them. On the other hand, for his English course the information literacy task required Andrew to find an unspecified amount of primary and secondary sources using the online library databases in order to write multiple drafts of an annotated bibliography, project proposal, and 7 to 9 page research paper on one of two pre-chosen topics related to the construction of national identity or national memory. Andrew reported having little difficulty with the more structured information literacy task; however, the unstructured one caused more difficulty for him. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.
**Digital Literacy Tasks.** Table 4.2 shows that the types of digital literacy tasks Andrew was assigned in the courses he took involved basic levels of knowledge of technology, including Word processing and searching the Internet. The most advanced levels of digital literacy knowledge included learning new software, such as Excel. Because Andrew had some experience with these types of digital literacy tasks, he reported not finding them to be too difficult to complete.

**Summary of Andrew’s Academic Contexts**

From the discussion of the academic contexts and tasks Andrew encountered in his first year of university study, we can see that the majority of the courses he took his first year were introductory courses. Academic reading, academic writing, and digital literacy were a big part of the academic contexts he negotiated, whereas information literacy was only part of two of the seven courses he took. Moreover, as Andrew negotiated these contexts, he was assigned a great deal of academic reading for purposes of test preparation rather than for the development of his own ideas and interpretations. This pattern suggests that his writing experience and skill acquisition in First Year composition received little attention in his subsequent course work. A further look at Andrew’s academic literacies, specifically his difficulties and academic literacies practices, can be found in Chapter 5. The next section discusses the second case study participant’s perceptions of academic literacies and contexts.

**Tiffany – “I hate to write and read, and I’m not a good writer.”**

Tiffany is from Taiwan, and unlike Andrew, is multi-lingual and multi-literate in four languages: Taiwanese, Mandarin, English and Japanese. She grew up in a multi-lingual and multi-literate environment, where she was exposed to different genres of
texts, including fiction, non-fiction and academic texts. Like Andrew, Tiffany came to the U.S. without her family at the start of her junior year of high school. Tiffany’s exposure to academic literacies in high school was more extensive than Andrew’s. In regard to writing, Tiffany reported doing mostly academic writing in the forms of daily journals, comparison/contrast and reflective essays, and a research paper. Tiffany reported using Google as a means for finding outside sources for her research paper. In regards to reading, Tiffany reported doing reflective reading from books on religion and government, philosophy and literature, such as Animal Farm, Hamlet, and Lord of the Flies, and from textbooks, although she admitted that she did not really read that much. The reading that she did do was mostly fiction based on her own interests, which she bought at a local bookstore. In her first year at the university she attended, she declared business as her major and lived in the dormitory designated for business majors. She placed into the intermediate level of ESL composition in her first quarter, and then subsequently completed the advanced level of ESL composition, and First Year composition in her first year.

Part I. Tiffany’s Perception of Academic Literacies

Tiffany’s overall perception of academic literacies is highlighted in the statement at the beginning of her profile when she states, I “hate writing and reading in English”.

Compared to Andrew’s rather muted perception of academic literacies, Tiffany used strong language to express hers about reading and writing in English. Furthermore, her perception is a seeming contradiction to her multi-lingual, multi-literate background. It seems that someone who knows many languages would like to use them; however, this was not Tiffany’s case, at least not in regards to reading and writing. She only expresses
strong negative feelings toward reading and writing, but in none of the interviews talk about or expresses any feelings about listening and speaking. One reason for this may be that since Generation 1.5 learners are known to be “ear” learners and are consequently more orally and aurally proficient, Tiffany may not even consider her listening and speaking skills as sources of input or frustration in learning English. In the various academic contexts she negotiated in her first year of university study, Tiffany learned how to read and write in ways that were different from what she had learned in the U.S. high school she attended, so her feelings toward and frustration with these skills were more apparent to her. In the interview transcript below, we can see another reason why Tiffany has such a negative perspective of reading and writing in English:

________________________________________________________________________

55:49  T: …like, I hate English reading. So far what I read that was most interesting was “Mother Tongue”. Other things are hard to understand and boring.

57:47  C: What was so hard to understand …?

57:51  T: I have no idea. I understand every single word. It just doesn’t make any sense. (From T.6.April 28, 2006)

________________________________________________________________________

In spite of Tiffany’s encounter with “English reading,” she reported enjoying specific works. For instance, one of the academic tasks Tiffany encountered required that she read the immigrant-oriented essay “Mother Tongue” by Amy Tan. In this essay, Tan shares her observations and thoughts on the use of different forms of English and perceptions and prejudices regarding these forms of English. Tiffany chose this particular article for this task because …
17:11 T: I thought it was the easiest one to understand. I got more inspiration from it than the other articles.

18:38 C: Why did you get more inspiration?

18:41 T: I thought just by read and I thought that I could write more on Mother Tongue. I just got that feeling 'cause I have more thought to it.

18:49 C: Why do you think that is?

18:52 T: I guess because I understand what she meant when she say the whole ashamed of a mother’s English and how language is so important and the experience of her mother got ignored by a doctor and nurse. (From T.5. April 10, 2006)

21:55 C: …I just wondered how you thought you could relate that story to you.

23:22 T: Well, first of all, I’m Asian. For the other three stories they are talking about whom or what is an American. Compared to other texts, it [Mother Tongue] relates more to me since I’m not an American. And what the author was saying in the article, how her mother speaks imperfect English. I understand that ‘cause that’s how mostly people in my country speak English ‘cause like the object, verb and subject, the order is differently. So when they translate directly from Chinese, it’s sound really funny English. But even though how she wrote that her mother spoke English in an imperfect way, I understood what she was saying by translating back to Chinese. I understood what it was, just the order was differently. If you rearrange the order of what her mother said, it would make perfect sense in English. I think her mother’s English was imperfect because she messes up the subject, verb and object because that’s how Chinese works. She just translates directly instead of translating the whole sentence to it. I mean, that’s how I spoke English when I first learned it. (From T.6. April 28, 2006)

Here Tiffany identifies with the text because she is Asian and shares the mother’s immigrant background. Perhaps because she had a strong sense of her own identity as Asian, Tiffany was able to bring her own experiences to bear to understand “Mother Tongue”. It is noteworthy to mention that after two years of living and studying in the U.S. and speaking English almost all of the time, Tiffany still maintained a strong Asian
identity. This is unlike other Generation 1.5 learners, who often feel caught between cultures and are not sure what their ethnic identities are (see Chiang & Schmida, 1999).

She also identified to some degree with “Mother Tongue” based on linguistic identification with the text. For example, when she talked about the spoken English of the mother in the text, Tiffany saw the connection between it and how people in her country speak English, but interestingly enough she did not fully connect this to her. In discussing the mistakes the mother in the text made with English, she stated, “I understand that ‘cause that’s how mostly people in my country speak English.” From Tiffany’s discourse we can see a distant identification; she associated the experience of the person in the text with what she knew about the spoken English of the Taiwanese. However, her use of the relative pronoun “that” and the exclusion of her personal experience from this statement show a distance between herself and the situation. This distant identification can also be seen at the end of the interview segment where she talks about her spoken English. Tiffany stated, “…that’s how I spoke English when I first learned it.” Here Tiffany identified with the text, but again in a very distant way, making it clear that she used to speak like the mother in the text, but she does not anymore. It seems like Tiffany does identify to some degree with “Mother Tongue”, but cannot seem to do so entirely. She clearly stated in the interview segment above that she is Asian, but not completely the type described in “Mother Tongue”. Tiffany’s ability to identify with and understand this text helped facilitate her completing the writing task that accompanied reading this text. Unlike other reading tasks in this course that caused Tiffany a great amount of frustration in trying to comprehend and write about them, because of her identification with “Mother Tongue” and her ability to generate thoughts
on which to write because of this identification, she was able to comprehend and write
about it with little difficulty. This, as well as other difficulties and academic literacies
practices of Tiffany, are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Tiffany’s perception of academic literacies also included a lack of identification
with aspects of it. This is shown in Tiffany’s struggle with comprehending an article she
chose to use for a rhetorical analysis essay for her First Year composition course on
identity and difference. The reading was an academic essay from the field of sociology.
Like Andrew, Tiffany’s non-membership in the academic discourse community was
revealed in the struggle she had in comprehending the text, primarily because of her lack
of knowledge of sociology and how knowledge in this field is constructed. Unlike how
Tiffany understood and identified with the content of “Mother Tongue”, with the
sociology text, Tiffany did not identify with the content of it from a sociologist’s
perspective, which points to her lack of membership in the academic community rather
than to difficulties Generation 1.5 learners have with reading. As a consequence of her
lack of membership, she had great difficulty completing the assignment, as can be seen in
the following interview segment:

49:27 T: …I spent 10 hours working on my paper. Five of those hours were just me
sitting there trying to understand the article because I couldn’t write anymore
because I couldn’t understand it.

50:30 C: You keep saying that it was difficulty to understand. Why was that?

50:35 T: Why was that? The author who wrote the article was a sociologist. …I think
the article tend more to the sociology part and what the author thinks identity is
based on the sociology view, so I thought it was really hard to understand.
…Like he talked about Karl Marx and how his opinion relates to identity. I’m
like okay, he’s the person who came up with Communism. That’s all I know.
Like I understood every single word, but I don’t understand what he was talking about. Like I read it and I read it and I’m like, oh my god, I’m dying. But every single word I could understand what he is trying to say. (From T.6. April 28, 2006)

The difficulties Tiffany faced in trying to comprehend the article challenged her self-perception as someone who seemed to have a pretty good grasp of English. After all, she reported that her English proficiency was not like that spoken by the mother in “Mother Tongue”, and consequently, she should have been able to understand written English. However, Tiffany realized that her current level of English proficiency did not allow her to fully comprehend the specialized language of sociology.

Despite the difficulties she faced in trying to comprehend the text, Tiffany still maintained a positive opinion of her English proficiency, that is, she did not say that she was bad at English because she did not understand what she was reading. Instead, she blamed her difficulties on the academic discourse of sociology rather than on being a poor language learner, as some learners might. So we can see that Tiffany seems to be confident about herself as an English language user, but got quite confused about and frustrated with the conventions of the formal academic discourse of sociology. This experience spotlights a part of the academic socialization process Tiffany went through in her first year of university study as she negotiated various academic contexts. She was able to identify specific characteristics of academic literacies, such as the concepts and lexicon specific to the field of sociology, and have a better understanding of the nature and complexity of academic literacies. Through this experience we can see that Tiffany
was able to conceptualize her difficulties with academic literacies as a result of the literacies themselves rather than a reflection of her deficiencies as a language learner.

Tiffany’s belief about academic literacies also played a role in shaping the perception of herself as an academic reader and writer. As previously pointed out in Andrew’s profile, he believed that improvement in writing came from knowing more about using elements of the language, particularly the structure and vocabulary, whereas Tiffany believed that improvement in writing comes from understanding the source(s) one is writing about. While Andrew’s belief about writing improvement was more elementary, that is, concerned with the mechanics of writing, Tiffany’s belief about writing improvement was grounded more in academic discourse, where writing is viewed as being source-based rather than experience-based. Tiffany realized that one cannot write without a source, and one must understand it in order to write about it.

Additionally, Tiffany believed that understanding academic texts is about knowing the academic language specific to an academic discourse community rather than the limitations associated with being a Generation 1.5 learner. On the other hand, Andrew believed that understanding academic texts involved, in general, learning more grammar and lexicon. Tiffany’s beliefs about academic literacies point toward an ideological view of them, because she sees academic literacies as being situated within a specific context. On the other hand, Andrew’s beliefs point toward an autonomous view of academic literacies, because he sees them merely as skills for completing academic literacies tasks detached from a context.
Summary of Tiffany’s Academic Literacies

From the discussion of Tiffany’s perspectives of and beliefs about academic literacies, we can see a difference between her multiliteracies background and opinion of academic literacies in English. As previously pointed out, Tiffany learned several languages; however, English was the only language in which she was learning to become academically literate. Consequently, she reported hated reading and writing in English. The cause of this “hatred” seems to be primarily the frustration she had in comprehending the assigned readings for her First Year composition course. In addition to her “hatred” of academic literacy, we can see Tiffany’s ethnic and linguistic identification with one of the texts for this course and her belief that improvement in language usage comes from knowing the language of the academic discourse community rather than from the difficulties associated with being a Generation 1.5 learner. The academic contexts that Tiffany moved in and out of during her first year of university study are discussed in the next section of this chapter.

Part II. Tiffany’s Academic Contexts

From the discussion of the research literature on academic contexts in Chapter 2, we saw that academic contexts are unique discourse communities with regard to the genres and tasks that comprise them. This was evident in the contexts Tiffany negotiated during her first year of university study, which are listed and described in Table 4.3 below.
Tiffany’s Academic Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter 2006 Courses</th>
<th>Spring Quarter 2006 Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Literature 251</td>
<td>Japanese Literature 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a humanities course that seeks to explore the foundations of Japan’s cultural expressions through readings of and writing about selected literary works and watching films</td>
<td>- a humanities course that introduces the major elements of Japanese culture from prehistoric to contemporary times and helps students gain a basic knowledge of Japanese cultural history by completing readings from the course pack; writing about the course readings; and viewing films related to course topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced ESL Composition 108.01</td>
<td>First Year Composition 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a skills-based course that provides guidance and instruction in academic writing skills and cultural knowledge of the ways to be successful in U.S. college degree courses through various genres and online source searches</td>
<td>- a skills-based course that is an introduction to college writing courses that employs methods of rhetorical and cultural analysis to provide students with tools to think and writing analytically about print and non-print texts and to improve students’ skills as academic writers by fostering research and analytical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science &amp; Engineering 200</td>
<td>Economics 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an introductory course that familiarizes students with the breadth of business software applications to provide a working knowledge of spreadsheets and databases</td>
<td>- an introductory course that focuses on the principles of microeconomics, including opportunity cost, supply and demand, and elasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 132</td>
<td>Statistics 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an introductory course that helps student comprehend mathematical concepts and methods adequate to construct valid arguments and understand inductive and deductive reasoning, scientific inference and general problem solving</td>
<td>- an introductory course on the basic concepts of probability and statistics, sample statistics, discrete and continuous probability distributions, and sampling distributions for means and proportions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Tiffany’s Academic Contexts
From Table 4.3 above, we can see that Tiffany took four courses in each quarter during the study, with two of the courses being skills-based and six of the courses being introductory, as designated by 100 and 200 numbers in the course titles. Of the introductory courses, two of these were science courses, two were humanities, and two were business courses. The content of the introductory courses included historical background and foundational knowledge of the field/discipline. Unlike the introductory courses, the content of the skills-based (writing) courses, Advanced ESL Composition and First Year composition, provided opportunities for Tiffany to develop her academic writing skills through the media of both written and oral literacy. These courses provided Tiffany, a Generation 1.5 or “ear” learner, the opportunity to utilize oral literacy to complete assigned literacy tasks. By contrast, other courses required her to heavily depend on her written literacy skills to learn the course material and complete course tasks, which is often difficult for Generation 1.5 learners. In addition to the skills-based (writing) and introductory science courses that Tiffany negotiated in her first year, there was also another academic context she negotiated, which was the humanities discipline. In this context, more academic reading and writing was expected than in the introductory courses that she took. Further discussion of the specific academic literacies genres and tasks in Tiffany’s introductory and skills-based (writing) courses are discussed in the following section.

**Tiffany’s Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks**

From the discussion of the research literature on academic literacies tasks in Chapter 2, we saw that while there are some similarities in academic literacies across academic contexts at the university, there is also variety, which further highlights the
uniqueness of and within academic discourse communities. This was evident in the academic literacies tasks Tiffany encountered during her first year of university study, which are listed and described in Table 4.4 below. Table 4.4 indicates the different genres and tasks according to the respective courses Tiffany took over two academic quarters. The numbers in parentheses following the genres and tasks indicate what Tiffany reported doing to accomplish the tasks. Unlike Andrew, Tiffany’s academic reading in the courses she took was less varied and included mostly course packs and textbooks. Like Andrew, Tiffany’s academic writing genres and tasks were quite varied, primarily because she took more skills-based (writing) and humanities courses during the study than did Andrew. The different genres and tasks are listed according to the information recorded on the syllabi for the respective courses Tiffany took during the study. The tasks in the contexts Tiffany negotiated illustrate the Academic Literacies Model, as they include a variety of communicative practices as well as multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000) and situated literacies (Barton et al., 2000). These include the following:

### Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks - Tiffany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter Courses</th>
<th>Japanese Literacy 251</th>
<th>Advanced ESL Composition 108.01</th>
<th>Computer Science &amp; Engineering 200</th>
<th>Math 132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Reading Tasks</strong></td>
<td>Course pack articles (20-90 pp./wk)</td>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td>Course pack, textbooks (40-50 pp./wk); course notes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks – Tiffany (Continued)
Table 4.4: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Writing Tasks</th>
<th>2 comparison/contrast essays (2 drafts; 2-5pp.); list (1 p.); essay outline; 3 quizzes</th>
<th>Diagnostic essay exam; objective report (2 drafts; 5 pp.); persuasive essay (2 drafts; 5 pp.); vocabulary quizzes (1/wk; N=10); course notes (2pp./wk); worksheets</th>
<th>Homework problems; course notes; quizzes (5); midterm (1); final (1); prelabs (7); inlabs (7)</th>
<th>Homework problems; course notes (4 pp./lecture; N=12 pp./wk); quizzes 1/wk; N=10); midterms (3); final (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy Tasks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Source Searches</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Literacy Tasks</td>
<td>Film viewing; word processing</td>
<td>Carmen usage – vocabulary quizzes; library database; word processing</td>
<td>Excel introduction; Access introduction; Windows introduction</td>
<td>Internet – download course notes, answer keys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter Courses</td>
<td>Japanese Literature 231</td>
<td>English 110</td>
<td>Economics 200*</td>
<td>Statistics 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reading Tasks</td>
<td>Course pack readings (30-100 pp./wk)</td>
<td>Course pack, textbook readings (15-50 pp./wk)</td>
<td>Textbook (40 pp./wk)</td>
<td>Textbook (30 pp./wk)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks – Tiffany (Continued)
As can be seen in Table 4.4, the contexts reflect similarities in academic literacies across contexts as well as differences, which highlight the uniqueness of academic literacies among and within academic discourse communities. Some of the skills-based courses Tiffany took included a greater range of academic literacies genres and tasks, where she wrote various genres and completed other academic literacies tasks, such as an oral presentation. The other courses, such as business and science, included a lesser range of genres and tasks, where Tiffany completed the same or similar types of tasks, such as

*Tiffany failed this course in Fall Quarter and retook it in Spring Quarter.*
note taking, homework problems, labs, quizzes, midterms and final exams. All of the courses included academic literacies tasks that primarily required large amounts of reading and are discussed in more detail in the sections that follow.

Reading Tasks. During the period of the study, both Tiffany and Andrew took Math 132, English 110, Computer Science & Engineering 200 and Economics 200. Compared with the literacies tasks for the four courses Andrew took, Tiffany reported less varied reading genres because not as many different ones were included in the sections of the courses she took as what were included in the courses Andrew took. These included mostly reading course packs and textbooks. The primary purpose for reading was to develop a foundation of knowledge of the assigned course topics. The academic reading involved what Myers (1992) lists in his discussion of textbook reading skills: “arranging facts in order; separating facts from research; taking most knowledge as accepted; and inferring knowledge using cohesive links” (p. 13). The amount of textbook and course pack reading Tiffany was assigned for her courses ranged from no reading to 50 pages per week in her skills-based courses; 30-50 pages per week in her business and science courses; and 20-100 pages in her humanities courses. Of particular interest was Tiffany’s lack of reporting of reading tasks for her math course. When asked about why she did not do any reading for this course, Tiffany replied,

59:11 T: …I don’t understand why they have you read the textbook ‘cause you need to do problems for math. (From T.4. March 31, 2006)

Her response includes her academic literacies practices in the course, that of doing the homework problems and not reading the textbook, which did not meet the instructor’s
expectations, of reading the textbook and then doing the homework problems. This highlights part of the process of Tiffany negotiating this particular academic context, where she questioned the instructor’s expectations of reading the textbook to complete the homework problems rather than just accepting the expectations without question and is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

*Writing Tasks.* The amount of academic writing and types of tasks Tiffany completed were quite varied, primarily because she elected to take several writing and humanities courses during the study. This is a noteworthy point to highlight because Generation 1.5 learners often choose their majors at the university based on how much (or how little) academic reading and writing are required in the courses for the majors. Many Generation 1.5 learners choose majors in the health and allied professions because the courses do not include a lot of academic writing tasks. Furthermore, since undergraduate L2 learners at the institution where this study was carried out can fulfill the ESL composition requirement at any time during their university study as long as they complete it prior to graduation, many Generation 1.5 learners postpone fulfilling this requirement until their final year to try and avoid the academic reading and writing that is involved in taking them. However, this was not necessarily the case with either Tiffany or Andrew; they both took the required ESL composition courses and First Year composition in their first year of university study.

As can be seen in Table 4.4, the most common genres of writing Tiffany encountered included homework problems, course notes, quizzes, midterms and final exams. These were the written genres that were most commonly assigned in the courses Tiffany took, with the most common writing task being copying. She did little writing in
her foundational science courses in the first year of university study, which Jackson et al. (2006) found to be true in their study of instructors of beginning undergraduate level science courses. Because of the homogeneity of academic writing genres in Tiffany’s introductory science and business courses, the opportunity to practice and develop the writing skills she learned in her ESL and First Year composition courses in other academic contexts in the first year did not present itself. This highlights the situatedness of academic literacies and sustains the myth of transience (Rose, 1985) that states courses like First Year composition are the panacea for the writing problems of undergraduate students. Furthermore, this finding is similar to results in the literature which point out that academic writing performed in First Year composition courses is different from other types of writing typically done in the first year of university study (see Leki & Carson, 1997).

In Tiffany’s Advanced ESL Composition course, the writing tasks primarily consisted of informational and argumentative tasks where students wrote multiple drafts, with the instructor as the primary audience and evaluator of the student products. According to the course goals and objectives, the purpose of the writing tasks in the course was to provide students with the opportunity to learn new academic writing genres. There were three required writing tutorials and a couple of opportunities to receive peer feedback on her writing for the course. In her First Year composition course, unlike the ESL composition course, the writing tasks primarily consisted of analytical tasks in which students wrote multiple drafts and composed a range of genres, such as a rhetorical analysis essay, annotated bibliography and project proposal, and analytical research paper. However, like in her ESL composition course, the purpose of
the writing tasks in the First Year composition course was to provide students with the opportunity to learn new academic writing genres while developing their analytical skills. There were several writing tutorials and peer evaluation opportunities for Tiffany, of which she took full advantage. So even between the writing skills courses Tiffany took in her first year of university, the writing genres and tasks were different, pointing again to the situatedness of literacy, even within similar discourse communities.

The writing Tiffany did in her humanities courses, like in her First Year composition course, was primarily analytical. Tiffany wrote multiple drafts of two different genres than what she had written for her Advanced ESL composition and First Year composition courses: comparison/contrast and response essays, with the instructor and teaching assistant being the primary audience and evaluators. There were no formal writing tutorials or peer evaluations in this course. Moreover, the instructor did not require students to write multiple drafts of the writing assignments; however, Tiffany opted to do this on her own, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6. Unlike the purpose for the writing tasks in her skills-based courses, the purpose of the tasks in Tiffany’s humanities courses was for students to demonstrate their understanding and thoughts about the course readings as well as to generate new knowledge about them. This purpose for writing reflects an ideological view of literacy, in that students are writing not merely as a means of learning how to write academically, but as a means to create new knowledge about the topic on which they are writing. This then helps them better understand the process of academic socialization and what is involved in becoming a member of an academic discourse community.
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The writing tasks in Tiffany’s business and science courses were different from those she encountered in her skills-based (writing) and humanities courses. These required only a demonstration of her understanding of and competence with the course content rather than a generation of new knowledge, and was done primarily with fill-in-the-blank, multiple choice and short answer exercises rather than academic essays. The primary writing task in these courses was copying information from overhead transparencies during course lectures in her math, economics, statistics and computer science and engineering courses. Tiffany’s skills-based courses that featured a lot of academic writing tasks are also the only courses that included information literacy tasks, which are discussed in the next section.

**Information Literacy Tasks.** The only courses Tiffany took during the study that included research tasks were the skills-based courses, as can be seen in Table 4.4. The types of information literacy tasks required in these courses included finding primary and secondary sources for the persuasive essay in the Advanced ESL Composition course and the annotated bibliography, project proposal and research paper for the First Year composition course. Tiffany reported having difficulty with these “unstructured” information literacy tasks, which were difficult for Andrew as well. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

**Digital Literacy Tasks.** Table 4.4 indicates that technology was included in every course Tiffany took during the two quarters of study. The types of digital literacy tasks Tiffany was assigned in her courses were similar to Andrew’s and involved a basic level of knowledge of technology, including Word processing and searching the Internet. The tasks also involved alternative types of practice, such as viewing and discussing films.
The most advanced levels of digital literacy included learning new software, such as Minitab, where guided instruction and a user manual were provided, and using the library database, where very little formal instruction was provided. Tiffany reported that she had started developing her digital literacy at a technology camp she attended when in the third grade, which may be the reason why she did not find these tasks to be too difficult to complete.

**Summary of Tiffany’s Academic Contexts**

From the discussion of the academic contexts and tasks Tiffany encountered in her first year of university study, we can see that, like with Andrew, academic reading, writing, and digital literacy were a part of all the contexts she negotiated. Additionally, like Andrew, Tiffany encountered a lot more academic reading than writing in her first year, with more of a variety of academic writing genres than reading genres. However, unlike Andrew’s academic writing that reflected only an autonomous view of literacy, the academic writing that Tiffany encountered across contexts reflected both autonomous and ideological views. With regard to information literacy tasks, unlike Andrew, Tiffany encountered these only in the contexts of her ESL and First Year composition courses. A further look at Tiffany’s academic literacies can be seen in the discussion on her academic literacies difficulties and practices in Chapter 5. The next section in this chapter discusses the third case study participant - Zack.

**Zack – “Everything was pretty straightforward.”**

Zack is from Kuwait and of Indian ethnicity. When asked about his native language, Zack had some difficulty in identifying this, which is a common problem for Generation 1.5 learners. According to Chiang and Schmida (1999), “The constant
waverings in bilingual identification seem to complicate the way students define
themselves in terms of the native speaker identification” (p. 88). This is true with Zack.
Although he claims Hindi as his native language, the transcript segment below reveals
that he may also consider English to be his native language as well.

2:26 C: What do you consider to be your native language?

2:30 Z: I don’t even know. When people ask me that, I don’t know what to say ‘cause I
speak English more than anything else. (From Z.6. May 5, 2006)

Like Tiffany, Zack is multi-lingual and multi-literate in English, French and Arabic. Like
Andrew and Tiffany, Zack attended a U.S. high school his junior and senior years. His
exposure to academic literacies in high school was quite extensive. With regard to
writing, Zack wrote book reports, a division/classification essay, a research paper and
letters and took notes. For the research paper, he accessed online databases. With regard
to reading, he read textbooks, contemporary literature (four books), handouts and journal
articles.

Unlike Andrew and Tiffany, who came to study in the U.S. without their families,
Zack immigrated here with his family with the intent of becoming part of the U.S.
society. This purpose for immigrating may contribute to Zack’s difficulty in identifying
his native language and shows how Generation 1.5 learners can become caught between
cultures and languages. In his first year at the university he attended, Zack declared a
pre-pharmacy major and film studies minor, the former a result of his experience as a
pharmacy technician prior to starting university, the latter based on his personal interest.
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Due to receiving high scores on the writing section of the SAT, Zack was exempt from taking the required ESL composition courses at the university and instead enrolled in the First Year composition course during Winter Quarter.

**Part I. Zack’s Perception of Academic Literacies**

Zack’s perception of and confidence in his academic literacies is based partially on what his instructors have thought of him as a writer, as evidenced in the following interview segment:

---

C: How do you think of yourself as a writer in English?

Z: I guess I’m pretty good. That’s my teachers’ opinions.

C: Do you agree with them?

Z: U, I guess, sort of. I’m not the type to judge myself very easily. I usually just leave that to others. (From Z.1. January 6, 2006)

---

Even though here he bases his assessment on his teachers’ judgment, in the second interview, he also credits himself with having a good perception of his writing in English.

In the interview segment below we can hear Zack’s certainty with and confidence in his writing in the claims he makes about his feel for good writing.

---

49:31 Z: The rough draft, like, I was not too sure about it. But once I got the final draft done, I was pretty sure that it was good.

49:44 C: Why?

49:46 Z: ‘Cause usually when I’m writing papers, I usually know if it’s good or not. And there’s no grey area in there. Like I know this one was good. Actually the final draft I knew I did a good job, so I knew it was going to be good.
From this we can see that Zack’s feel for good writing comes from his experience with it, that for him, good writing is intuitive, and that he perceives himself as being confident about writing. Likewise, Tiffany also talked about her feel for good writing, but unlike Zack, who discussed this early on in the interviews, she did not discuss this until the last interview. In a segment from this interview found below, Tiffany clearly articulates her feel for good writing for the tasks she completed for her First Year composition course, which is based on the criteria for good writing established by the instructor for the course.

40:29  T: …when I was writing this paper, and then I’m like okay, I think I achieved all the things that she said in class. Like how you give examples, that you talk about two things, you talk about how they’re different, and the implicit and explicit meanings, and you have to have a thesis, and every paragraph should refer to the thesis. Like, stuff that she say in the class. Then when I’m writing, I’m like, okay, I think I achieve those. I probably got a good grade on this one. But the first one, I know that I wasn’t gonna get an A because I didn’t have the deep analysis in it. And for the fourth one, I didn’t think it was that good because I didn’t have a thesis statement, so I now know what I don’t have in the paper or what I have in the paper, so that’s why I know, okay, this is probably gonna get an A or this is gonna get a B. (From T.8. June 6, 2006)
In this segment we can see how good writing was defined by the instructor within the context of Tiffany’s First Year composition course. To be a successful writer within this context and develop a feel for good writing, Tiffany knew to take on her instructor’s definition of good writing and apply it to the writing she did for the course. This is quite unlike Zack’s feel for good writing, which was much more intuitive and came from his experience with writing prior to coming to the university rather than from the required First Year composition course he took in his first year.

In addition to his intuitive feel for good writing, Zack’s perception of his academic literacies was based on his reading and writing ability in French, one of the several languages Zack knew, rather than on his L1. Unlike Andrew, who had a negative perception of his academic literacies abilities in English, Zack had a positive perception of his literacy proficiency in one of his other languages, as can be seen in the interview segment here:

________________________________________________________________________

C: How well would you say you write in French?

Z: Um, decent.

...

C: How about reading?

Z: Reading is not too bad. It is not that hard as opposed to writing. I guess once you start reading, you know, how you like, certain tenses and how they are conjugated. (From Z.1. January 6, 2006)

________________________________________________________________________

Zack’s perception regarding his literacy proficiency in French is noteworthy because unlike Andrew, who transferred his academic literacies perception from his L1 to
English, Zack transferred his from one of his other languages rather than his L1. The reason for this is that Zack, as previously discussed, was uncertain what his L1 was. For example, when asked about his literacy proficiency in Hindi, what Zack thought might be his L1, he stated that he did not know how to read and write in it. In fact, when Zack was living and going to school in Kuwait, in the country where he was born and grew up, he took classes to learn Hindi as a second language. Zack’s positive perception of his academic literacies ability in French seems apparent in his perception of academic literacies in English when he says, “everything regarding academic literacies [in English] is pretty straightforward”. When asked about what he meant by “everything was pretty straightforward”, Zack responded by explaining the differences between his high school and college writing experiences:

---

:00 C: …you said that the writing at OSU has been straightforward. … I wondered what you meant by straightforward writing on a subject.

1:16 Z: …There’s no expected format that they give you. There’s no outline where they state we want you to have five paragraphs. It’s kind of like open. There’s this rubric that has stuff in it, but the format isn’t as limiting as it was in high school where you have to have five paragraphs, where the first one is the introduction and you have three body paragraphs and the last one is the conclusion with the last line restating the thesis. …It was a little more open here, where you can have maybe two body paragraphs or one long paragraph. And your conclusion can have something new or slightly newer point. …It wasn’t like in high school where you have to choose a thesis and make sure it is restated in the conclusion. (From Z.8. June 12, 2006)

---

Zack’s explanation of his statement that “everything [about academic literacies] was pretty straightforward” seems in essence to be a contradiction to what most beginning academic writers would say. It seems that rather than finding the “openness” of the
academic essay structure at the university to be straightforward, they would find the 5-paragraph writing formula to be straightforward. However, this was not the case with Zack. Rather than replicating the 5-paragraph essay structure used to complete high school writing tasks, Zack’s confidence with academic writing led him to feel liberated by the more open style he was allowed to use in his writing at the university. This stands in stark contrast to Andrew’s and Tiffany’s perceptions of academic literacies, pointing to the fact that Zack’s knowledge and meta-language of high school writing was much more extensive than the others, thus making him more confident about his writing.

Zack’s belief about academic literacies also seems to play a part in his perception of being an academic writer. His understanding of academic writing, as discussed above, includes the distinction between academic writing in high school and at the university. And even though Zack possesses an intuitive feel for good writing, as previously discussed, he also recognized what more he needed to do to write at the university:

26:17 Z: …the writing here [at OSU] is different from what I did before. So getting used to that has been more of a process of adaptation more than anything else.
(From Z.8. June 12, 2006)

Zack’s belief regarding writing at the university includes adapting to the different types of writing within this context as compared to other contexts. This belief is similar to Tiffany’s, in that he recognizes the situatedness of literacy, that writing at the university is different from writing in high school. However, unlike Tiffany, who only recognizes the situatedness of literacy but does not state how to negotiate it from one context to another, Zack states that experience with this situatedness is what helps in negotiating it
in various contexts, which points to a better understanding of academic writing than what Tiffany or Andrew possess.

**Summary of Zack’s Perceptions of Academic Literacies**

From the discussion of Zack’s perceptions of and beliefs about academic literacies, we see a Generation 1.5 learner who is caught between languages and cultures. Despite this “in-between-ness”, Zack seems to be experienced and comfortable with academic literacies. This is reflected in his self-perception of academic literacies, which includes an intuitive feel for good writing as well as an understanding of the situatedness of literacy and how to negotiate this from one context to another. The academic contexts Zack moved in and out of during his first year of university study are discussed in the next section of this chapter.

**Part II. Zack’s Academic Contexts**

From the discussion of the research literature on academic contexts in Chapter 2, we saw that academic contexts are unique discourse communities with regard to the genres and tasks that comprise them. We also saw that even within contexts there are unique discourse communities. This was also evident in the academic contexts Zack negotiated during his first year of university study, which are listed and described in Table 4.5 below.
### Winter Quarter 2006 Courses

**Chemistry 123**  
- an introductory course that helps students understand the basic facts, principles, theories and methods of modern science; learn key events in the history of science; provide examples of the inter-dependence of scientific and technological developments; and discuss social and philosophical implications of scientific discoveries and understand the potential of science and technology to address problems of the contemporary world

### Spring Quarter 2006 Courses

**Biology 113**  
- an introductory course designed to give students and in-depth experience in the biological sciences through a variety of readings from the textbook, lab manual and *The New York Times*; writing of lab reports and *The New York Times* project; and learning lab equipment

---

### First Year Composition 110

- a basic writing skills course that employs methods of rhetorical and cultural analysis to provide students with the tools to think and write analytically about print and non-print texts and to extend and refine students’ skills in critical reading, writing and thinking

### Physics 111

- an introductory course that helps students understand the basic facts, principles, theories and methods of modern science; learn key events in the history of science; provide examples of the inter-dependence of scientific and technological developments; and discuss social and philosophical implications of scientific discoveries and understand the potential of science and technology to address problems of the contemporary world

---

Table 4.5 Zack’s Academic Contexts (Continued)
Table 4.5: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History 260</th>
<th>Scandinavian Film 520</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a humanities course that provides students opportunities to view, read about, discuss and interpret key examples of world cinema; develop a working knowledge of the ideas, forms, issues and terminology of filmmaking and film history; broaden understanding of historical periods and international differences in cinema tradition; demonstrate the critical methods of evaluating individual films of diverse origins; and gain awareness of the perceptual and psychological experience of watching films</td>
<td>a humanities course that trains students to the practice of close-reading/viewing of films and the screenplays, to introduce them to the idea that all films are cultural products, manifestations of particular ideologies, and to expose them to one of the truly great directors of the filmic tradition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Seminar 138.02</th>
<th>Freshman Seminar 137.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an elective humanities course that looks at the question What is your world view? from the perspective of both the sciences and the humanities through course readings and response writing</td>
<td>an elective humanities course that is an introduction to psychological science and provides insight into how matters of everyday life can be examined empirically, how research psychologists pursue both theoretical and practical questions, and how the knowledge base of psychology can be applied to understanding a wide range of topics through course readings and response papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.5, we can see that Zack took required introductory and skills-based (writing) courses during the study. Like Tiffany, Zack took four courses in both quarters, which included four humanities course, three science courses, and one skills-based course. The content of the introductory course included historical and foundational knowledge of the field. Unlike the introductory courses, the content of the skill-based course, First Year composition, provided opportunities for Zack to develop his academic
writing skills through the mediums of written and oral literacy. Zack’s First Year composition and elective courses provided him, a Generation 1.5 learner, the opportunity to utilize oral literacy when having class discussions, doing small group work and giving presentations, whereas his other courses required him to heavily depend on his written literacy skills to learn the course material in order to complete course tasks.

Unlike Andrew and Tiffany, who took mostly required courses in their first year, Zack took elective courses as well as the introductory courses during his first year because he had enough time to take them and he thought they would be “easy”. The elective courses Zack took included two freshman seminars, which are intended to introduce first year students to academia and directly assist them in the academic socialization process. The seminars are small and include no more than 18 students in a class, which is very different from the large number of students typically enrolled in introductory level courses, which are the primary courses that most first year students take. The seminars are restricted to freshmen to allow them opportunities to participate in class discussions without competing with older and more academically experienced students. The seminars exemplify Lea and Street’s (2000) Academic Literacies Model, in that they place more emphasis on the students’ learning process rather than on the students’ final products. They are intended to introduce freshmen to new research on various topics and give them the opportunity to take courses from tenured professors.

Unlike the large amounts of academic reading required in other courses Zack took during his first year for the purpose of merely learning content, the freshmen seminars Zack took did not include large amounts of academic reading, which allowed students to read and formulate ideas about what the readings and then discuss their ideas in the
seminars. In essence, the students were being socialized into an academic discourse community by the knowledge creation that was taking place not only in their own readings of the text, but also in the discussions they were having with the other students in the seminar. The type of writing the students did for the course included response writing, which was another way in which they were being socialized into an academic discourse community. The tasks required that students not only discuss what they understood about the readings they did for the seminars, but also write about the thoughts and ideas they had, again, allowing them the opportunity to create their own knowledge about the topics they were reading about. Furthermore, students in the seminar were required to prepare for and lead one class discussion during the quarter. This experience positioned students in a different role with regard to knowledge holders in the classroom. 

In the introductory courses that most students take in their first year, the knowledge holder is the professor. The students listen, record and memorize the knowledge the professor delivers to them through the course lectures. On the other hand, in the freshman seminars, students are given the opportunity to be the knowledge holders in the class by leading one of the discussions, which represents the Academic Literacies Model, (Lea & Street, 2000) in that the course structure reverses the hierarchy of power that is present in most other courses students take in their first year at the university.

Unlike the other participants, Zack is the only participant who took a 500 level course in his first year: an elective rather than a required course for his declared minor area of study, film studies, rather than for his declared major area of study, pre-pharmacy. (At the university Zack attended, the higher numbered courses are typically taken during the junior or senior year.) During the interviews, Zack talked about how he was
apprehensive about taking such a high level course in his first year because of his unfamiliarity with the academic literacies at this level; however, he said he wanted to take it because of his interest in film studies. Because of Zack’s experience with the situatedness of academic literacies, he had an idea that academic literacies may be different in a higher level course than what they are in a lower level course, but he was uncertain what they would be like exactly. Nonetheless, he was willing to take a risk and find out what these were like because of his interest in the course topic. As will be seen in the discussion of the specific academic literacies genres and tasks in this course as well as the other courses he took during the study that are discussed in the following section, the academic literacies tasks in the 500 level course were not that much different from those in the lower level courses he took in his first year of university study.

**Zack’s Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks**

From the discussion of the research literature on academic literacies tasks in Chapter 2, we saw that while there are some similarities in academic literacies across academic contexts at the university, there is also variety, which further highlights the uniqueness of and within academic discourse communities. This was evident in the academic literacies tasks Zack encountered during his first year of university study which are listed and described in Table 4.6 below. In the table, Zack’s academic literacy practices are included in parentheses following the genres and tasks and are recorded according to what he reported doing to accomplish the tasks. Like Andrew, Zack’s academic reading genres in the courses he took were varied, and like Andrew and Tiffany, Zack’s academic writing genres and tasks were also varied, primarily because he took more writing and humanities courses during the study. The different genres and
tasks are listed according to the information recorded on the syllabi for the respective courses Zack took during the study. The tasks in the contexts Zack negotiated represent the Academic Literacies Model, as they include a variety of communicative practices as well as multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000) and situated literacies (Barton et al., 2000). These include the following:

**Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks - Zack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter Courses</th>
<th>Chemistry 123</th>
<th>English 110</th>
<th>Art History 260</th>
<th>Freshman Seminar 138.02 – World Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Reading Tasks</strong></td>
<td>Textbook (3-6 pp./wk); lab manual</td>
<td>Textbook, course pack readings (2-180 pp./wk); sample essays; handouts</td>
<td>Textbook (20-80 pp./wk)</td>
<td>Course book, course pack (5-45 pp./wk); handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Writing Tasks</strong></td>
<td>Lab reports (1 p.); course notes (18-24 pp./wk); lab procedures; quizzes (7); midterms (2); final (1); lab notebooks</td>
<td>Analytical summary, response essay (2 drafts; 3 pp.); comparative rhetorical analysis (2 drafts; 4 pp.); annotated bibliography, project proposal (2 drafts; 3 pp.); research project (2 drafts; 10 pp.)</td>
<td>Course notes (2-12 pp./wk); midterms (2); final (1)</td>
<td>Response essays (2-1p.); quizzes (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information literacy Tasks</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Primary, Secondary Source Searches</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Academic Literacies Genres and Tasks – Zack (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Literacy Tasks</th>
<th>PH Meter; stirring motors; centrifuge – learned how to use these</th>
<th>Word processing; films - viewed; online databases – searched for outside sources</th>
<th>Film Clips - viewed</th>
<th>PowerPoint – viewed for presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter Courses</td>
<td>Biology 113</td>
<td>Physics 111</td>
<td>Scandinavian Film 520</td>
<td>Freshman Seminar 137.12 – Psychology of the Simpsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reading Tasks</td>
<td>Textbook, lab manual (40-60 pp./wk) ; NYT articles (4)</td>
<td>Textbook (10-30 pp./wk)</td>
<td>New Yorker article (10 pp.); screenplays (30-100 pp./wk)</td>
<td>Edited book (15-35 pp./wk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Writing Tasks</td>
<td>Course notes; lab reports, lab practicals (1-2 pp./wk); NYT project (3 pp.); midterms (2); final (1)</td>
<td>Course notes (2-5 pp./wk); homework problems (9); lab responses; quizzes (7); midterm (1); final (1)</td>
<td>Course notes (2pp./wk); quizzes (8); midterm (1); final (1)</td>
<td>Written responses (10-1/2p.); final paper (3 1/2 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information literacy Tasks</td>
<td>Sources Searches</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Literacy Tasks</td>
<td>Light microscope; spectrophotometer – learned to use these; Excel – used to generate data spreadsheets</td>
<td>Computer program; motion sensor; force table – learned to use these; Internet – download course notes, answer keys</td>
<td>Films (8) - viewed</td>
<td>Sitcom episodes (1-2/wk) - viewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 4.6, the courses that Zack took required different academic literacies tasks, or communicative practices, as indicated by the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000). The courses also highlight similarities in academic literacies across academic contexts at the university as well as variety, which point to the uniqueness of and within academic discourse communities. Some of the courses Zack took included more heterogeneous academic literacies genres and tasks. For example, his skills-based (writing) course required that Zack read literature rather than academic essays and write various genres, such as a rhetorical analysis, annotated bibliography and research proposal, and complete other academic literacies tasks, such as a group presentation. The freshmen seminars required that he read edited books rather than textbooks and think about and discuss the ideas and arguments in these with others in the class as well as respond to the ideas and arguments in writing. They also required that he lead the class in a discussion of the readings at least one time during the quarter.

The other courses Zack took, such as his science courses, included more homogeneous genres and tasks, where Zack completed the same or similar types of tasks, such as reading the textbook, note taking, and completing homework problems, quizzes, midterms, and final exams. These courses included academic literacies tasks that primarily included large amounts of reading and are discussed in more detail in the sections that follow.
Reading Tasks. While there were other sources of reading, Table 4.6 shows that the textbook was the major genre assigned as reading in all but two of Zack’s courses. The primary purpose for reading was to develop a foundation of knowledge of the course topics Zack was studying at the time. The academic reading involved the previously cited list of textbook reading skills from Myers (1992). Overall, Zack reported doing a lot of reading for the majority of his courses, with the exception of his chemistry course, which he reported as not needing to read for because he had either already learned the material in high school or it seemed superfluous. With regard to this last point, he stated, “It wasn’t important to read the textbook because a lot of it was just repeating what the professor had gone over in the lecture” (From Z.4. March 30, 2006). Of the reading that he did do, the amount ranged from two to 180 pages per week in his skills-based course, 3-60 pages per week in his science courses, and 5-100 pages in his humanities courses. Like Andrew and Tiffany, Zack took First Year composition during the study. The academic reading genres Zack encountered in this course were different from what Andrew and Tiffany encountered in their First Year composition courses. The section of First Year composition Zack chose to take included readings from literature rather than academic readings, as was the case in the sections of First Year composition that Andrew and Tiffany chose to take. Consequently, Zack read a variety of literary genres, including plays, short stories and prose. The most common type of academic reading genres which Andrew and Tiffany read were journal articles. Moreover, this is a reason Zack was assigned more reading in this section than what Andrew and Tiffany were in their sections. Zack intentionally selected this course knowing there would be more reading
than if he had taken a section of English 110 that included only academic readings, such as journal articles, which seems to point to his comfort with academic literacies.

Unlike the large amounts of academic reading required in other courses Zack took during his first year for the purpose of merely learning content, the freshmen seminars Zack took did not include large amounts of academic reading, which allowed him to read and formulate ideas about the readings and then discuss his ideas in the seminars. Furthermore, the types of academic reading genres included in the seminars were edited books that included more than one writer’s view on a particular topic rather than textbooks that merely present common knowledge in the field. This allowed Zack the opportunity to read for different purposes than what he did when he read textbooks. With the readings in the seminars, Zack was not reading to gain knowledge about the topic but rather read critically in order to challenge the ideas and arguments in the text and discuss and write about them.
Writing Tasks. From Table 4.6, one can see that the most common writing genres were homework problems, course notes, quizzes, midterms and final exams, similar to Andrew and Tiffany, with the most common writing tasks being copying, which did not include critical thinking or the creation of new knowledge. These types of genres show a lack of writing in foundational courses in the first year of university study, which Jackson et al. (2006) found in their study of instructors of beginning undergraduate level science courses. The common academic writing genres that differed from Andrew and Tiffany’s experience were lab reports and response essays. As previously mentioned, Zack, like Andrew and Tiffany, took First Year composition during the study. The academic reading genres Zack encountered in this course were different from what they encountered in their First Year composition courses. Even so, the academic writing genres Zack encountered were more or less the same as what Andrew and Tiffany encountered. Likewise, the amount of writing Zack did for this course was roughly the same as what Andrew and Tiffany did for their First Year composition courses, which primarily consisted of analytical writing tasks, with the instructor being the primary audience and evaluator. The purpose of the writing tasks was to provide students with the opportunity to learn new academic writing genres in an attempt to socialize students into an academic discourse community. By contrast, the writing tasks in Zack’s science and humanities courses required him to demonstrate his understanding of and competence with the course content primarily with fill-in-the-blank, multiple choice and short answer activities. The primary writing task in these courses was copying information from overhead transparencies during course lectures in his chemistry, biology, physics, art history and Scandinavian film courses.
The biggest differences in academic literacies tasks for the case study participants in the First Year composition course were in the number of drafts written for each assignment, where Zack and Tiffany were assigned two drafts for each assignment, and Andrew was assigned three, as well as the amount of reading completed, where Zack was assigned a larger amount (2-180 pages per week) than Andrew (20-25 pages per week) and Tiffany (15-50 pages per week).

Zack also experienced different writing tasks in the freshman seminars he took compared to those in the First Year composition course. The type of writing he did for these courses included response writing, which was a way in which Zack was being socialized into an academic discourse community. The tasks required that Zack not only discuss what he understood about the readings he did for the seminars, but also write about the thoughts and ideas he had, again, allowing him the opportunity to create his own knowledge about the topics he was reading about. Furthermore, unlike in his First Year composition course where Zack was introduced to and practiced, to a limited degree, several different genres of academic writing, the freshman seminars included the same writing genre – response writing – and required that students write at least one per week, thus providing several opportunities to practice this rather than just one or two times as in other courses.
Information Literacy Tasks. Like Andrew and Tiffany, most of the academic contexts Zack negotiated during his first year of university study did not include information literacy tasks. Only two courses required students to carry out these tasks, as can be seen in Table 4.6, those being his First Year composition and biology courses. Even so, the types of information literacy tasks required in these courses varied greatly. In Zack’s biology course, the task was to find four articles from *The New York Times* related to the topic of biology, whereas in his English course, the information literacy task required Zack to find an unspecified amount of primary and secondary sources using the online library databases in order to write multiple drafts of an annotated bibliography, project proposal and 7 to 9 page research paper on one of two pre-chosen topics related to the construction of national identity or national memory. Zack reported having little difficulty with the more structured information literacy task; however, the unstructured one caused more difficulty for him. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Digital Literacy Tasks. Like Andrew and Tiffany, the types of digital literacy tasks Zack was assigned in the courses he took involved basic levels of knowledge of technology and included Word processing and searching the Internet. The tasks also involved alternative types of technology, such as watching films and sitcoms. The most advanced levels of digital literacy included using various types of lab equipment in his science courses, such as a centrifuge, PH meter, and light microscope, which Zack already knew how to use from his experience with them in high school.

Summary of Zack’s Academic Contexts

From the discussion of the academic contexts and tasks Zack encountered in his first year of university study, we can see that, like with Andrew and Tiffany, academic
reading, writing and digital literacy were a part of all the academic contexts he negotiated. Similar to Andrew, Zack encountered information literacy tasks in only two of the courses he took, his biology and First Year composition courses. Moreover, also as Andrew and Tiffany did, Zack encountered a lot more academic reading than writing in his first year. Despite this, he reported more of a variety of academic writing genres than reading genres. Another difference between Zack and the other participants is the elective courses he took during the first year, which are designed to give students a better sense of what is required to be a member of the academic discourse community. From taking these seminar courses, Zack gained more experience with and insight into the academic literacies practices within the academic community because of the knowledge creation he did not only in his writing for these seminars but also by discussing the readings with other students in the courses. Also, he was given the opportunity to be a knowledge holder by leading a class discussion on the readings. This experience with academic literacies juxtaposed with experiences with academic literacies in other courses clearly shows the situatedness of academic literacies among contexts and the need to understand how students like Zack negotiate the situatedness. Further discussion of Zack’s academic literacies, including his difficulties with and academic literacies practices, can be found in Chapter 5.

**Chapter Summary and Overview**

In this chapter, profiles of the three Generation 1.5 learners, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack, provided an in-depth look at the various academic contexts, genres and tasks they negotiated in their first year of university study. A summary of the findings shows there are similarities in academic literacies across academic contexts and with tasks, as well as
variety, which further highlights the uniqueness of and within academic discourse communities. Insight into how the case study participants in this study negotiated the worlds of academic literacies they encountered in their first year at the university can be seen not only in their familiarity with (exposure to and practice with) the different genres and tasks in the various academic contexts at the university, but also in the difficulties they encountered with academic literacies and the academic literacies practices they utilized to overcome these difficulties. The following chapter, the second chapter of results and data analysis, presents a comparison of the academic literacies difficulties and academic literacies practices of the case study participants across the academic contexts discussed in Chapter 4; it also presents sources of their academic literacies practices.
CHAPTER 5

ACADEMIC LITERACIES PRACTICES ACROSS CASES AND CONTEXTS

Introduction

Chapter 4 presented data relevant to the first research question, including profiles of the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study, the specific academic contexts they negotiated over two quarters of coursework in a range of fields and disciplines, and the tasks they were assigned within these contexts. This chapter examines the academic literacies practices of the case study participants, including the difficulties they encountered and the practices they utilized to complete and overcome difficulties with the tasks they were assigned within the contexts discussed in Chapter 4. It provides data relevant to the three other research questions which shaped this study and are as follows:

• What academic literacies difficulties did the Generation 1.5 learners in this study face in completing the academic literacies tasks they encountered in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

• What academic literacies practices did the Generation 1.5 learners utilize to overcome the academic literacies difficulties they encountered with academic literacies tasks in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

• What were the sources of academic literacies practices the Generation 1.5 learners utilized to assist them in navigating the various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

Discussion of the results is presented according to aspects of the theoretical
frame for this study, including multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000) and situated literacies (Barton et al., 2000), as well as models of academic literacies (Lea & Street, 2000) and characteristics of Generation 1.5 learners, and organized across cases and contexts. The importance of further examining the academic literacies experiences of the Generation 1.5 learners in this chapter is that it enables us to broaden our understanding of the participants’ academic literacies by examining their practices in juxtaposition with each other and how they negotiated the academic contexts in their first year of university study. Chapter 6 then presents and discusses answers to all the research questions that shaped this study and important characteristics of how the case study participants utilized the academic literacies practices discussed in Chapter 5 to negotiate the academic contexts they moved in and out of during the study.

**Academic Literacies: Multiple and Situated**

As presented in Chapter 2, the theoretical frame through which the academic literacies practices of the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study were viewed is based on the understanding that literacy is multiple and situated. This meaning is best reflected in two separate yet interconnected models of academic literacies – Academic Socialization and Academic Literacies (Lea & Street, 2000). The concept of academic socialization has been defined as the process learners go through to become an insider in communities that share the same language, behaviors and beliefs. The Academic Socialization Model of Lea and Street (2000), based on an ideological view of literacy, shows how students who are outsiders to academic discourse communities might become academically literate. By means of acculturation into the academic discourse of fairly homogenous academic cultures, students’ writing represents their understanding of these
communities and serves as one of several means of entrance into them. However, as Lea and Street (2000) argue, discourse communities in the academy are not necessarily homogenous; nor are students necessarily Tabula rasa, compliantly acculturating into these homogenous communities. They argue that academic discourse communities are contextual, hence making them, as well as the students’ academic literacies practices within them, heterogeneous. This view of academic literacies has resulted in the creation of another model of student academic literacies in higher education – the Academic Literacies Model (ALM), which is the primary lens through which the academic literacies practices of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study were viewed. The Academic Literacies Model, which is an incorporation and extension of the Academic Socialization Model, presents literacy as a social practice and literacy tasks as a variety of communicative practices (Lea & Street, 2000). More specifically, the ALM defines literacy as a social practice within various contexts where multiple literacies are present and the literacy tasks within these contexts as a variety of communicative practices. This model reveals an increased sensitivity to the students, especially their identities as academic writers, by shifting the focus from students’ academic literacy deficiencies to seeing the influence students’ experiences have on their academic literacies skills and how this helps in their identity development as academic writers. The use of the Academic Literacies Model in this chapter provides a theoretical frame with which to view the academic literacies practices, including the difficulties and practices the Generation 1.5 learners utilized to accomplish academic literacies tasks within the academic contexts discussed in Chapter 4.
Main Characteristics of the Participants

As presented in Chapter 4, the participants in this study - Andrew, Tiffany and Zack - were three Generation 1.5 learners enrolled in their first year of university study. They were identified as such based on common definitions of Generation 1.5 learners in the research literature (Harklau et al., 1999; Roberge, 2002), that is, a non-native speaker of English and U.S. resident educated in the American K-12 system prior to entering the university. Andrew, Tiffany and Zack came to the U.S. in their junior year of high school and graduated from a U.S. high school prior to their First Year of university study. None of them took ESL courses in high school, but rather were mainstreamed into English Language Arts courses. During the time of the study, all three participants were in their first year of university study. All three participants had some level of literacy in their first language; Tiffany and Zack had some literacy in other languages as well, although they were not completely literate in any of these languages. In their first year of university study, Andrew and Tiffany placed into ESL composition courses; Zack placed into the first course of First Year composition. In general, Generation 1.5 learners are seemingly different from L1 learners because of their unique literacies backgrounds, which was the case with Andrew, Tiffany and Zack, and are different from traditional ESL learners because “They are not learning the language; they are learning to use a particular variety of the language in a particular way” (Leki, 1992, p. 34). Accordingly, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack’s unique educational and literacies backgrounds and the particular way in which they learned and used English may direct how they negotiated and used academic literacies in their first year of university study, which was the impetus for this study. The following pages include a discussion of the academic literacies
difficulties, academic literacies practices, and sources of academic literacies practices of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study as they negotiated various academic contexts in their first year of university study.

**Academic Literacies Difficulties, Practices, and Sources of Academic Literacies Practices of Generation 1.5 Learners**

As discussed in Chapter 2, the most common difficulties that Generation 1.5 learners have with academic literacies include the following: many are inexperienced readers to begin with, so they have a lack of experience with reading in English (Blanton, 2005; Reid, 1997); lack of experience with extensive academic reading (Roberge, 2002); lexicon (Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Lowry, 1999; Reid, 1997; Santos, 2004); managing large amounts of academic reading (Blanton, 1999); and understanding academic writing (Blanton, 1999). Moreover, many find academic writing to be challenging because of a lack of experience with writing and academic genres (Blanton, 2005; Harklau, 1998; Johns, 1999; Reid, 1997; Roberge, 2002); sentence level problems such as syntax, grammar and punctuation (Reid, 1997; Thonus, 2003); language fossilization (Frodesen & Starna, 1999); limited practices for responding to instructors’ feedback (Ferris, 1999; Harklau, 2003); lexicon (Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Rodby, 1999); lack of a meta-language of grammar (Ferris, 1999); and plagiarism (Wolfe-Quintero & Segade, 1999).

In addition to academic literacies difficulties, previous studies have documented the learning practices Generation 1.5 learners engage in. Prior schooling in U.S. K-12 schools provides these students with an understanding of how the American school system works and an exposure to the language and culture that traditional ESL students typically do not have. As a consequence, Generation 1.5 learners are often found to be
more orally proficient than their counterparts and to possess a better understanding of the American culture. According to Reid (1997), Generation 1.5 learners possess learning practices based on their language and educational backgrounds, and have been identified as ear learners, that is, they learn English through oral input and trial and error and are typically more orally fluent than traditional ESL learners. Experience in U.S. K-12 schools also provides these students with the opportunity to develop their academic literacies by becoming familiar with practices associated with process writing and the academic essay, especially the five paragraph essay. This provides Generation 1.5 learners with some level of knowledge and familiarity with the writing system in English on which to build when they get to college.

In regards to sources of academic literacies practices, the research literature spotlights the instructor as the greatest source of academic literacies practices for learners in addition to academic difficulties and practices. For example, in her study of how the writing of twenty L1 students developed over four years of undergraduate study, Carroll (2002) found that the instructors were a source of academic literacies practices for the participants. She reported that many of the students worked closely with their instructors, particularly on revising their writing. Leki (2003a) also found something similar to what Carroll (2002) did in her multiple case study of ESL undergraduate learners over their four years at the university. She described the academic literacies practices the participants’ instructors provided to them as follows: “…when writing for writing’s sake was assigned, the disciplinary instructors typically provided quite detailed instructions for completing these assignments and thereby did, in that sense, model elements of disciplinary discourse, perhaps most notably what the discipline values in its discourse”
The source of academic literacies practices the participants discussed most frequently during the interviews was their course instructors.

Table 5.1 is a compilation of the difficulties, practices, and sources of academic reading, writing and information literacy the Generation 1.5 learners in this study most frequently discussed encountering as they negotiated various academic contexts in their first year of university study. Although digital literacy was a part of all the academic contexts the participants negotiated during the study, the difficulties with this type of literacy were minimal and largely used to retrieve information; therefore, digital literacy was excluded from the discussion of the results in this chapter. The numbers in the tables represent the frequency counts of the codes used to analyze the participants’ discussion of their academic literacies difficulties from 32 interview transcripts. Highest frequency counts are included in the data sets as a representation of what was most difficult for the participants with regard to academic literacies. Numbers not included on a line or in a column in the table means that the participant(s) did not discuss the code in the interview transcripts. (A list of all codes and frequencies of all academic literacies difficulties can be found in Appendix D) Individual tables of academic literacies difficulties, practices, and sources of academic literacies practices are discussed in the sections following this table.

**Frequency Counts of Academic Literacies Difficulties, Practices, and Sources of Academic Literacies Practices of Three Generation 1.5 Learners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Reading Difficulties</th>
<th>Andrew</th>
<th>Tiffany</th>
<th>Zack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Frequency Counts of Difficulties, Practices, and Sources of Academic Literacies Practices of Three Generation 1.5 Learners (Continued)
The following sections include detailed discussion of the contents of Table 5.1 and include the following: First, the academic literacies difficulties of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack; second, their practices for completing tasks and overcoming difficulties with academic literacies; and third, the sources of academic literacies practices they utilized.
while negotiating various academic contexts. The discussion begins with academic reading, followed by academic writing then information literacy.

**Academic Reading: Contexts, Difficulties and Practices**

The first type of academic literacies to be discussed is academic reading, that is, reading in various fields and disciplines in a university context, contained in textbooks, course packs and lab manuals. The results of the study show that there were several academic contexts in which two of the three participants had difficulties with and utilized academic literacies practices to complete academic reading tasks and overcome difficulties with these. Andrew and Tiffany were the only participants who reported having difficulties with the academic reading; Zack had no reported difficulties with academic reading. The contexts in which Andrew and Tiffany had academic reading difficulties included their First Year composition course. Andrew also had difficulties with academic reading in his chemistry, math, biology and economics courses; Tiffany had difficulties in her two Japanese literature courses. The only course Andrew and Tiffany had no reported difficulties with academic reading was their Computer Science and Engineering course. Surprisingly, Tiffany reported having no difficulties with academic reading in her math, economics and statistics courses. With regard to academic literacies practices, only Andrew and Tiffany discussed utilizing these to help them overcome difficulties and to complete academic reading tasks in these contexts. Specific difficulties and practices of academic reading across the cases within these contexts are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.
Academic Reading Difficulties

According to the research literature, the most common difficulties that Generation 1.5 learners have with academic reading includes lack of experience with reading in English (Blanton, 2005; Reid, 1997); with extensive academic reading (Roberge, 2002); lexicon (Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Lowry, 1999; Reid, 1997; Santos, 2004); with managing large amounts of academic reading (Blanton, 1999); and with understanding academic writing (Blanton, 1999). As the Generation 1.5 learners in this study negotiated various academic contexts, Andrew and Tiffany reported difficulty with lexicon in academic reading tasks (15, 11 respectively); Zack indicated no difficulties.

Andrew and Tiffany’s difficulties with lexicon cut across the curriculum and various types of academic literacies tasks. The interview segments that follow highlight Andrew’s difficulties with lexicon in his chemistry, First Year composition, and economics courses, and Tiffany’s difficulties with lexicon in her First Year composition and two Japanese literature courses. Andrew and Tiffany’s difficulties with lexicon were also tied to the purpose of various academic literacies tasks within these contexts. For example, in their First Year composition course, the purpose of reading was to complete various academic writing tasks; in introductory courses, such as Andrew’s biology course, the purpose of reading was to learn the course content and demonstrate learning through assessment; and in humanities courses, such as Tiffany’s Japanese literature courses, the purpose of reading was to understand the material so as to discuss and write about the ideas in it. In the following discussion, we can see how Andrew and Tiffany’s difficulties with lexicon inhibited their performance on academic literacies tasks such as reading-to-write and reading-for-assessment.
Lexicon Difficulties – Reading to Write

Andrew’s difficulty with lexicon was evidenced in his inability to read-to-write for his chemistry and First Year composition course. As a result, he was unable to effectively use the course readings to complete assigned writing tasks. For example, he had difficulties with the lexicon used in questions he was to answer to complete his lab reports for his chemistry course, as can be seen in this interview segment:

34:34  C: When you say you have difficulties understanding the questions, is it the language or the concept of knowledge that the question is trying to get at?

34:56  A: I think both. Like here. The word “excess”. I thought it means left over, but it really means not enough left over, so I didn’t know what to do [to complete the lab report].… (From A.2. January 25, 2006)

Not being able to understand the precise discipline-specific meaning of the lexicon for his chemistry course interfered with Andrew’s completion of his lab report. Difficulties such as this with Generation 1.5 learners have been reported in the literature (Santos, 2004) and show that they may possess breadth in their lexicon because of their exposure to the language, having been in a U.S. K-12 setting; however, because of limited time and/or exposure to the language, there is not a lot of depth to their lexicon, particularly what they are exposed to in their first year of university study. Consequently, Generation 1.5 learners run into problems like what Andrew did with understanding other meanings of the lexicon, particularly academic meanings, to complete academic literacies tasks.

In addition to struggling with developing depth to his academic lexicon, Andrew also struggled to understand the content-specific lexicon, a characteristic which is not
limited only to Generation 1.5 learners. Many students at all educational levels who are new to an academic discourse community struggle to learn the lexicon of the community and incorporate it into their existing lexicon. As a case in point, Andrew discussed having difficulties with translating the lexicon in word problems in his math homework from words to equations. In one interview he pointed out, “…like I can understand the word part and the meaning, but the hard part is change it from words to math equations. So like changing from words to equations to calculate what they are saying [in order to complete the homework assignment].” (From A.3.13:52 February 13, 2006). As a consequence, the difficulties Andrew had with content-specific lexicon interfered with his completion of the academic literacies task.

Lexicon difficulties for Andrew were also apparent in the readings he did to complete a series of mini-papers for his First Year composition course, where students completed assigned readings and then produced a short essay based on their reading and understanding of it. The purpose of this task was to help students prepare for class discussions, practice using analytical concepts and techniques, think critically about writing and reading habits, record thinking done during the class about the reading and writing, and provide source material for use in other course assignments (taken from the English 110 course syllabus, Winter 2006). The expectation was that students would produce academic writing in these mini essays, which included a strong thesis or primary argument, good use of evidence and citation, effective organization practices and thorough editing. Students were given seven opportunities to write a mini essay; however, they only had to complete five out of the seven of them, with the first mini essay being mandatory, but which Andrew did not complete. Consequently, his
instructor required that he complete the second one, which he did on Marianne Hirsch’s “Reframing the Human Family Romance.” Andrew’s main difficulty in completing this assignment was understanding the reading, specifically the lexicon and the sentence structure, in order to write the mini essay, as can be seen in the following interview segment:

7:22 A: … mostly I can read it [assigned course reading], but I don’t get what trying to say…Probably too academic for me.

7:59 C: What do you mean by too academic?

8:02 A: Like the word, the word of choice they use, just some big word and the way they write the sentence. It take like times to understand it. Their, they way they use example and connect their ideas are different from a normal essay, so …

(From A.2. January 25, 2006)

According to Andrew, he could read the text but not understand what he was reading not only because of the lexicon but also because of what appeared to be an incoherent style of writing (see Blanton, 1999). He recognized that because of his difficulty with the reading, it took a lot of time to do it, which was not something he seemed to want to do since, as he previously pointed out in Chapter 4, he was not “a big fan of reading”, and is characteristic of many Generation 1.5 learners (see Blanton, 2005). As a result of the difficulties Andrew had with the lexicon in the assigned reading, he was unable to effectively use the course readings to support the arguments in his writing, which weakened his writing. For example, in mini essay #2, students were asked to write about the overall form and organization of Hirsch’s essay and the relationship between its parts.
Students were encouraged to cite from it, but cautioned about doing this in excess. Andrew incorporated one direct quotation from the original source. As discussed in the previous interview segment, Andrew struggled with the lexicon he encountered when reading this essay. A strategy he utilized to overcome this difficulty was to use the part of the text that he understood, that is, he incorporated only the parts of the text that were comprehensible to him, while ignoring the parts that were not. However, this was not an effective strategy. In discussing the main point of the essay, he included the term ethnography along with a definition of it. However, his instructor asked why certain words were used in the definition and what the author meant by them in connection with one of the larger themes of the text. This illustrates the gaps in understanding Andrew experienced because of his limited lexicon and how this interfered with his ability to demonstrate his understanding of the text in his writing.

Like Andrew, Tiffany also faced the difficulty of understanding the academic lexicon in the assigned readings for her courses in order to use them in her writing. In the interview segment below, Tiffany discusses the difficulties she had with the lexicon in the article “Ethnicity: Identity & Difference” by Stewart Hall that students were asked to read and write a rhetorical analysis of. This included comprehending the text in order to summarize and analyze it as well as integrating direct quotations to support the analysis (taken from the English 110 course syllabus for Spring Quarter, 2006). Some may think that because Generation 1.5 learners have lived longer in the U.S. and have, in theory, had more opportunities to acculturate into an academic discourse community, they possess the schema necessary for understanding academic texts (Brickman & Nuzzo, 1999). While this may be true with some Generation 1.5 learners, it is not necessarily
true with all of them. The difficulties Tiffany faced while reading the assigned article and writing a rhetorical analysis of it were that she neither had the background knowledge about the topic necessary to help her understand the content of the article nor did she identify with the content of the text from a sociologist’s perspective. As a consequence, Tiffany reported that it took her about 10 hours to complete the rhetorical analysis. Her discussion of the struggles she had with the lexicon she encountered in the article is highlighted in the interview segment here:

50:30  C: You keep saying that it was difficult to understand. Why was that?

50:35  T: Why was that? The author who wrote the article was a sociologist. At first when I didn’t understand the article, I went to my friend and she asked if this was a sociology class. I’m like no, it’s an English class, so I think the article tend more to the sociology part and what the author thinks identity is based on the sociology view, so I thought it was really hard to understand. The tone and the terms he was using. Like he talked about Karl Marx and how his opinion relates to identity. I’m like okay, he’s the person who came up with Communism. That’s all I know. Like I understood every single word, but I don’t understand what he was talking about. Like I read it and I read it and I’m like Oh my god, I’m dying. But every single word I could understand what he is trying to say. (From T.6. April 28, 2006)

Tiffany recognized and pointed out what she did understand, which included content (e.g., Karl Marx was the person who came up with Communism) and lexicon, that is, every single word, but was frustrated by the fact that despite her understanding of the word and sentence, it was not enough to help her understand the entire text. And as evidenced in the interview transcript, this caused great frustration for her. She could not understand why it was that she could understand every single word but not understand the
Like with Andrew and as previously pointed out, Tiffany’s difficulty in comprehending the article interfered with her ability to complete the academic writing task, which highlights the importance of the reading-writing connection (Hirvela, 2004) and makes the point that academic writing difficulties of Generation 1.5 learners may be more reading related than writing related. In addition to the difficulty of reading-to-write, Andrew and Tiffany also struggled with the academic lexicon when reading-for-assessment, which is discussed in the next section.

Lexicon Difficulties – Reading for Assessment

In addition to lexicon impeding Andrew and Tiffany’s ability to complete academic writing tasks, it also impeded their ability to perform well on course assessments. For example, Andrew’s struggle with remembering the lexicon in the reading for his biology class affected his performance on the multiple choice quizzes over *The New York Times* articles, the lecture material, and information in the required readings in the textbooks, as shown in the following interview extract:

22:26 C: Let’s talk about your biology class. How many quizzes have you had?

22:38 A: Three

22:44 C: How did you do?

22:46 A: Real bad

22:47 C: Why?

22:50 A: I don’t know, ‘cause there’s a thing on there that didn’t even go on the lecture. You have to do the reading real good to understand it, so I don’t remember all that.
C: Did you do the reading?

A: I did, but I don’t remember everything. There are a lot of new words in biology. (From A.5. April 21, 2006)

From this we can see that Andrew struggled remembering the biology lexicon included on the course quizzes, which he reportedly did not do well on. In the interview he did not quantify the words he needed to learn; however, he did state that he had to do the reading well in order to successfully complete the quizzes but was not able to because of all the new words, which leads one to believe that there were a lot that he did not know. Most students new to an academic discourse community struggle to learn and remember the lexicon of the community; in this case, Andrew was struggling with learning and remembering the lexicon indicative to biology in order to complete the weekly quizzes. Hence, Andrew’s struggle with remembering the biology lexicon is more indicative of first year university undergraduate students rather than Generation 1.5 learners.

Furthermore, in Andrew’s economics course, difficulties with the lexicon also impeded his ability to successfully complete course assessments, in this case a multiple choice midterm:

C: What were the problems that you had [on the midterm]?

A: Trying to understand the terms like elasticity. First of all, those econ words, I didn’t really understand it, and you have to have an economist’s thinking. We have to relate it to some subjects too. To some real world experience, example, whatever. (From A.6. May 10, 2006)
From this interview segment we can see that Andrew not only recognized the difficulties he had with understanding the lexicon on the midterm but also realized that in order to understand it, he had to think like an expert in the field by applying the lexicon to real-world economic situations. While discussing this problem, Andrew realized there was more to the difficulties he experienced with the midterm in this academic context than just knowing the lexicon; it was that he did not yet possess the body of foundational knowledge that experts in the field do, which is often a difficulty for students in their first year of university courses. Andrew’s realization of this is significant in that it shows his emerging understanding of academic literacies within the context of his economics course and what it takes to be socialized into this academic discourse community (Lea & Street, 2000). This is of particular importance because, as previously highlighted in Chapter 4, Andrew’s chosen major was business, so learning the conventions of academic literacies within this discourse community was important to his success.

Like Andrew, Tiffany faced difficulties with academic lexicon not only in her ability to complete academic writing tasks, but also in her ability to perform well on course assessments. For example, she struggled with the lexicon for weekly vocabulary quizzes for her advanced ESL composition course, as can be seen in this interview segment:

14:26 T: …the chapter that we are doing right now is really hard. Up to this point, the vocabulary in this chapter is the hardest.

14:40 C: Why?
The lexicon assigned in the advanced ESL composition course Tiffany was taking was very difficult because she was encountering some of the words for the first time in her study of English. As can be seen in the interview transcript above, her frustration with learning these new words was not only that she did not understand them, but that even the native speakers she asked did not know what the words were. This reveals Tiffany’s assumption about the lexical knowledge that native English speakers should have and how this assumption was challenged by the difficulty she faced learning the lexicon for her advanced ESL composition course. If Tiffany, being identified by the university as an ESL learner because of her placement into the ESL Composition Program, was learning lexicon that native English speakers, who were not taking ESL or similar courses in which lexicon was taught, did not understand, what did this say to her about the nature of academic literacies and who she perceived as sources of academic literacies practices? Tiffany viewed native English speakers as sources of academic literacies practices she could access to help her learn the lexicon for her advanced ESL composition course. However, she discovered in this instance that she could not. Although she did not
explicitly talk about this in the interviews, her discussion of how her “American friends”
did not understand the words revealed the tension Tiffany was living in while being a
non-native speaker who did not understand lexicon that native speakers did not
understand and how she could not necessarily depend on them as sources of academic
literacies practices to help her with learning lexicon. What Tiffany failed to realize in
this situation is that with regard to learning academic English, her native speaking friends
were much like her. They were users of the language, like Generation 1.5 learners (Leki,
1992), learning to use the language in a particular way, that is, academically. In this
regard, there does not seem to be such a clear distinction between Generation 1.5 and L1
learners as what is often presented in the literature.

**Lexicon Difficulties – Reading to Comprehend**

Both Andrew and Tiffany faced difficulties with academic lexicon when reading-
to-write and when reading-for-assessment. However, Tiffany discussed facing one
additional lexicon difficulty than what Andrew did, that is, reading-to-comprehend. Her
difficulty with academic lexicon in order to read-to-comprehend was seen primarily in
her two Japanese literature courses. The following segments from two interviews
highlight Tiffany’s specific difficulties with lexicon in her Japanese literature courses.
Below she discusses the difficulties she had with the lexicon in the readings in English on
Japanese geography, prehistory, language, religion and literature she did for her course
on *Japanese Literature in Translation*:
2:12 T: …we read about Japanese culture the first week and like the geography of Japan. …the difficulties I found was the vocabularies. (From T.2. January 20, 2006)

Here we can see the struggle she experienced with the lexicon was content-specific, which is similar to the struggle that Andrew had with the content-specific lexicon for his math and biology courses.

In the following interview segment, Tiffany discusses difficulties she had with other reading she did for the same course, only later in the quarter, and how the lexical difficulties were genre-specific rather than content-specific.

18:23 T: We started a new reading. It’s still in the Genji book, but it’s the Tale of Haykay. I thought it was a lot harder to understand the story than what we read in the Tale of Genji because the Tale of Genji is like a story type of book. But then the Tale of Haykay is like a historical type of fact, so most of the words are like historical words, so that took me a while to understand. But I still didn’t understand the whole thing. (From T.4. March 31, 2006)

Here Tiffany emphasized that genre-specific lexicon was the reason she had difficulties with reading the novels for her course on Japanese Literature in Translation. According to her, one of the books she read was a narrative; the other book was historical fiction, and in her reading, the difficulties she faced were with the historical lexicon. From these interview segments we can see that not only did Tiffany face difficulties with the content-specific lexicon, but she also faced them with the genre-specific lexicon.
Summary of Academic Reading Difficulties

In summary, the most frequent academic reading difficulty that Andrew and Tiffany discussed facing with academic reading tasks was lexicon, which inhibited their abilities to read-to-write and read-for-assessment purposes. They had quite a bit of difficulty with the lexicon in their First Year composition course, and this interfered with their ability to comprehend the course material to complete academic writing tasks for the course. They also had difficulties with lexicon that was included in course assessments. Tiffany also had difficulties with the lexicon in her Japanese literature courses, which interfered with her ability to understand the course readings. In contrast to Andrew and Tiffany, Zack did not discuss having any difficulties with academic reading.

Andrew and Tiffany’s difficulties with lexicon may be a result of the lack of reading they did in English in their U.S. K-12 schooling experience. It may also be a result of the lack of reading they did in their first year at university. As discussed in Chapter 4, although quite a bit of reading was assigned in the classes Andrew took during the course of the study, he did very little of it because of difficulties with the lexicon and the content of it being almost the same as the lecture notes, so he found little motivation to do the assigned readings. Although Tiffany did quite a bit of reading for her Japanese courses, she did relatively little reading in any of the other courses she was taking at the time of the study. This was not because the instructors were not assigning any reading; it was more because Tiffany, like Andrew, found that she did not need to read. She could gain the knowledge and information she needed from the class notes and/or homework assignments she did for the class; Zack found this to be true as well. Consequently, Andrew and Tiffany especially were not exposed to as much vocabulary as they could
have been had they taken the time to read, which, according to the research, is a liability because of the correlation between reading and vocabulary size (see Parry, 1991). For Zack, who reported no difficulties with academic reading, this seemed to be of no real consequence. However, for Andrew and Tiffany, who frequently reported struggling with lexicon, this could have negative results on the development of their lexicon and be the reason they struggled with it so much.

The next section of this chapter discusses the practices the participants used to help them complete academic reading tasks and overcome difficulties they had with them as they negotiated various academic contexts.

**Academic Reading Practices**

With respect to completing academic reading tasks and overcoming any difficulties they faced with them as they negotiated the academic contexts they moved in and out of during the study, only Andrew and Tiffany discussed utilizing any academic reading practices. The most frequently discussed academic reading practice they identified was lexicon (Andrew 2, Tiffany 15, and Zack 0).

**Lexicon Practices**

As can be seen, Andrew and Tiffany were the only participants who reported using an academic reading practice. However, from the reported frequencies, it can be seen that Andrew and Zack did not discuss as many academic reading practices as Tiffany did in the interviews. The following interview segment represents one of the few times Andrew discussed using a lexical practice to help him complete an academic literacies task. Here he talks about the use of the dictionary to help his reading of the outside sources he chose to incorporate into his research paper for his First Year
composition course:

35:39 C: …Were there other difficulties [with reading the outside sources], like with language?
35:59 A: Yeah, ‘cause they used a lot of big words in there [outside sources].
36:01 C: So the vocabulary…?

While including Andrew’s discussion of using the dictionary above may seem insignificant and commonplace, the fact is that this was the only lexical practice and one of only two times throughout the interviews he discussed using lexical practices to complete academic reading tasks during the study. With Andrew this was particularly surprising based on his beliefs about academic literacies. As discussed in Chapter 4, Andrew pointed out that increasing one’s lexicon improves one’s writing, so it appears he understood the connection between lexicon and writing; however, he seems to have failed to see the connection between reading, vocabulary and writing. Surprisingly, one of the most frequent difficulties Andrew discussed having with the academic reading tasks during the study was with academic lexicon and yet, as evidenced in the table above, he did not seem to have (m)any practices to help him overcome this difficulty. The reason he had difficulties with academic reading may have been because of his lack of academic reading practices. Moreover, his lack of academic reading practices may have been because of the fact that he did very little reading. As previously mentioned, Andrew
found the reading assigned for his introductory courses to be redundant in comparison with the content of the course lectures, so he saw no apparent reason to do the reading. Consequently, he was not developing his academic reading and seeing how academic reading, vocabulary and writing were connected.

Like Andrew, the academic reading practice category most frequently discussed by Tiffany was lexical practices; however, unlike Andrew, Tiffany discussed a variety of these practices in the interviews. In the following segment we can see the specific lexical practices Tiffany used to overcome her difficulty with the lexicon in the readings on Japanese geography, prehistory, language, religion and literature for her course on

*Japanese Literature in Translation:*

2:12 T: …we read about Japanese culture the first week and like the geography of Japan. ...the difficulties I found was the vocabularies. ...what I did was, I wasn’t trying to look everything up, but I tried to look up, like, the important words from the dictionary. That’s why you can find, like, Chinese writing in the book, actually. Yeah, that’s what I did.

2:42 C: How did you determine what the important words were?

2:45 T: …like, if you can’t understand what that word is, you won’t be able to understand whole sentences.

2:54 C: What kind of dictionary did you use? Was it a translator?

2:57 T: I used a [an electronic] translator and online dictionary.

3:01 C: Can you tell me a little bit about the online dictionary?

From this interview segment we can see several types of practices that Tiffany used to help her complete the academic reading tasks for one of her Japanese literature courses: the use of an online dictionary, the use of her L1, the use of margin notes, the ability to identify the most important words in a sentence, and the use of an electronic translator. This clearly exemplifies the large repertoire of lexical practices Tiffany possessed, especially in comparison to that of Andrew.

In the following interview segment, Tiffany discusses another reading practice, guessing the meaning from context, which she utilized when she did not have enough time to complete the assigned Japanese literature reading again for her *Japanese Literature in Translation* course:

43:14  C:  Any particular difficulties with the reading from the course pack?

43:23  T:  I didn’t have time to finish reading that. Like I didn’t finish on time, but I finished it afterwards. Normally I look up the words I don’t understand in the dictionary, but after you read so much, you kinda guess the meaning, so I stopped doing that. That makes it a lot faster for me to finish my work. (From T.3. February 17, 2006)

From what she discussed here, we not only see the use of another practice, but also the effectiveness of it, which is something she did not explicitly mention with the other practices she discussed in the interviews. About two thirds of the way through Winter Quarter, Tiffany realized that the lexical practice she had been using, using the dictionary, was ineffective. She found that looking up every word in the dictionary took a lot of time for her to complete all the reading she had to do for her courses, particularly
this Japanese course, where there was quite a bit of reading assigned each week.
Consequently, she substituted the strategy of guessing the meaning of unknown words in
their contexts and found this made completing the academic reading tasks more efficient.

In this next segment, we see an instance where Tiffany had difficulties with the
lexicon assigned for weekly quizzes in her advanced ESL composition course and
discussed the utilization of yet another practice which she used before and chose to use
again because it effectively helped her learn unknown words.

37:37  C:  What was so difficult about [vocabulary] quiz 5 and 6?
37:41  T:  Vocabulary that was hard to remember.
37:44  C:  Why?
37:45  T:  …when I first started to learn English, people always a-p-p-l-e, apple, apple,
apple, like that. But for me, it was more the pronunciation than just memorizing
the alphabet. So I was trying to sound it [the word] out. So that’s easier to
understand, and it takes less time too. (From T.4. March 31, 2006)

As can be seen here, Tiffany had difficulty remembering the vocabulary for her advanced
ESL composition course, much like what Andrew faced with learning the vocabulary for
his biology course. However, unlike Andrew, Tiffany had a practice she used to help her
remember this lexicon. From Tiffany’s previous experience with learning vocabulary,
she discovered that emphasizing pronunciation, or what Ong (1982) refers to as oral
memorization, was an effective practice for learning it. Consequently, she applied this
experience to learning the lexicon for her advanced ESL composition course. However,
Tiffany found this strategy did not work as well with the academic literacy task in her advanced ESL composition course as it did with previous tasks because of the difficulty she had with pronunciation. In the same interview she stated, “It was hard [learning the lexicon] because some of the words were really hard to pronounce” (From T.4.37:45 March 31, 2006). She found from trial and error across academic contexts that this practice did not work.

As a summary of Tiffany’s experience with academic reading difficulties and practices, in the interview segment from our final interview, Tiffany reflected on the difficulties she had with lexicon and the practices she used to overcome these difficulties. In the end, she realized how she was able to turn a learning deficiency into a learning strength (and even a learning practice).

37:40  C:  Any other reading weaknesses that you thought you had prior to starting the study?

37:46  T:  The difficulty of understanding some hard vocabulary. Since it’s literature, there a lot of hard vocabulary in the books we read. Like I said, if I have time, I always go back to the dictionary and find out the word. But sometimes when you read so much, you’re like, okay, I think this is what it meant, even though there’s one word you don’t understand or you don’t understand the sentence. You can still understand the whole story, what event. I think that’s my strength. You know, like guessing the word. Like you turn your weakness into a strength. (From T.8. June 6, 2006)

**Summary of Academic Reading Practices**

With regard to practices of academic reading, Andrew and Tiffany discussed utilizing what they had available to help them overcome difficulties with academic
reading or to complete academic reading tasks: various lexical practices. In comparison to what Andrew and Zack reported, Tiffany had a large repertoire of lexical practices that included the use of a dictionary, the use of her L1, the use of margin notes, the use of an electronic translator, guessing meaning from context, and pronunciation. Her large repertoire of lexical practices seems to have come as a result of the difficulties she had with academic reading tasks and how she utilized these academic reading difficulties to develop academic reading practices. In contrast, Andrew did not discuss as many academic reading practices as Tiffany. Zack did not discuss any at all. This may be because, as reported in the literature, female ESL learners discuss using language learning practices more frequently than males (see Green & Oxford, 1995). It may also be because the few practices Andrew possessed were effective, so he saw no need to develop others. It could also be that he had not been exposed to as many practices as Tiffany had been. Or it may be that he had not had sufficient time to assimilate new practices into his existing repertoire. Whatever the case may be, Andrew did not discuss his practices of academic reading as frequently as Tiffany did in the interviews.

In the next section of this chapter a second type of academic literacies is discussed - academic writing, which includes various genres of writing across numerous fields and disciplines in a university context, such as summaries, comparison/contrast essays, and research papers.

**Academic Writing: Contexts, Difficulties and Practices**

According to the literature, many Generation 1.5 learners find academic writing to be challenging because of a lack of experience with writing and academic genres (Harklau et al., 1999). The results of this study show that there were some specific
academic contexts in which all three participants had difficulties and utilized academic literacies practices to address these difficulties. Andrew, Tiffany and Zack had difficulties with the academic writing in their First Year composition course; Tiffany also had difficulties with the academic writing in her Japanese literature courses. Surprisingly, these were the only contexts the participants discussed having difficulties with the academic writing tasks, despite the fact they took other courses during the study which also included academic writing tasks. Reasons for this are related to how academic writing was constructed within specific academic contexts. For example, within the First Year composition course, one criterion of writing evaluation was the students’ grammar. Moreover, difficulties that Andrew, Tiffany and Zack faced in certain academic contexts, like First Year composition, also seem to be based on the following: 1) they lacked the skills needed to complete the academic writing tasks; 2) the genres of academic writing were different from what they had yet encountered in learning academic English; and 3) the readings that were the basis for the academic writing tasks presented difficulties that impeded their ability to write. These, along with specific difficulties and practices of academic writing across the cases within these contexts, are discussed in the pages that follow.

**Academic Writing Difficulties**

Unlike the category of academic reading difficulties, where both Andrew and Tiffany faced the same type of difficulty, with academic writing difficulties, they faced completely different ones, as can be seen in Table 5.2 below. Zack did not report any difficulties with academic writing. The diversity in their academic writing difficulties speaks to the uniqueness of these learners, which is also reflected in the literature on the
writing difficulties of Generation 1.5 learners (see Harklau et al., 1999; Roberge et al., in preparation). The highest frequency counts of the participants’ discussion of academic literacies difficulties were included in the data sets as representations of what were most difficult for the participants in regards to academic writing during the study. As can be seen in Table 10 below, the most frequently discussed difficulties were different for each participant and included, for Andrew, grammar and expression and for Tiffany and Zack, a lack of writing ability to develop content in their essays.

**Frequency Counts of Academic Writing Difficulties of Three Generation 1.5 Learners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Andrew</th>
<th>Tiffany</th>
<th>Zack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Expression</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.2 Frequency Counts of Academic Writing Difficulties of Three Generation 1.5 Learners**

**Grammar Difficulties in Writing**

The most frequently discussed difficulty for Andrew regarding his academic writing for his First Year composition course was problems with grammar in most of the academic writing tasks he did for the course. In the interview segment below, Andrew discusses the feedback he received from his instructor on the mini essays he did for his First Year composition course. He stated:

9:53 A ...I didn’t read all the comments here, but I think she wants me to work on the grammars...(From A.3. February 13, 2006)
A little later in the same interview we returned to discussing the mini essays for Andrew’s First Year composition course. In this discussion he pointed out the difficulty he had with writing was grammar:

16:04 C: I forgot to ask you about the difficulties that you had in regards to [writing the mini essays].

Writing Development

Unlike Andrew, the most frequently discussed academic writing difficulty Tiffany and Zack faced in their academic writing was not grammar but the development of their essays in their First Year composition and Japanese literature courses, Tiffany much more than Zack. In the following interview segment, Tiffany discussed this difficulty in connection with a short essay she wrote for one of her Japanese literature courses. Students were given the option to choose a topic they wished to write on; Tiffany wrote a comparison/contrast paper on different types of heroes in the readings they did for the course. Below, Tiffany points out the difficulty she had in writing the introduction for the paper:

21:32 C: What difficulties did you have in writing this?
21:35 T: The length of the paper.
21:38 C: Can you say more about that?

21:40 T: The introduction was really short. (From T.4. March 31, 2006)

________________________________________________________________________

In this next interview segment she states that the academic writing difficulty she had with writing an essay for her advanced ESL composition course was:

________________________________________________________________________

26:05 T: I think I couldn’t come up with that many support statements [for the body of the paper]. (From T. 3. February 17, 2006).

________________________________________________________________________

From these two interview segments we can see that one of the specific difficulties Tiffany had with her writing was development. Other specific difficulties Tiffany had with her writing development included writing analytically and using the right kind of support. One of the academic writing tasks for Tiffany’s First Year composition course was to write an analytical summary, which was much like an assignment she did for the intermediate ESL composition course which she took in the first quarter of her first year of university study. In the following interview segment, Tiffany discusses the specific difficulty she had with writing this assignment:

________________________________________________________________________

10:41 T: The summary, when I was in English 107, we did the descriptive summary, so I had trouble trying to understand the difference between descriptive and analytical summary. Basically you wrote a descriptive summary and then you analyze it…It took me two hours. It was so hard. I thought it was hard. Like the summary part wasn’t hard. The analyzing part was hard ’cause you need to get the author’s point and what he was talking about. (From T.5. April 10, 2006)
From her discussion of the specific difficulty Tiffany had with writing an analytical summary, we can see that it seemed to stem from two problems, that is, understanding diverse writing genres and the source text used for the analysis. As previously mentioned, Tiffany had little experience with diverse academic writing genres prior to her first year of university study, which may be the main reason for her difficulty with this particular task. Furthermore, as previously discussed, Tiffany had difficulties with academic reading tasks in her First Year composition course, which may be another reason she found the task of analytical writing difficult.

A difficulty caused by Tiffany’s inability to analyze was that of developing support. In the following interview segment, Tiffany discussed the difficulty of developing support for her analytical summary assignment for her First Year composition course, where students were asked to choose an article from four which they had read for the class and summarize and analyze the article. Tiffany chose the article “Mother Tongue” by Amy Tan. Below she discusses the difficulty she had in finding a second point of analysis of the text:

21:45 C: So you were to summarize and analyze the text and you’ve written the first draft. What difficulties did you have?

21:56 T: Analyzing

21:58 C: Can you say more about that?

22:06 T: I got the author’s major point, the main point, and then I just need to say how the author approached the main point. From the article it would be the experiences that she gave to approach her point. Why the language was so important to speak perfect English. But then it was not long enough. I need to
find another major point that she was talking about. But it was hard for me to find a second major point ‘cause I was so focused on the first major point. So it took me a while to find the second major point. (From T.5. April 10, 2006)

As discussed in a previous interview, Tiffany seemed to have a good understanding of the article she chose for this task, so a lack of understanding of the text she was analyzing was probably not the cause of her writing difficulty. It may have been that she had not given enough thought to her analysis of the text, a problem which is not specific to Generation 1.5 writers, but to many writers.

Another specific difficulty Tiffany discussed having with development in her writing was the use of inadequate support. The following interview segment highlights her discussion of the problem she had with the quotes she used as support in a paper she wrote for her Japanese Literature in Translation course:

41:36 T: The paper, after I read my first draft, it was really terrible, because we have to use quotations, at least one quotation in every paragraph. There’s this one paragraph I probably put 5 quotations in it, and after she sent the draft back to me, there were like 3 out of 5 that were not what I think they said the word. Like it’s a poem that’s describing the prince and his father, but I thought it was describing the prince, but actually it’s describing the father. (From T. 3. February 17, 2006)

Here it is apparent that Tiffany did not know how to use quotations as support in her writing. She seemed to incorporate them only for the purpose of fulfilling the assignment expectations, which is what Andrew reported doing with one of the mini essays for his First Year composition course. However, because Andrew was fortunate in choosing the
sections of the text he understood, he was more successful with his writing than what Tiffany reported. Additionally, it seems that she did not understand what she had read and was writing on, which echoes what was discussed in the section on the academic reading difficulties of both Andrew and Tiffany in this chapter.

Zack had a similar problem with development for some of the writing assignments he did for his classes, but as can be seen from the data, this was not seemingly as much of a difficulty for him as it was for Tiffany because of how infrequently he discussed it. In the following interview segment, Zack discussed the issue of support in the rhetorical analysis assignment for his First Year composition class, where students were asked to use one of the primary literary texts they had read for the class (e.g., “A Streetcar Named Desire”), and develop an analysis of it based on methods of interpretation students learned from the course textbook. Below we can see that based on the instructor’s feedback, Zack also struggled with developing an aspect of his essay:

________________________________________________________________________

48:52 C: How about the feedback that she gave you on the final draft of the paper? Did you find that to be useful?

48:59 Z: Yeah, she told me that I pretty much did a good job, but she said that I need to be a little more analytical than descriptive and develop my stuff overall to be slightly better, so I’m taking that into account for when I do the next assignment. (From Z.2. January 27, 2006)

________________________________________________________________________

Here we can see Zack struggled with analyzing the text as well as developing the discussion in his writing.
Another instance in which Zack struggled with developing support was in the final assignment for his First Year composition course. For this assignment, students were asked to write a research paper which was an extension of the rhetorical analysis paper they wrote at the beginning of the quarter. It included an analysis of representations of ideas they had discussed in class, and students were required to find primary and secondary sources to support their analyses. Toward the beginning of the writing process, Zack briefly met with his instructor to discuss a rough draft of his paper. From Zack’s recap of their discussion in the following interview extract, we can see that he had the same struggle with developing support in his paper as he had with the rhetorical analysis assignment:

7:13 Z: Basically she pointed out where certain things were unnecessary or a certain part was too long and she asked me to elaborate more on certain points in there. Certain arguments I had to expand and others I had to shorten ‘cause she said those were more important. (From Z.4. March 30, 2006)

So even at the end of the quarter, Zack was still working on issues of writing development, which seems to show this was a persistent problem for him.

**Summary of Academic Writing Difficulties**

In summary, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack had difficulties with the academic writing in their First Year composition courses. Tiffany also had difficulties with the academic writing in her Japanese literature courses. The most frequently discussed academic writing difficulties were difficulties with grammar and expression (for Andrew) and writing development (for Tiffany and Zack). This seems to indicate that Tiffany and
Zack had more of an awareness of global issues of writing, such as writing development, as previously discussed in their beliefs of academic literacies in Chapter 4. While Andrew’s belief about writing improvement was more elementary, that is, concerned with the mechanics of writing, Tiffany’s belief about writing improvement was grounded more in academic discourse, where writing is viewed as being source-based rather than experience-based. Zack’s belief regarding writing at the university includes adapting to the different types of writing within a context compared to other contexts. This shows that Zack recognizes the situatedness of literacy. The findings here highlight the diversity of writing issues Generation 1.5 learners face with academic writing, as discussed in Harklau et al. (1999) and Roberge et al. (in preparation).

The next section of this chapter discusses the practices the participants used to help complete academic writing tasks and overcome the difficulties with these tasks as they negotiated the various academic contexts they encountered in their first year of university study.

**Academic Writing Practices**

In response to difficulties with academic writing and to help them negotiate the academic contexts they moved in and out of during the study, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack discussed utilizing more academic writing practices than academic reading practices. The most frequently discussed academic writing practices the participants used to overcome the difficulties they faced with academic writing tasks are found in Table 5.3 below, including utilizing stages of the writing process, following instructors’ feedback, and developing their writing.
Frequency Counts of Academic Writing Practices of Three Generation 1.5 Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Andrew</th>
<th>Tiffany</th>
<th>Zack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composing Processes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Instructors’ Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of Writing Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Frequency Counts of Academic Writing Practices of Three Generation 1.5 Learners

*Composing Processes*

The only academic literacies practice that all three participants discussed with near equal frequency was the use of different composing processes as practices to help them complete academic writing tasks and overcome academic writing difficulties they had with these tasks. This is what Bosher (1998) also found in her multiple case study of the composing processes of Generation 1.5 learners. Because of their previous academic writing experience in their high school ELA classes and in the ESL and First Year composition course they took, the Generation 1.5 learners in this study had some familiarity with the stages in the writing process and seemed to understand the purpose of them. This is not to say that they had fully developed the ability to successfully complete the tasks that comprise these stages (see Ferris, 1999); nonetheless, based on their previous experience, they were familiar with these stages. In the following transcript segment, Andrew discussed the different stages in the writing process *he used* to help him overcome the difficulty of organizing his thoughts in an essay for his First Year composition course:
16:38 C: How do you go about trying to overcome the difficulty of putting together your thoughts for the essay?

17:03 A: Well, the idea probably came from when we meeting and those idea came from that. And then I was trying to read over my old draft, and trying to revise it and fit the ideas. When I do that, I check for grammar and trying to use different words too, just like use all the techniques I learned in writing essays, academic. (From A.3. February 13, 2006)

Here we can see some of the stages of the writing process, such as writing tutorials, multiple drafting, revising and editing, and how these stages, particularly Andrew’s approach to revising his writing, reflected his view of what constitutes good writing. As discussed in Chapter 4, Andrew’s notion of academic writing emphasized knowing fully the grammar and lexicon of a language, which is reflected in what he discussed in the segment above. However, addressing grammar and lexicon issues were the only practices for editing which Andrew specifically mentioned in the discussion here; his discussion of other practices was ambiguous, as can be seen with what he said in the last line of the segment above – “He used all the writing techniques he learned to complete the academic writing tasks for his course.” From this it is unclear as to whether or not Andrew possessed writing knowledge because, if he did possess it, he did not have the meta-language about writing to articulate it. Despite the ambiguity of his answer to the question, Andrew demonstrated his familiarity with the stages in the writing process and practices that accompany these stages in order to complete academic writing tasks and overcome any difficulties with them.
Like Andrew, Tiffany also discussed the use of stages in the writing process as practices for completing and overcoming difficulties with academic writing tasks. In the interview segments below we can see the various stages of the writing process that Tiffany used to complete an in-class essay for her First Year composition course:

4:39 T: First I had to think about it [the topic].
5:02 T: I spent a lot of time thinking before I started to write. (From T.5. April 10, 2006)

After Tiffany thought about the topic, she then wrote and reserved time at the end to edit for grammar errors:

7:32 T: I went back through for grammar and stuff. And I think the grammar was okay. The only thing I’m not sure about is if it was interesting to the instructor. (From T.5. April 10, 2006)

Like Andrew and Tiffany, Zack also demonstrated familiarity with stages in the writing process, such as multiple drafting and writing tutorials, and utilized these stages as practices to complete academic writing tasks. In the segment below we can see some of the stages in the process Zack used to write a paper based on a speech he read for his First Year composition course:
43:07  Z:  First I like read over the speech a couple times and highlighted the parts of it I thought I should address. Then I started typing pretty much.

43:22  C:  Did you have any outline or prewriting that you did?

43:25  Z:  For this one, no, 'cause it was pretty short. I just started writing straight away.

44:15  C:  How many times did you write the draft?

44:18  Z:  Once. Then I improved on it once. Then I went to my teacher, and she said, okay, you can fix this, this, this, and this. Then I improved on it once more, and that was my final draft. (From Z.2. January 27, 2006)

Like Andrew, Zack used some of the stages in the writing process as an academic writing practice to complete the assignment. From the discussion of the participants’ use of stages in the writing process we can see how they utilized different sources of input to help facilitate their writing, that is, Andrew utilized the content of a tutorial discussion, Tiffany utilized the thoughts she had on the topic on which she was writing, and Zack utilized the text on which his writing was based as well as a writing tutorial. However, what was most noteworthy about this was the fact that all three participants frequently discussed utilizing various stages of the writing process to complete academic writing tasks and overcome difficulties with these tasks.

One other observation about the participants’ utilization of the stages in the writing process is the academic context in which they were used. Unlike Andrew and Zack, where they talked about using stages in the writing process as practices for writing tasks in their First Year composition courses, Tiffany discussed using these stages to complete writing tasks in courses other than the First Year composition course she took during the study, as can be seen in the interview segment below. Here we can see that
Tiffany applied the steps she followed to write an essay for her First Year composition course and applied it to complete a writing assignment for one of her Japanese literature courses, *Japanese Literature in Translation*:

37:37 T: I wrote one draft and then sent an e-mail with an attachment to my professor, and then she look over it and make comments, what I should add and what I should eliminate. So I sent it to her on Friday and then she give it back to my on Saturday with her comments, and then I revise it. (From T.3. February 17, 2006)

We can see that she utilized practices from the writing process, such as multiple drafting and using feedback for revision, similar to how all three participants used them to complete academic writing tasks in their First Year composition course. However, what is noteworthy about Tiffany’s use of these stages as writing practices in this Japanese literature course is that she took what she learned about the stages from her writing courses, ESL and First Year composition, and applied this knowledge to complete writing tasks in other courses. In courses like ESL and First Year composition, the writing process is typically built into the course curriculum. However, in content area courses, such as Tiffany’s Japanese literature course, this is generally not the case. So it is noteworthy how Tiffany applied what she learned about the writing process to other contexts that included writing. This not only shows Tiffany’s understanding of the stages in the writing process and how and when to utilize them across academic contexts, but it is also indicative of Lea and Street’s (2000) Academic Literacies Model where students are utilizing academic literacies practices among academic contexts.

*Following Instructors’ Feedback*
Another academic writing practice frequently discussed in the interviews was following instructors’ feedback for academic writing tasks. The variety of academic writing genres, especially in the First Year composition course, and the participants’ relative unfamiliarity with these genres compared to other types, such as multiple choice or short answer exercises, in other academic contexts may have been the reason why following instructors’ feedback for academic writing tasks was discussed by all three participants. As can be seen in Table 5.7, Tiffany discussed this much more than Andrew and Zack did. As with her frequent discussion of utilizing academic reading practices, Tiffany’s frequent discussion of academic writing practices may be because, as reported in the literature, female ESL learners discuss using language learning practices more frequently than males (Green & Oxford, 1995). The type of instructors’ feedback for academic writing that the participants discussed includes both written and oral. Written feedback is that which instructors provided, for example, in the margins of the participants’ work that was handed in and assessed without the participants present. Oral feedback is that which the instructors provided, for example, in a writing tutorial where the participants and instructor were discussing face-to-face a piece of their writing.

An example of a participant following an instructor’s written feedback can be seen in the interview transcript below, where Tiffany discusses the feedback she received from her instructor in response to a difficulty she had with understanding the text she was to write a paper on for her First Year composition course. After spending about 10 hours trying to decipher what the text meant, Tiffany e-mailed her instructor to ask for help. The instructor responded to Tiffany’s e-mail with an interpretation of what the text meant and suggestions as to how to utilize the understanding of the text when writing the
assignment. Tiffany’s discussion of what she did with the instructor’s feedback can be seen here:

52:12 T: …I read the e-mail first and kinda put it in my own. Then I printed it out and went back to the book and this topic relates to what the author said in the first article. It had four different sections as well, so I kinda thought the section three related to that section. (From T.6. April 28, 2006)

From Tiffany’s solicitation of her instructor’s help on this assignment, we can see that Tiffany viewed the instructor as a holder of knowledge, that is, the instructor understood the text and could provide Tiffany with this understanding. Tiffany also saw value in the instructor’s understanding of the text, so much so that she utilized the instructor’s feedback in order to write her paper. Tiffany reported that after reading through and thinking about the instructor’s response, it took her just a couple hours more to complete the assignment. However, because of the importance of completing the assignment rather than developing her own understanding of the text, Tiffany utilized her instructor’s understanding of the text as a substitute for her own.

Zack also discussed utilizing his First Year composition instructor’s feedback to help him write a comparative rhetorical analysis paper, as can be seen in the following interview extract:

A: I added things that she said could add to the paper. Certain examples and certain points. And then a couple of things I took out of there and changed ‘cause she said it didn’t go with the rest of the paper. (From A.3. February 17, 2006)
Zack’s discussion of how he responded to his instructor’s feedback reflects an autonomous view of literacy. The changes he made to his essay in response to his instructor’s feedback were based on what the instructor said could be added to, deleted from or changed in his paper rather than how Zack thought his paper should be revised. In this regard, the instructor possessed a dominant view of what “good” writing is for Zack to follow in order to be a successful writer rather than allowing there to be room for Zack’s own ideas of what “good” writing is.

What is noteworthy about the participants in this study following their instructors’ feedback on their writing is that it contradicts what the literature says about the revising practices of Generation 1.5 learners. In her research on Generation 1.5 student writers and teacher feedback, Ferris (1999) found that students “had limited strategies for utilizing it in subsequent writing tasks” (p. 147). She also found that “…immigrant student writers may ignore or avoid comments when they do not feel competent to make the changes necessitated by those comments, even deleting material rather than attempting to improve it…” (1999, p. 154). However, the Generation 1.5 learners in this study possessed practices for utilizing instructor feedback in their writing.

Methods of Writing Development

Methods of writing development was another frequently discussed practice for completing academic writing tasks primarily in First Year composition courses. For example, Andrew discussed utilizing various worksheets provided by his First Year composition instructor as a tool to help develop his writing. He stated, “It [the worksheets] gives me an idea to write my paper. What I’m gonna write about. What I’m gonna explain.” (From A.2. January 25, 2006). For example, when completing the
rhetorical analysis paper for his First Year composition course, Andrew utilized a list of questions the instructor provided the students to help them with the writing. Andrew talks about utilizing this list to help him write his paper in the following interview segment:

23:31 A: I look at that [the text he’s analyzing] and look at the question [from the list the instructor provided] and try and answer it and put it into my essay. But like I probably had to read this like two or three times and not like right after each other, but like during the course of doing the essay, so I’m constantly revising my essay. (From A.3. February 13, 2006).

We can see that, with the help of the worksheet provided by his instructor, Andrew transferred his answers to the questions from the worksheet into his writing and consequently was able to continuously develop it.

Just as difficulties with development were frequently discussed by Tiffany in the interviews, so too were practices for development. In the following interview segment, Tiffany discusses her difficulty with development for a summary analysis essay for her First Year composition course. For this assignment, students needed to find points of analysis of a text they chose to analyze and summarize. Tiffany chose Amy Tan’s essay, “Mother Tongue”. In the process of completing the assignment, Tiffany had difficulties analyzing the text because of what she reported as her lack of experience with analysis. When she was finally able to find a point from the text she could analyze, she reached a place where she could not find another. In the interview transcript below, we see her discussion of the practice she used to help her come up with another point of analysis:
22:45 C: Did you find one [another point of analysis]?

22:48 T: Yeah, well, I don’t know if it’s a major point, but I just made it up. The second strategy was to see the routine that she used over and over again. That was a strategy in our book that you count the words. How many times she uses, and a lot of the time it means it’s important. I didn’t count the words, but I count what she was approaching, and I thought that would be a good second major point. (From T.5. April 10, 2006)

At the beginning of Tiffany’s response, we can see that she was a bit uncertain about the second point of analysis she chose because she did not know if it was an important point to analyze from the text. From the interview segment we can see that the practice she used to develop her writing came from the course textbook and how Tiffany modified the use of this practice to fit her own purposes in writing. Rather than counting repetitive words in the text, Tiffany chose to count the repetitive approaches Tan included in the text. This adaptation of academic literacies practices shows Tiffany may possess a good understanding of how to choose academic writing practices and apply them to academic literacies tasks; this is also reflected in her evaluation of the choice of practice and application of it in the last part of the interview segment above, where she discusses the positive outcome of the application of this modified practice. She states that she thought the result of the application of this practice would be another major point regarding the content of the text that she could analyze in her paper.

Zack also discussed a specific practice for development several times throughout the interviews. This specific practice was soliciting feedback from his First Year composition instructor. With each draft of the assignments he wrote for this course, Zack made an appointment to see his instructor and review the draft with her. By doing so, he
was able to see, through her lens, what parts of his essays were under and overdeveloped and then was able to make the necessary corrections. He talks about this here:

7:13 A: Basically she pointed out where certain things were unnecessary or a certain part was too long and she asked me to elaborate more on certain points in there. Certain arguments I had to expand and others I had to shorten ‘cause she said those were more important. (From A.4. March 30, 2006).

From the discussion of the participants’ practice of writing development, we can see that although the specific practice each of them used was a little different, they each were provided with assistance by their First Year composition instructor to better help them understand how to develop their writing. This speaks to the importance of the instructors’ choice of course materials, and that these should be chosen with all students’, including Generation 1.5 learners’, needs in mind. The discussion of the participants’ practice of writing development, furthermore, highlights the fact that while Andrew and Tiffany utilized more generalized practices for their writing development with the use of worksheets and the course textbook, Zack utilized a more individualized practice. The face-to-face writing tutorials with his course instructor gave him the individualized attention he needed as a Generation 1.5 writer to develop his writing that the more generalized practices of worksheets and the course textbook might not have. Zack sees his instructor as a knowledge holder in an academic discourse community, and that he has access to this knowledge through the means of writing tutorials. This highlights the role that oral literacy plays in written literacy development (Weissberg, 2006), and how this is a way that Generation 1.5 learners’ oral proficiency strength can be utilized to help them with written literacy development.
Summary of Academic Writing Practices

The practices of academic writing that Andrew, Tiffany and Zack discussed utilizing to help them overcome their difficulties with academic writing or to complete the academic writing tasks for their courses included the use of composing processes, following instructors’ feedback, and methods of writing development. These practices reveal how the participants were able to negotiate the academic contexts they moved in and out of during the study. As previously mentioned, Tiffany discussed practices for writing development more than Andrew or Zack in the interviews. These results are similar to the results of the academic reading practices, where Tiffany utilized a number of different practices to help her understand the assigned readings; however, Andrew and Zack did not discuss as many, which for Zack was not that surprising, since he reported having very little difficulty with the academic reading he did during the course of the study. On the other hand, the results concerning academic writing practices show that Zack did not frequently discuss practices for development, which may be the reason why development was one of his most frequently discussed academic writing difficulties. Moreover, with Zack thinking that everything about academic literacies, including academic writing, was “pretty straightforward”, it would seem that he would more frequently discuss the practices he used to help him with his writing development. However, he did not. One reason for this, like with his lack of discussion of academic reading practices, may be that the few practices he possessed were effective to some degree in helping him overcome the difficulties he had with academic writing, and he saw no need to develop others. It could also be that he had not acquired as many academic writing practices as Tiffany, although this is somewhat hard to believe because
of Zack’s extensive language background and perception that everything about academic literacies is “pretty straightforward”. It might also be that Zack had not yet had sufficient time to assimilate new academic writing practices into his existing repertoire. In his last interview, Zack discussed his realization that learning new academic literacies is a process, and he had to learn to adopt and adapt new practices that accompanied this process. Perhaps Zack was still in the process of developing his academic writing practices during the time of the study, which resulted in little discussion of academic writing practices.

The third type of academic literacy present in the academic contexts the participants negotiated during the study was information literacy, which is the ability to use the library, including searching for outside sources, using the library catalog and databases, and choosing keywords to guide searches.

**Information Literacy: Contexts, Difficulties and Practices**

Very little of the research on Generation 1.5 learners discusses information literacy. As previously mentioned, it focuses primarily on the academic reading and academic writing of these learners, but not this particular type of academic literacy. Because the theoretical frame for this study viewed academic literacies as multiple, the results include the contexts, difficulties and practices of the information literacy of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack. The difficulties with information literacy all three participants experienced were in the contexts of their ESL and First Year composition courses. The only other context in which information literacy was present was Andrew and Zack’s introductory biology course. However, they did not report difficulties with the tasks in this context because of the structured nature of them. They were to search
The New York Times for four articles related to biology, whereas in their First Year composition course, the information literacy tasks were unstructured and caused more difficulties for the participants than the structured tasks did. There were no information literacy tasks in the other academic contexts Andrew, Tiffany and Zack negotiated during the study, so there were not reported difficulties with information literacy tasks in contexts other than ESL and First Year composition. The practices they reported using to help them overcome these difficulties were also used for these other courses. Specific difficulties and practices of information literacy across the cases within these contexts are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

Information Literacy Difficulties

Like Andrew, as Tiffany and Zack negotiated the various academic contexts they moved in and out of during the study, they discussed encountering several different kinds of difficulties with the academic literacies tasks they were assigned. The most frequently discussed information literacy difficulty participants faced with research tasks was finding appropriate sources and keywords by which to search (Andrew 4, Tiffany 3, and Zack 4), though the frequencies reported by them were not high.

Source Searches

All three of the case study participants discussed having difficulties with finding outside sources to use for the academic literacy tasks in their First Year composition course, which was one of the only courses where there was a need for this kind of activity. A reason why Andrew had difficulties with finding outside sources for his academic literacies tasks in First Year composition includes the length of time it took to
find sources and keywords to search with. In the following interview segment he discusses the length of time it took him to find sources for his research paper assignment:

29:26 A: Just to find the source to write the essay. It took me like two days. (From A.4. March 2, 2006)

The other participants also expressed frustration over the amount of time it took to find outside sources for their papers; however, Andrew was the only one who actually quantified his frustration in an interview. Incidentally, the only type of outside source Andrew searched for was books, which, since the expectation for this task was that students use a variety of sources, seems to indicate Andrew’s limited knowledge of the different types of outside sources.

Locating keywords to search with was a reason why Tiffany had difficulties finding outside sources. In the interview segment below we can see the specific difficulties Tiffany had with doing keyword searches to find sources, primarily articles, for the research paper she wrote for her advanced level ESL composition course:

26:57 T: It was really hard to use the database system in the library ‘cause my research topic is related to social class. But you need to think of the keywords you need to type in, otherwise you won’t find the articles you want. So I think the difficulties was come up with keywords. Like at first I used my keywords as food consumption, social class. I think those are the two things I type in. I couldn’t think of more. (From T.3. February 17, 2006)
Here we can see that Tiffany had difficulties using online databases, but had some idea of how to search for sources, such as thinking of keywords to search for articles. However, she stated that it was difficult coming up with keywords by which to search. Tiffany was able to come up with two but states that she could not come up with any more, which did not result in an effective source search for her for this assignment.

In the interview segment below we can see that the specific difficulty Zack had with searching for sources was finding secondary sources for his research paper for his First Year composition course. The specific problem was that he could not find anything that directly addressed the topic he was working with:

________________________________________________________________________

Z: … I couldn’t find too many secondary sources that had to do with my topic. They were mostly things that had to do with the research paper, but nothing directly addressing the topic. (From Z.3. February 17, 2006)

________________________________________________________________________

One reason the participants had difficulties conducting source searches for their academic writing tasks may have been a lack of or varying proficiency with this skill. From the interviews, experience with information literacy that participants had prior to their first year of university study was quite limited. Very few of the academic literacies tasks the participants completed in their U.S. high school contexts included information literacy. Both Tiffany and Zack had some experience with information literacy for the research paper tasks they completed for the English Language Arts courses they took their senior year in the high schools they attended, but it was hardly extensive. As for Andrew, he reported that he had not been to a library prior to the library orientation he
attended for his ESL composition course in his first quarter of university study, which may be why it took him so long to find sources. In one of our interviews he pointed out, “The library thing is new for me. How to do research. In general, how to do a research paper. That would be new.” (From A.4. March 2, 2006). Furthermore, the academic contexts which the participants negotiated in their first year included information literacy tasks, but did not necessarily include information literacy instruction, e.g., how to search for sources. In other words, in contexts such as First Year composition and introduction to biology that included information literacy, there was an assumption that students already possessed information literacy skills prior to entering the academic contexts. Seemingly as a consequence of this false assumption, participants in this study reported difficulties with conducting source searches.

**Summary of Information Literacy Difficulties**

The difficulties with information literacy all three participants experienced were in the academic contexts of their ESL and First Year composition courses. The most frequently discussed difficulty with information literacy the participants faced was finding appropriate sources, including the appropriate keywords by which to search. These difficulties may have resulted from a lack of proper orientation to the library system and instruction on how to effectively search for sources. The next section of this chapter discusses the practices the participants used to help them complete information literacy tasks and overcome difficulties with them while negotiating the various academic contexts they encountered in their first year of university study.
Information Literacy Practices

To complete information literacy tasks and to help them negotiate the academic contexts they moved in and out of during the study, the case study participants utilized two primary information literacy practices: Google searches and, despite their difficulty with them, online databases (Andrew 2, Tiffany 3, and Zack 2). However, the frequencies shown indicate that they made little use of these practices.

Using Google, Online Databases

Like with the academic writing practices, all three participants discussed practices for completing the information literacy tasks they were assigned primarily in their ESL and First Year composition courses. Because of Andrew’s unfamiliarity with the library and searching for sources, as previously discussed, his information literacy practices were seemingly more elementary than Tiffany and Zack’s, as can be seen in the interview segment below:

________________________________________________________________________

24:30 A: Right now I can try and find books online using the catalog and database and get the call number and go to the library and find it. (From A.4. March 2, 2006)

________________________________________________________________________

With regard to his source search practices, he only discussed finding books online using the library database. He did not discuss searching for other types of sources or utilizing other types of search technologies; thus, his search practice proficiency seems elementary.

On the other hand, Tiffany’s search practice proficiency seemed more advanced than Andrew’s. For Tiffany, one of the practices she discussed using to help find
keywords to use to conduct source searches was using Google, as can be seen in the
following interview extract:

29:41  C: Can you tell me more about what you did on Google to help you find
keywords?

29:45  T: Um, like I came up with the keywords of food consumption and social class,
and then it [Google] came up with a lot of articles, but then I read through like 10
articles. And after I read through the articles, I came up with other keywords.
(From T.3. February 17, 2006)

As mentioned previously in the same interview, Tiffany began her search with the two
keywords she came up with originally. However, because of her lack of success with
using these to find sources in the library’s database system, she used the same keywords
to search for sources via Google, despite the cautionary advice from her instructor about
the unreliability of Google searches. The results from her Google search provided
Tiffany with many more sources which she used not only as outside sources for her
research paper, but also as a tool to create other keywords by which to conduct other
searches. Searching with Google was a practice Tiffany adopted from one of her
classmates because of this classmate’s success with finding sources using it, despite the
instructor’s caution about reliability issues that accompany searching with Google:

30:21  T: …there’s this girl in my English class. She found her articles on Google. She
found more of her articles on Google. And I understand that it’s not reliable. The
instructor encouraged us not to find articles from Google. But then there’s a lot of
articles [on Google] that’s related to my topic. But what I did was after I read the
articles, I type in the title and author name into the library database, and if it’s reliable, I’ll be able to find an article, which I think is only one out of ten that I could find in the library database. (From T.3. February 17, 2006)

Tiffany acknowledged that the practice of using Google to search for academic sources was not completely reliable for finding them, based on her instructor’s cautionary note. Despite this, Tiffany combined the practice of searching with Google, which she adopted from one of her classmates, and searching in an online library database to find appropriate sources by cross referencing the sources she found in Google with those in the library’s database. Tiffany decided that the sources were reliable if they were found in the library’s database and therefore could be used to complete the academic literacies task for her ESL composition course. What this tells us about Tiffany’s knowledge of information literacies is that by combining one information literacy practice with another, she knew how to utilize different research practices to accomplish information literacy tasks and negotiate this academic context. As previously discussed in the sections in this chapter on Academic Reading and Writing Practices, we can also see how Tiffany used a combination of academic reading and writing practices to help her complete and overcome difficulties with academic reading and academic writing tasks. This ability to combine academic literacies practices in order to complete academic literacies tasks shows that Tiffany may possess a good understanding of how to select academic reading, writing and information literacy practices and adapt and apply them in unique ways to complete various academic literacies tasks, further illuminating how she negotiated the academic contexts in her first year and indicative of Lea and Street’s (2000) Model of
Academic Literacies where students can be seen switching academic literacies practices not only between but also within academic contexts.

Like Tiffany, Zack’s information literacy practices seem more advanced than Andrew’s because of the types of sources he discusses searching for in the interview segment here:

A: Pretty much we were looking for articles and reports. Those kinds of things online. Published papers.

C: Were you looking in journal databases?

A: Yeah, we were looking in like JSTOR and Academic Search Premier. (From A.3. February 17, 2006)

From Zack’s discussion of the types of sources for which he was searching, we can see that they were more advanced than what Andrew and even Tiffany were looking for. Unlike Andrew, Zack does not mention searching for books but rather journal articles and reports, and unlike Tiffany, he does not mention using Google to find these sources but instead two well-known journal databases. From this we can clearly see that Zack had greater proficiency with information literacy than did Andrew and Tiffany. This may have been because of the experience he reported having in high school. When asked about how he conducted his searches, Zack replied:

A: I searched a long time and different things. Like I didn’t stick to one journal database. I looked at multiple. (From Z.3. February 17, 2006).
From his description of his search practices, we once again can see his familiarity with this type of academic literacy in comparison with Andrew and Tiffany. In the interview segment above, Zack states that his search took a long time, which he did not present as a difficulty like Andrew did, but more as his understanding that source searches take a long time. In this segment we can also see his use of multiple sources for his search rather than just single sources, such as the library database (Andrew) or Google (Tiffany). Clearly Zack was much more proficient with this type of academic literacy than the other two participants and points to the fact that Generation 1.5 learners can have a range of experience with information literacy.

**Summary of Information Literacy Practices**

The information literacy practices the participants reported using to help them overcome difficulties they encountered with information literacy tasks were primarily for their ESL and First Year composition courses. The most frequently discussed information literacy practices were using the library, and searching Google and other online databases. From the discussion of these practices we can further see how the participants in the study negotiated the academic contexts which included information literacy tasks and how different their experiences were with this type of academic literacy.

It should be noted here that although not included in this discussion, digital literacy was also a part of the academic contexts Andrew, Tiffany and Zack negotiated in their first year of university study. However, the difficulties and practices with this type of literacy they discussed in the interviews were minimal; therefore, digital literacy was excluded from the discussion of the results of the academic literacies experiences of the
Generation 1.5 learners in this study. Even so, in addition to the academic literacies practices the participants discussed utilizing to complete and overcome difficulties with the academic literacies tasks in their first year of university study, they also discussed sources of academic literacies practices which they utilized. Examples of these are discussed in the following paragraphs.

**Sources of Academic Literacies Practices**

The results of the study show that there were a few specific sources of academic literacies practices the participants discussed utilizing. For Andrew, Tiffany and Zack, these sources were frequently discussed with respect to their First Year composition course. Tiffany also discussed these sources in connection with the two Japanese literature courses she took during the study. No report of sources of academic literacies practices in other academic contexts usually meant that these sources may not have been a part of that context or were not tapped into by the participants. Specific sources of academic literacies practices across the cases within these contexts are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

**Sources of Academic Literacies Practices**

Another focus of this study was what the participants’ sources of academic literacies were. The most frequently referenced source of academic literacies practices for the participants was the instructor (Andrew 22, Tiffany 60, and Zack 16). Two types of academic literacies practices emerged from examining the participants’ discussions of the instructor as a source of academic literacies practices; one type was academic writing, and the other was academic reading. For Andrew, the practices of academic writing
came from his discussion with his instructor in a writing tutorial regarding the rhetorical
analysis essay he wrote for his First Year composition course:

19:27 A: The comment from the teacher for the analyze essay, her comments make me go
in a different direction, so I’m just trying to do what is best. So pretty much go
with what the teacher say. (From A.3. February 13, 2006).

Here we can see that despite her feedback taking him in a different direction in his paper
than where he was originally headed, he states that he wants to do what is best, which
means to follow the feedback his instructor gave him. From this we can see that Andrew
views the instructor as an expert in academic literacies, someone who knows best about
academic writing, despite the fact that he had already written something prior to coming
to talk with her about it. It seems that Andrew views his instructors’ practices of
academic writing as a substitute for his own limited knowledge of academic writing,
which, as discussed with Tiffany and Zack in the following paragraphs, stands in sharp
contrast to their perception of this knowledge as a supplement to their own.

A second type of academic literacies practices that emerged from examining the
participants’ discussions of the instructor as a source of academic literacies practices was
academic reading. Tiffany was the only participant who frequently discussed utilizing
her instructors as sources of academic reading practices. Zack may not have discussed
this because, according to him, everything, including academic reading, was “pretty
straightforward”; thus, he saw no need to seek this kind of academic literacies practice.
In Andrew’s case, it may have been because, instead of doing the reading for his courses,
he was relying on his course notes to complete academic literacies tasks, or that he learned how to use the parts of the course reading he understood to complete writing tasks. In both cases, he learned to avoid difficulties with reading comprehension, so there was no need to seek academic literacies practices from his instructors. However, Tiffany had a different experience.

For the rhetorical analysis essay Tiffany wrote for her First Year composition course, she had to compare two articles and write about this comparison. The biggest difficulty Tiffany faced on this assignment was in comprehending one of the two articles. She found some help in the group discussions they had in class; however, the discussion for this article was cut short, so she was left to finish comprehending it on her own. Consequently, she ran into a lot of problems, and these impeded her ability to complete the assignment. After a long delay, she contacted her instructor via e-mail to inform her of the difficulties she was facing. In the following interview segment, we can see what Tiffany did and the instructor’s response:

48:27  C: Why was it taking you so long [to write your paper]?

48:30  T: I understand what I have to do. I understand that I have to compare and find the difference and the similarity, but I couldn’t understand the second article, so I couldn’t find the similarity because I didn’t understand it. So I e-mailed her and told her that I understood we had a discussion, but we never finished our notes because we never finished the discussion. So then she sent out an e-mail to everybody. She kinda break down the ideas, and then she said that the main point in the section is this and this and this. So that help a lot. I think she sent it out on Saturday morning. I finished my paper on Saturday, so that helped a lot. (From T.6. April 28, 2006)
From this we can see that Tiffany understood how to write the paper; however, she did not have the content for it because of the difficulties she had with comprehending the article, which prevented her from completing the task. Tiffany realized she did not have the academic literacies practices necessary to overcome this difficulty on her own, so she contacted her instructor, who she perceived as being a supplemental source of practices of academic writing to that of her own. This shows Tiffany’s understanding of her instructor as a representative of an academic discourse community who possesses knowledge of that community, and as a means of gaining access to this community, Tiffany, along with the other participants, accessed her instructor’s academic literacies knowledge. Here the instructor sent an e-mail with an explanation of the text which included the academic literacies practices of how to break down the ideas in the text into smaller parts in order to be able to comprehend them and how to recognize the main idea in each section of the text. Rather than giving students the “correct” answer by telling them what the text meant, the instructor provided students, including Tiffany, the academic literacies practices necessary to understand this text as well as others like it. According to Tiffany, these practices were effective in helping her complete the task.

Like Andrew, Zack also saw his instructor as a source of academic literacies practices when it came to getting help with his writing. In discussing this, he stated:

32:49 Z: ..I just went to my teacher’s office hours and had her opinion on what had on my rough draft. Like I had her go over that and after that I came up with my final draft.

34:08 Z: …with every paper I would go and have her look at it before I turn it in. (From Z.2. January 27, 2006)
Zack never elaborated on what specific academic literacies practices the instructor provided; however, because he did this with every paper he wrote, we see that he viewed his instructor as someone possessing a body of knowledge of academic writing that seemed supplemental to his own, like Tiffany, and the importance of this.

**Summary of Sources of Academic Literacies Practices**

For Andrew, Tiffany and Zack, sources of academic literacies practices were discussed in regards to their First Year composition courses; Tiffany also discussed these sources with regard to her Japanese literature courses. The most frequently discussed source of academic literacies practices, specifically for academic reading and academic writing, was the participants’ instructors, who they saw as those who possessed academic literacies practices which served as a substitution for (Andrew) and supplemental to (Tiffany and Zack) what they already possessed. Although Andrew, Tiffany and Zack discussed accessing other sources of academic literacies practices, such as friends, classmates, and roommates, throughout the interviews they pointed out that it was really the instructors’ academic literacies practices that mattered most in completing academic literacies tasks, which is echoed in the case study research on the academic literacies of undergraduate students (see McCarthy, 1987).

**Summary of Academic Literacies Difficulties and Practices across Cases and Contexts**

In summary, Andrew and Tiffany discussed difficulties with and practices of academic reading, in various academic contexts, which echoes what the literature on Generation 1.5 learners says about their difficulties with lexicon (Hartman & Tarone,
With regard to academic writing, the participants had varying difficulties with this, including grammar (Andrew) and development (Tiffany and Zack); however, these difficulties were found mostly in the academic contexts of their First Year composition courses and, for Tiffany, her Japanese literature courses. These results also seem to echo discussions in the literature about the academic writing difficulties of Generation 1.5 learners (Reid, 1997; Thonus, 2003). The practices of academic writing for all three participants included frequent discussion of the stages in the writing process. It also included following instructors’ writing feedback and methods of writing development, which did not echo the discussions of academic writing practices of Generation 1.5 learners (Ferris, 1999; Harklau, 2003). One other academic literacy that was examined in this study was information literacy. The results from this examination show that the participants discussed experiencing difficulties with this, such as finding appropriate sources and keywords by which to search, primarily in their ESL and First Year composition courses. The practices the participants reported utilizing to complete information literacy tasks and overcome difficulties with these included the use of the library database, Google and other online databases. Because little research has been done on the information literacy of Generation 1.5 learners and information literacy, it is not possible to compare these findings with others.

The concluding chapter, Chapter 6, presents emergent characteristics of how the Generation 1.5 learners in this study negotiated the academic contexts in their first year of university study along with answers to the research questions that shaped this study. It also includes implications for instructors in various academic contexts at the university.
and directions for further research into the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners.
Currently there is a mounting trend of immigrant, or Generation 1.5, students joining the population of traditional ESL students at American universities. Based on their U.S. K-12 schooling experiences, most Generation 1.5 students enter university with some foundation in academic literacies. However, many Generation 1.5ers have difficulties with the more complex and more language-intensive academic literacies tasks they encounter in various academic contexts they negotiate in their first year at university. For example, many are relatively inexperienced academic readers, so they struggle to comprehend assigned texts, and many find academic writing to be challenging (Blanton, 2005; Reid, 1997). Hence, understanding how Generation 1.5 learners negotiate the various academic contexts in their first year of university study and acquire academic literacies in English have become critical needs if these students are to become academically successful. In order to better understand how three Generation 1.5 learners negotiated academic literacies tasks in multiple academic contexts in their first year of university study, I employed case study methods to explore how three first year Generation 1.5 students negotiated academic literacies as multiple and situated practices (Barton et al., 2000; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). The primary objective of this study was to examine how these Generation 1.5 learners negotiated various academic contexts, including various academic genres and tasks. Specifically, I considered the academic
difficulties these students experienced and the academic literacies practices they utilized to overcome these difficulties to successfully complete the tasks.

The following research questions shaped my analysis of these students’ efforts to learn skills, become socialized, and negotiate the challenges of becoming academically literate:

1. What were the academic contexts the Generation 1.5 learners in this study negotiated in their first year at the university? What types of academic literacies genres and tasks were included in the academic contexts the participants negotiated in their first year at the university?

2. What academic literacies difficulties did the Generation 1.5 learners in this study face in completing the academic literacies tasks they encountered in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

3. What academic literacies practices did the case study participants utilize to overcome the academic literacies difficulties they encountered with academic literacies tasks in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

4. What were the sources of academic literacies practices the Generation 1.5 learners utilized to assist them in navigating the various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

In-depth discussion of the answers to these questions that shaped this study are woven together with related findings from the literature on literacy, academic socialization, and Generation 1.5 learners and presented in the first part of this chapter. The second part of this chapter presents significant attributes of the academic literacies of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack that emerged from the analysis of the results of this study and are discussed in convergence or contradiction with previous findings on academic literacies and socialization of Generation 1.5 learners. Finally, pedagogical implications and directions for further research on the academic socialization and academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners are presented in the latter part of the chapter.
Academic Contexts, Genres and Tasks

The first research question the study investigated was:

What were the academic contexts the case study participants negotiated in their first year at the university? What types of academic literacies genres and tasks were included in the academic contexts the participants negotiated in their first year at the university?

In order to better understand the academic socialization process and academic literacies experiences of three Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study and address the first research question (as well as the others), a focus of this study was to examine the specific academic contexts and genres and tasks that were present within these contexts they negotiated. The results from this examination provide evidence of multiple, situated literacies (Barton et al., 2000; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000) which are highlighted by the presence of multiple contexts, multiple literacies and a variety of genres and tasks in the different academic contexts the three Generation 1.5 learners negotiated in this study. These aspects of academic literacies were examined primarily with two interconnected models of academic literacies – Academic Socialization and Academic Literacies (Lea & Street, 2000). The Academic Socialization Model highlights what the participants needed to learn to become a part of a discourse community. It was with the use of this model that the academic contexts, genres and tasks were examined and are discussed in the following pages. The other model – Academic Literacies Model – considers how the participants were being socialized into academic discourse communities. It was with the use of this model that the process of negotiating various academic contexts in the first year of university study
of the three Generation 1.5 learners was examined and is discussed in the answer to the second research question in the next section of this chapter.

In response to the first research question, and consistent with previous research (Harklau, 2001; Hirvela, 2004; Leki, 1999), Andrew, Tiffany and Zack negotiated mostly introductory courses in their first year of university study. In looking across the academic contexts included in this study, one can see that the academic literacies genres and tasks included in these contexts were varied and required knowledge of not only academic reading and writing, but also information and digital literacies, which is indicative of situated literacies where “…within a given culture, there are different literacies associated with different domains of life” (Barton et al., 2000, p. 11). For example, some of the courses Andrew took during the study included a wide variety of academic literacies genres and tasks, while others required a cluster of the same types of genres and tasks. In general, there was a diversity of genres and tasks in which he was engaged during the study. A notable finding is that Andrew’s instructor expected that he already possessed academic literacies practices necessary to negotiate the complexities of what the student regarded as new literacy demands. This assumption reflects an autonomous view of literacy, where course instructors assume literacy to be the same from one course to the next. However, as found in this study, Andrew experienced shifting notions of reading and writing across contexts.

Unlike Andrew, Tiffany’s academic reading genres and tasks in the courses she took were less varied, but varied nonetheless, and included mostly reading course packs and textbooks. However, like Andrew, Tiffany’s academic writing genres and tasks were quite varied, primarily because she took more writing and humanities courses during the
study than did Andrew. Like Andrew, Zack reported doing a variety of reading for his courses; the exception was a course for which he had already learned the material in high school. Unlike Andrew and Tiffany, Zack took elective courses as well as the introductory courses during his first year which are intended to introduce first year students to academia and directly assist them in the academic socialization process. Unlike the large amounts of academic reading required in other courses Zack took during his first year for the purpose of merely learning content, the freshmen seminars he took did not include large amounts of academic reading. However, the seminar made other demands, and students were expected to read and to formulate ideas about the readings and then discuss their ideas in the seminars.

The academic writing genres and tasks Zack encountered in First Year composition were more or less the same as what Andrew and Tiffany encountered. Likewise, the amount of writing Zack did for the course was roughly the same as what Andrew and Tiffany did for theirs. One of the differences in academic writing tasks between Zack and the others in this course was in the number of drafts written for each assignment as well as the amount and type of reading completed, where Zack did a larger amount than Andrew and Tiffany. Furthermore, in the elective courses Zack took during his first year, the academic writing he encountered was quite different from that which he was doing in the other courses he took during the first year. The type of writing Zack did for the course included response writing, which was a way in which he was being socialized into an academic discourse community. The tasks required that students not only discuss what they understood about the readings they did for the seminars, but also
write about the thoughts and ideas they had about the readings, allowing them the opportunity to create their own knowledge about the topics they were reading about.

These findings echo those of other studies that have described in detail academic literacies tasks in individual undergraduate courses across the curriculum (Braine, 1995; Carson et al., 1992; Jackson et al., 2006) and in multiple undergraduate courses across the curriculum (Carson, 2001; Hale et al., 1996; Hirvela, 2004; Horowitz, 1986; Rosenfeld et al., 2001). Consistent with findings from these studies, the findings from this study show that across contexts, academic reading was a common task; however, it was also varied in genre. The participants encountered a lot of academic reading because there was a lot assigned for the courses they took during the study. For instance, the majority of the courses Andrew took during the study were introductory courses and required anywhere from 10 to 180 pages of reading per week. For Tiffany, there was more reading assigned in her humanities courses than in the other courses she took during the study, which is often the case because of the nature of academic literacies within the humanities. For Zack, there was more assigned reading in his First Year composition course rather than the humanities courses he took during the study.

Beyond the findings from other studies where participants did a lot of textbook reading (e.g., Jackson et al., 2006), those in this study are unique in that they show differences in the genres of academic reading. All three of the participants did a lot of reading in their first year of university study, but not only of textbooks, as one might assume. There were a variety of genres present in various contexts, including the introductory courses they negotiated, such as academic essays, newspapers, novels, screen plays, course handbooks, computer manuals, and poetry. So, in addition to being
the type of academic literacy that was most commonly found in the academic contexts in the first year, academic reading was also varied in genre. This reflects the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000), where literacy is viewed as being ideological in that there were multiple and changing academic literacies genres within and among contexts Andrew, Tiffany and Zack negotiated during the study.

Regarding academic writing genres and tasks, they were limited to certain contexts (unlike reading); however, like reading, there was somewhat of a variety of genres. Consistent with previous research findings (Harklau, 2001; Hirvela, 2004; Leki, 1999), the findings here indicate that the most substantial writing Andrew, Tiffany and Zack did in the first year of university study took place within their skills-based (writing) and humanities courses. For example, other than copying, which was the skill the case study participants utilized in most of their courses, the substantial writing they did occurred in their skills-based (writing) and/or humanities courses. Moreover, it was also the case that even though the academic contexts in which the participants were writing were limited, the genres they were writing within these contexts were varied, which also echoes findings in the literature (e.g., see Hirvela, 2004).

Beyond the findings from other studies, where participants did most academic writing in limited contexts, those of the present study are unique in that they show differences among academic writing genres within the same type of academic context. As previously stated, the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study all enrolled in a section of First Year composition at some point during the study. For the most part, the goals and objectives for this course were similar, that is, to develop students’ skills in expository writing, reading, critical thinking through written and oral expression, and
retrieve and use written information analytically and effectively. However, the findings of this study show that not all of the academic writing genres assigned as tasks in the sections of the course the participants took were similar, which reflects an ideological view of literacy (Street, 2000). Moreover, the findings of this study point to the fact that the academic reading the participants did in order to complete the academic writing tasks in this course were quite varied, ranging from textbook reading to academic essays to short stories and plays. These findings not only reflect an ideological view of literacy, but also reinforce the understanding of the situatedness of literacies (Barton et al., 2000). They also point to the importance of learners’ awareness of this situatedness in order to negotiate not only across but also within various academic contexts.

Another form of academic literacy included in the contexts the participants negotiated was information literacy. To date, most research that has been conducted on information literacy has focused on the incorporation of it in the First Year composition curriculum (Hearn, 2005; Knight, 2006; Samson & Millet, 2003). However, because of the increasingly information saturated society we live in, the need for information literacy skills across the curriculum has been identified, and studies have been carried out to examine the development and incorporation of information literacy tasks to help develop students’ information literacy skills within academic contexts other than First Year composition (see Feast, 2003; Fiegen et al., 2002; Mackey & Ho, 2005; Mackey & Jacobson, 2005). Although information literacy tasks were the least commonly assigned task within the academic contexts in this study compared to academic reading and academic writing, it was present in both the skills-based (writing) and introductory courses Andrew, Tiffany and Zack took during the study. The information literacies
tasks incorporated in these contexts were varied in regards to how wide and narrow the search parameters were for the tasks to be completed. For example, in Andrew and Zack’s biology course the parameters they were given for the New York Times project were quite narrow, requiring them to find four articles related to biology from The New York Times. On the other hand, the parameters for the research paper assignment for the First Year composition course were rather wide in comparison, requiring Andrew, Tiffany and Zack to find several sources rather than just several articles from one source.

Additionally, the information literacies tasks incorporated in these contexts were also varied in regards to how much information literacy proficiency the instructors assumed the participants (and students in the course) already had with this type of literacy. With regard to the New York Times project, Andrew and Zack reportedly had no difficulties finding the articles. However, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack faced various difficulties with finding sources for the research paper assignment in their First Year composition course. These findings reveal the literacy skills instructors assume students already possess in their first year of university study, in this case, information literacy, which is reflective of the Skills-Based Model of academic literacy (Lea & Street, 2000), where students acquire pre-determined knowledge and skills of the academic discourse community. If this is the prevalent model of academic socialization, why is it that instructors make the assumption that students already possess certain academic literacy skills, like information literacy? One possible answer to this question is that instructors assume students, particularly native speaking students as opposed to non-native speaking, already know how to use the library and are able to conduct effective source searches. And since Generation 1.5 learners are often categorized as native speaking students
because of their strong oral proficiency (Reid, 1997) and their prior experience in a U.S. K-12 setting, it may also be assumed that they possess these skills. However, this is not necessarily so, and the results from this study echo this. Andrew, for instance, had never used the library prior to his first year of university study, let alone conducted source searches. And although Tiffany and Zack had some experience with source searches prior to their first year of university study, they still had difficulties with conducting effective keyword searches and searching for secondary sources.

So, although Generation 1.5 learners are seemingly more experienced with academic literacies than traditional ESL learners because of their time in a U.S. K-12 setting prior to their first year of university study, it can not be assumed that they acquire the academic literacies skills needed to socialize into various academic discourse communities prior to their first year of university study. This highlights the need for the incorporation of specific instruction for information literacy tasks in the curricula that include information literacy.

Digital literacy was another form of academic literacy that was part of the academic contexts the participants negotiated, and like academic reading and academic writing, digital literacy tasks were found to be incorporated to some degree across all academic contexts studied, which is similar to the findings of Hirvela (2004). Also consistent with his findings and much like the findings regarding the information literacy of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study is the fact that the instructors assumed the students had a certain amount of digital literacy ability. During the interviews, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack reported having received instruction on digital literacy only in the courses they took in the first quarter of their university study. And because they
possessed relatively high levels of digital literacy proficiency from their prior experience with digital literacy in the American high schools they attended, they reported not facing much difficulty with the digital literacy tasks they encountered during the study. However, not all Generation 1.5 learners possess the same level of digital literacy proficiency as Andrew, Tiffany and Zack did in their first year of university study. For example, from my experience working with Generation 1.5 learners in a beginning level ESL composition course in the ESL Composition Program at the university the participants attended, I observed various types of difficulties these learners encountered with digital literacies because of inexperience with digital literacy. These difficulties ranged from turning on the computer to managing e-mail to basic word processing. Generation 1.5 learners with difficulties such as these would be disadvantaged in courses where the instructor assumed even basic levels of digital literacy proficiency of the students in their courses.

These findings highlight the frequency of digital literacy tasks in various academic contexts across the curriculum. They also underscore the need for digital literacy instruction for all (Generation 1.5) learners in courses that include digital literacy in order to carry out these tasks, as represented in Lea and Street’s (2000) Academic Literacies Model. This highlights the diversity of this group of learners (Harklau et al., 1999) and the need for the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) in understanding the academic socialization of a diverse group of learners such as this because of their varying levels of familiarity with academic literacies, such as digital literacy. The Academic Literacies Model helps us to see that because of the varying skill levels Generation 1.5 learners possess with academic literacies, their process of academic
socialization will be less linear and less predictable than what is anticipated by course instructors. With the use of the Academic Literacies Model, we can see the process by which Generation 1.5 learners are being socialized into academic discourse communities rather than focusing on their learning deficiencies, which in turn can help instructors better understand the academic socialization process from the students’ experience and perspective.

**Summary Regarding Research Question One**

In summary, the answer to research question number one focused on the academic contexts Andrew, Tiffany and Zack negotiated in their first year of university study in addition to the academic literacies genres and tasks they encountered in these contexts. The answer to this question highlights the different notions of academic literacies in and among the contexts the Generation 1.5 learners negotiated in this study based on the idea of literacies being multiple and situated (Barton et al., 2000; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). However, because these differences were not always explicit in the academic contexts they negotiated, the participants more or less had to figure these out on their own, which could be difficult for Generation 1.5 learners who, despite their experience with the American educational system, may still be relatively unfamiliar with the American university system because of it being their first year or were not necessarily independent learners (Sternberg, 1998).

Because the Generation 1.5 learners in this study, who had two years of American high school experience, had some familiarity with academic literacies in English prior to their first year at the university, this seemed to have given them some advantage when it came to understanding how to negotiate the university level academic contexts (Harklau,
2001; Schwartz, 2004), such as with digital literacy. In the case of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack, what they knew about digital literacy and what was expected of them with regard to the digital literacy tasks were similar. However, because what Andrew, Tiffany and Zack knew did not fully align with what was expected of them regarding academic reading, writing and information literacy, this caused some difficulties for them. In order to have a better picture of how they negotiated the various academic contexts, another point of focus of this study was to examine their academic literacies difficulties. These are discussed in the next section of this chapter, which addresses research question number two.

**Academic Literacies Difficulties**

Building upon the study’s first research question, the second question posed was:

What academic literacies difficulties did the Generation 1.5 learners in this study face in completing the academic literacies tasks they encountered in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

In order to better understand how the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study negotiated various academic contexts in their first year of university study, another focus of this study was to examine the specific academic literacies difficulties and the academic literacies practices the participants utilized to overcome these difficulties and complete the tasks that were present within the academic contexts they encountered. Noteworthy results from this examination provide evidence of a variety of academic literacies difficulties and practices both consistent with and deviant from the literature. These are discussed in more detail in this section of the chapter.
Academic Reading Difficulties

According to the literature, Generation 1.5 learners have several different kinds of difficulties with academic reading (Blanton, 2005; Harklau et al., 1999; Santos, 2004). With regard to the academic reading difficulties the Generation 1.5 learners in this study had with academic reading tasks they encountered, those in the First Year composition course were more difficult for Andrew and Tiffany compared to the academic reading tasks in other contexts they negotiated during the study. On the other hand, Zack reported no difficulties with academic reading in any of the contexts he negotiated during the study, including his First Year composition course, which is unlike what the research reports on the academic reading of Generation 1.5 learners and raises a question as to why Andrew and Tiffany encountered the same difficulty in their academic reading, whereas Zack did not, and once again points to the diversity of this group of learners and how the current descriptions of Generation 1.5 learners are inadequate (Harklau et al., 1999) and need to be reconfigured accordingly.

The specific difficulty Andrew and Tiffany reported having with academic reading was the lexicon they encountered in the reading, particularly for their First Year composition course. The topics of the readings for this course were much more varied than those included in other academic contexts the participants negotiated during the study and required a certain amount of background knowledge of the topics, which Andrew and Tiffany did not have. This may have been the reason for the difficulties they had. Not only was a lack of background knowledge a cause of their struggle with academic lexicon, but also the breadth and depth of the academic and content lexicon Andrew and Tiffany encountered in their reading, which inhibited their abilities to read-
to-comprehend, read-to-write, read-to-learn, and read-for-assessment purposes. This finding echoes other research findings on the difficulties Generation 1.5 learners face with academic reading, that is, the breadth and depth of academic and content (Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Lowry, 1999; Santos, 2004).

**Academic Writing Difficulties**

According to the literature, the difficulties Generation 1.5 learners have with academic writing include a lack of experience with writing (see Harklau et al., 1999). Unlike academic reading, where only Andrew and Tiffany encountered difficulties, with regard to academic writing, all three participants had difficulties with it, primarily in their First Year composition course. (Tiffany also had difficulties with the academic writing in her Japanese literature courses.) This may have been because the writing genres all three participants encountered in this context were different from what they had written before or were writing in the other courses they took during the study, which echoes to a certain degree the findings of Blanton’s (2001) multiple case study of four Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study and the differences they observed between their academic literacies experiences in high school compared to those at college. She found that her participants encountered academic writing genres they had not encountered in high school, which, for this reason, caused difficulties for them. Although Andrew, Tiffany and Zack had studied for two years in an American high school prior to their first year of university study, they reported doing very little academic writing during this time and very little writing that mirrored what they wrote in their First Year composition course. Moreover, Andrew and Tiffany, who took ESL composition courses in their first year of university study, did not encounter the same types of writing
genres in these courses as they did in their First Year composition course. This observation not only points to the participants’ lack of exposure to varied academic writing genres (Blanton, 2005; Harklau, 1998; Johns, 1999; Reid, 1997; Roberge, 2002), but also to the situatedness of literacy (Barton et al., 2000), where the notions of what academic writing was in their First Year composition course were different from the notions of academic writing present in their high school English Language Arts and university ESL composition courses. This finding not only highlights the situatedness of academic literacies but also sustains the myth of transience (Rose, 1985) that states courses like First Year composition are the panacea for the writing problems of undergraduate students. This observation also points to Andrew, Tiffany and Zack’s difficulties with academic writing stemming more from their novice level of socialization into academic discourse communities at the university level than their Generation 1.5 status.

Andrew’s most frequently discussed academic writing difficulties were with grammar and expression, and for Tiffany and Zack, developing content in their writing. There findings are partially consistent with the research on the academic writing difficulties of Generation 1.5 learners. Research on the academic writing of Generation 1.5 learners spotlights their difficulties with sentence level problems such as syntax, grammar and punctuation (Reid, 1997; Thonus, 2003). According to Reid (1997), the “ear learnedness” of Generation 1.5 learners is the primary way in which they learn English, which results in the subconscious acquisition of the grammatical system through trial and error based only on oral input and may be the reason for their struggles with it. That is, they do not necessarily learn the formal properties of English through listening
and have to rely on their intuition, which may have been the reason Andrew struggled with it so much in his own writing. While the difficulties Andrew faced with academic writing echo the literature, the difficulties Tiffany and Zack faced do not. A reason for this is that developing content in writing is not so much a “writer issue” as it is a “writing issue”, that is, developing content in writing is an issue for most writers in their first year of university study (Rose, 1985).

Not included in the discussion of the results in Chapter 5, but worth mentioning here, is one of the least frequently discussed academic writing difficulties of the participants, which was difficulties with revision. It is surprising that they so infrequently talked about difficulties with revision, because the literature shows that Generation 1.5 learners often come to university having had little opportunity to develop their revising practices (Ferris, 1999), which would lead one to expect these students to frequently discuss difficulties with writing revision. In her research on Generation1.5 student writers and teacher feedback, Ferris (1999) found that these students “had limited strategies for utilizing it in subsequent writing tasks” (p. 147). She also found that “…immigrant student writers may ignore or avoid comments when they do not feel competent to make the changes necessitated by those comments, even deleting material rather than attempting to improve it…”(1999, p. 154).

Part of the reason Generation 1.5 learners have little opportunity to develop these practices is that the practices may not necessarily be taught in the K-12 setting. For instance, in Hillocks’ (2002) research on the influence of standardized testing on the K-12 curriculum, particularly writing instruction, he found that students may not receive instruction on all stages of the writing process, including revision. So, even though
Generation 1.5 learners may come to the university with U.S. high school academic writing experience, they may not have practiced all the parts of the writing process. Consequently, they may not have had the opportunity to develop their revising practices. However, this was not the case with the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study. One reason for this is that the participants viewed their instructors as the greatest source of academic literacies practice (another finding in this study discussed later in this chapter) and knew to talk with them about writing revisions. Andrew, Tiffany and Zack discussed writing revisions with their instructors either via e-mail or face-to-face for almost every writing assignment they did rather than just relying on the instructors’ notes for revision written in the margins of their assignments. In general, knowing to talk with their instructors may have come from the participants’ U.S. K-12 schooling experience, where it is common to talk with teachers about coursework. Knowing to talk about writing revisions with their instructors, for Andrew and Tiffany, may have come from the practice of writing tutorials that was modeled for them in the ESL composition courses they took in their first year of university study. It is not exactly clear as to why Zack knew to consult his instructor for help with his writing revisions; nevertheless, he did, which may be the reason why the participants did not discuss encountering difficulties with revising their writing.

**Information Literacy Difficulties**

Most of the literature on the academic literacies difficulties of Generation 1.5 learners focuses on the difficulties they have with academic reading and academic writing; very little focuses on their difficulties with information literacy. However, according to the small amount of research carried out on the information literacy of
Generation 1.5 learners, the difficulties they have with information literacy include obstacles to library access and finding sources (Case & Asher, in preparation). The difficulties with information literacy all three participants in this study experienced were with the information literacy tasks assigned in the contexts of their ESL and First Year composition courses. The most frequently discussed difficulty with information literacy all three participants faced was finding appropriate sources and keywords with which to search. For Andrew, this included the length of time it took for him to find sources for his research paper. For Tiffany, the difficulty had more to do with locating keywords by which to search for sources for her research paper. The specific difficulty Zack had with source searches was finding secondary sources for his research paper. A reason why the participants encountered these difficulties may have been a lack of proficiency with this skill. According to the participant interviews, their experience with information literacy was quite limited. Very few of the academic literacies tasks the participants completed in their U.S. high school contexts included information literacy, and very few of the academic contexts they negotiated in their first year of university study required information literacy skills. Those contexts that required information literacy skills assumed the participants (and other students in the class) already possessed a certain level of proficiency with this skill.

The participants’ lack of experience with information literacy points to the situatedness of literacy (Barton et al., 2000), where information literacy was “more situated” in the first year of university study because it was only included in a few academic contexts Andrew, Tiffany and Zack negotiated. In subsequent years of university study, the participants may also find that information literacy may be “more
situated”, meaning it may be included across all academic contexts they negotiate. The assumption that the participants in this study already possessed information literacy skills in their first year of university study points to Lea and Street’s (2000) Skills-Based Model and the notion that pre-established knowledge and skills are what students need to learn in order to become part of an academic discourse community. At times, this pre-established knowledge and skills are made explicit by, for example, the course instructor; however, at other times this is not so, thus leaving it up to students to figure out on their own the knowledge and skills needed to become part of an academic discourse community (see Bartholomae, 1985). Because the participants in this study were new to the academic discourse communities they negotiated in their first year of university study, and the practices of information literacy and skills they needed to successfully complete information literacy tasks were not always made explicit, they encountered difficulties with them.

**Digital Literacy Difficulties**

Like the dearth of literature on Generation 1.5 learners and information literacy, there is also a dearth of literature on Generation 1.5 learners and digital literacy. One reason may be that among the academic contexts the Generation 1.5 learners in this study encountered, digital literacy was the type they reported having the least difficulty with. These findings echo those of Sokolik’s (2003) study of digital literacy and ESL learners, where the learners had more experience with technology than even the course professors, so that they encountered fewer difficulties with it than their professors. The Generation 1.5 learners in this study reported that they had some experience with technology prior to the study, such as word processing, e-mailing, blogging, online chatting, and surfing the
Internet, all of which seemed to help them with the digital literacy tasks in the academic contexts they negotiated. Of the three participants, Andrew was the only one who reported difficulties with digital literacy tasks, primarily in the contexts of his First Year composition and chemistry courses in terms of reading/writing online. Andrew reported that eye strain and distractions caused by the technology itself created difficulties with reading and writing online, and echo the findings of Crosby’s (in preparation) case study of the print and screen reading difficulties and practices of a Generation 1.5 learner in her first year of university study, and the findings of Hirvela’s (2004) multiple case study of the computer-based reading and writing of two undergraduate ESL learners.

**Summary Regarding Research Question Two**

In summary, the answer to research question number two, which focused on Andrew, Tiffany and Zack’s academic literacies difficulties, highlights three aspects regarding these difficulties: 1) The difficulties the participants encountered with academic literacies tasks across various academic contexts were not the same for each of the participants, which points to the diversity within this group of learners and how the current descriptions of Generation 1.5 learners are inadequate (Harklau et al., 1999) and need to be reconfigured accordingly. 2) It should come as no surprise that the participants in this study encountered difficulties with academic literacies tasks. Just because they came to the university with U.S. high school literacy experience, it cannot be assumed that this experience prepared them for their university literacy experience. Therefore, it should be expected that they would encounter difficulties with academic literacies in their first year of university study. 3) The difficulties the participants in this study encountered with academic literacies were not necessarily because of their
Generation 1.5 status but because literacy is situated (Barton et al., 2000), where notions of academic literacy differed within and among the academic contexts the participants negotiated during the study. In order to better understand the academic literacies of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack, another focus of this study was to examine the academic literacies practices the participants utilized to overcome difficulties and complete tasks they encountered in the academic contexts they negotiated. These are discussed in the next section of this chapter, which addresses the third research question.

**Academic Literacies Practices**

Building upon the study’s second research question, the third research question posed was:

What academic literacies practices did the Generation 1.5 learners utilize to overcome the academic literacies difficulties they encountered with academic literacies tasks in various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

**Academic Reading Practices**

With regards to academic literacies practices, the literature on Generation 1.5 learners discusses two categories of practices they employ: their oral literacy strength (Reid, 1997) and their experience in the U.S. K-12 context (Schwartz, 2004). However, only one of these practices, experience in the U.S. K-12 context, applied to the specific academic literacies Andrew and Tiffany encountered during this study. Consequently, the literature used to discuss the academic literacies practices of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study comes mostly from the ESL literature. According to the literature on practices of academic reading, strong ESL readers use more and a wider variety of practices than weak readers (Anderson, 1991). In regards to specific reading practices, Kern (1994) found that even though the use of translation in reading has been viewed as a
“bad habit”, some ESL readers use it effectively as a practice for semantic processing, consolidation of meaning with different texts, concentration, and comprehension confirmation. In this study, only Andrew and Tiffany reported utilizing the academic reading practices they had access to in order to help them overcome difficulties with academic reading or to complete academic reading tasks in their first year and ESL composition and Japanese literature courses. (Like with academic reading difficulties, Zack did not discuss any academic reading practices.) Although Andrew did not discuss utilizing lexicon practices as frequently as Tiffany did in the interviews, he did report using the dictionary to help his reading of outside sources to incorporate in the research paper for his First Year composition course. For Tiffany, the most frequently discussed category was lexicon-based practices, such as the use of a dictionary, the use of her L1, the use of margin notes, the use of an electronic translator, guessing meaning from context; and pronunciation. What this shows is the differing levels of reading proficiency of Generation 1.5 learners. According to Anderson (1991), Andrew was a weaker reading because of his limited lexicon-based practices, whereas Tiffany was a stronger reader because of her large repertoire of lexicon-based practices. Despite the difference in the number of lexicon-based practices between the participants, the use of these indicates notions of academic literacy as determined by Andrew and Tiffany rather than the instructor, which is representative of the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000). These notions of literacy include the idea that academic reading can be understood and the ways in which one can go about understanding it.

Not included in the discussion of the results in Chapter 5 but worth noting here is the academic reading practice all three participants least frequently discussed using to
help them with their reading, which was consulting lecture notes. One reason this is surprising is that the amount of note taking the participants reported doing during the study. Rather than the participants using their notes as a means for helping them with the reading, they reported using these as a substitute for the reading. Consequently, the amount of reading the participants did during the study decreased and the amount of note taking they did increased, which is consistent with much of the previous research on note taking that shows the use of lecture notes as a substitute for academic reading (Harklau, 2001; Parry, 1991; VanMeter et al., 1994). Another reason this finding is noteworthy is that it points to two differing notions of socialization: that of the instructor, who believes students learn the knowledge they need to gain entrée into academic discourse communities best by reading, which reflects the Academic Socialization Model (Lea & Street, 2000), and that of the case study participants, who believe they obtain the knowledge they need to gain entrée into some academic discourse communities by using their course notes, which reflects the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000). The instructor’s notion of academic socialization reflects a pre-determined notion of what the acquisition of academic literacy consists of, that is, reading the textbook, and that by reading the textbook, students acquire the knowledge and skills that are required to become members of the academic discourse community. On the other hand, the participants’ notions of academic literacy reflect a different notion of literacy that was based on their experience negotiating academic contexts. For example, in contexts where literacy included large amounts of textbook reading and course notes which overlapped with the reading, the participants developed their own notion of literacy in response to this which, in this instance, differed from their instructor’s notion. This not only reflects
more of an ideological view of literacy but also highlights how the Generation 1.5 learners in this study approached this particular aspect of the academic socialization process in their first year of university study.

**Academic Writing Practices**

In response to difficulties with academic writing, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack discussed utilizing more academic writing practices than academic reading practices, primarily in their First Year composition and Japanese literature courses. The most frequently discussed practices were the use of composing processes (e.g., freewriting, multiple drafting, revising); following instructors’ feedback; and writing development. Because of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack’s previous academic writing experience in their high school ELA classes and in the ESL and First Year composition courses, they had some familiarity with the stages in the writing process and seemed to understand the purpose of them, which exemplifies what the literature says about Generation 1.5 learners drawing upon their U.S. K-12 literacy experience being a practice. This is not to say that they had fully developed the ability to successfully complete the tasks that comprise these stages (see Ferris, 1999); nonetheless, based on their previous experience, they were familiar with these stages. What is noteworthy about the second academic writing practice - following instructors’ feedback on writing - is that it contradicts what the literature says about the revising practices of Generation 1.5 learners. As previously mentioned, Ferris (1999) found that the Generation 1.5 learners in her study had limited revising practices. However, the participants in this study knew to follow their instructors’ feedback as a practice for improving their writing. Finally, with regard to the practice utilized for developing content in their writing, Andrew, Tiffany and Zack
discussed utilizing different types of sources, such as worksheets, textbooks, and tutorials. This highlights the diverse learning practices of these Generation 1.5 learners, which are often overlooked in the discussions of this group of learners in the literature. For instance, while Andrew and Tiffany utilized more generalized practices for development in their writing with the use of worksheets and the course textbook, Zack utilized a more individualized practice, that of face-to-face writing tutorials, in which he was able to acquire the individualized attention he needed as a Generation 1.5 writer to develop his writing rather than the more generalized practices of worksheets and the course textbook might not offer. These findings spotlight not only similar but also different academic writing practices of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study. These findings point to their diversity as language learners and their different approaches to the socialization process (Lea & Street, 2000).

**Information Literacy Practices**

As previously pointed out, most of the literature on the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners focuses on their academic reading and academic writing; very little focuses on their information literacy. Nonetheless, a focus of this study was on the information literacy of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack. The information literacy practices all three participants reported using to help them overcome difficulties they encountered with information literacy tasks were primarily for their ESL and First Year composition courses. The most frequently discussed information literacy practices were using Google and online databases. Because of Andrew’s unfamiliarity with the library and searching for sources, his information literacy practices were seemingly more elementary than Tiffany and Zack’s. He discussed finding books online using the library database,
whereas Tiffany discussed finding journals online with the use of Google and online databases and Zack discussed searching for journal articles and reports with the use of two well-known journal databases. What this shows is the range of information literacy practices the participants utilized to complete information literacy tasks for courses which highlights the diversity of experience these learners possessed and utilized, and challenges, to some extent, the prevailing discussions of the deficiencies of these kinds of learners presented in most of the Generation 1.5 literature (see Harklau et al., 1999).

**Digital Literacy Practices**

Although digital literacy was a part of the academic contexts Andrew, Tiffany and Zack negotiated during the study, the practices they reported utilizing to complete digital literacy tasks were minimal. As previously mentioned, of the academic literacies the Generation 1.5 learners in this study encountered, digital literacy was the type they reported having the least difficulty with. Consequently, there was little discussion of digital literacy practices, which speaks to the preparedness of these learners (see Sokolik, 2003). The Generation 1.5 learners in this study reported having experience with technology prior to the study that consisted of word processing, e-mailing, blogging, online chatting, and surfing the Internet, and helped them with the digital literacy tasks in the academic contexts they negotiated. However, based on my work with other Generation 1.5 learners and as previously pointed out in this chapter, not all Generation 1.5 learners possess the same level of digital literacy proficiency as Andrew, Tiffany and Zack did in their first year of university study. Hence, it is important to realize, in some cases, the different levels of digital literacy proficiency of Generation 1.5 learners.
Summary Regarding Research Question Three

In summary, the answer to the third research question, which focused on Andrew, Tiffany and Zack’s academic literacies practices, highlights three aspects regarding the utilization of these practices: 1) The practices the participants utilized to complete and overcome difficulties with various academic literacies tasks were the same in some instances and different in others. Moreover, the amount and type of practices the participants utilized points to their different levels of academic literacies and learning styles. This again points to the diversity within this group of learners. The diversity in Andrew, Tiffany and Zack’s repertoire of academic literacies practices challenges, to some extent, the prevailing discussions of the deficiencies of these learners presented in most of the Generation 1.5 literature (e.g., Harklau et al., 1999). 2) The academic literacies practices utilized by Andrew, Tiffany and Zack point to differing notions of academic literacies and academic socialization as determined by the participants themselves rather than, for example, the course instructors and how they approached different aspects of the academic socialization process in their first year of university study (Lea & Street, 2000). 3) The utilization of some practices shows the positive influence the participants’ U.S. K-12 literacy experience had on their university literacy experience (Schwartz, 2004).

In order to further understand the academic literacy experiences of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack, one other focus of this study was to examine their sources of academic literacies practices. These are discussed in the next section of this chapter, which addresses the fourth research question.
Sources of Academic Literacies Practices

The final question the study investigated was:

What were the sources of academic literacies practices the Generation 1.5 learners utilized to assist them in navigating the various academic contexts in their first year of university study?

In order to better understand how the three Generation 1.5 learners negotiated academic contexts in their first year of university study, another focus of this study was to examine the specific sources of academic literacies practices the participants utilized to overcome difficulties and complete tasks that were present within the academic contexts they negotiated. The results from this examination provide evidence of a single source of academic literacies practices, a finding which is consistent with the literature and discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs. In her study of how the writing of twenty L1 students developed over four years of undergraduate study, Carroll (2002) found that the instructors were a key source of academic literacies practices for the participants. She states that many of them reported working closely with their instructors, particularly on revising their writing. Leki (2003a) discusses something similar in the multiple case study she did with ESL learners over their four years at the university. She describes the academic literacies practices the participants’ instructors provided as follows: “…when writing for writing’s sake was assigned, the disciplinary instructors typically provided quite detailed instructions for completing these assignments and thereby did, in that sense, model elements of disciplinary discourse, perhaps most notably what the discipline values in its discourse” (p. 328).

For Andrew, Tiffany and Zack, sources of academic literacies practices were frequently discussed with regard to their First Year composition course; Tiffany also
discussed these sources with regard to her Japanese literature courses. The most frequently discussed source of academic literacies practices, specifically for academic reading and academic writing, was the participants’ instructors, who the participants saw as those who possessed knowledge of academic literacies, either as a substitution for (Andrew) and supplemental to (Tiffany and Zack) the academic literacies practices they already possessed. Although they discussed accessing other sources of academic literacies practices, they reported that it was the instructors’ practices that mattered most in completing academic literacies tasks, which echoes what the participant Dave said in McCarthy’s (1987) case study of the academic literacies practices of an L1 learner.

Moreover, the academic context seemed to have an influence on the participants’ source of academic literacies practices. As previously stated, the greatest source of academic literacies practices for the participants in this study was their instructor, more specifically the instructor for their First Year composition course, which raises the question as to why this was. It could have been because two of the three participants reported having more difficulties with academic literacies within this context than any of the other contexts they negotiated during the study. Or it could have been because the number of students in the sections of First Year composition was smaller than the size of the lecture courses the participants took, so the participants felt the instructor was more approachable and had more time for individual attention. Also, because writing tutorials were part of the course structure, instructors were positioned to be more approachable and consequently viewed by the participants as a source of academic literacies practices.
Summary Regarding Research Question Four

In summary, the answer to the final research question, which examined the participants’ sources of academic literacies practices, reveals an important aspect of this source. Although the primary source of academic literacies practices was the participants’ instructors, which is to be expected, what is noteworthy about this finding is how the participants positioned the practices they received from this source along with their own. As previously mentioned, Andrew used the practices from this source as a substitute for his own academic literacies practices, whereas Tiffany and Zack used the practices from this source as a supplement to their own. Andrew’s use of this practice is a reflection of the Academic Socialization Model (Lea & Street, 2000), where his approach was to acquire the knowledge and skills determined by the instructor. However, Tiffany and Zack’s use of the instructors’ practices reflects the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000), where their approach to the academic socialization process involved their academic literacies identities and a restructuring of the hierarchical structure underlying the acquisition of practices, where the instructors’ practices replaces that of the students’. Instead, Tiffany and Zack created a linear structure of knowledge acquisition with their academic literacies practices juxtaposed with their instructors’. This is significant in that it shows how these Generation 1.5 learners created room for their academic literacies practices rather than allowing them to be replaced by the instructors’, which is the traditional view of academic socialization.

Section Summary and Overview

To summarize the answers to the research questions that shaped this study on the academic socialization and academic literacies experiences of three Generation 1.5
learners in their first year of university study, four important characteristics about their academic socialization emerged from the answers to the research questions that shaped this study. 1) The situatedness of academic literacies is sometimes the cause of difficulties with academic literacies rather than the Generation 1.5 status. 2) The Generation 1.5 learners in this study had notions of academic literacies which revealed a less linear, different approach to and interpretation of the academic socialization process than traditional notions of academic literacies and socialization. This provides us with a learner’s perspective of this process rather than another instructor’s perspective. 3) There is diversity in regard to academic literacies difficulties and practices within this group of learners. 4) The U.S. K-12 literacy experience of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study was an advantage to them as they negotiated various academic contexts in their first year of university study. These characteristics are discussed in more detail in the following section of this chapter.

**Generation 1.5 Learners Negotiating Academic Contexts**

From the answers to the research questions that shaped this study, several important characteristics regarding the Generation 1.5 learners’ negotiation of academic contexts emerged and lead us to a better understanding of their academic socialization and literacy learning processes. One of the characteristics regarding the negotiation process of the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study that emerged is that the situatedness of academic literacies is the cause of some difficulties with academic literacies for Generation 1.5 learners, rather than their Generation 1.5 learner status. This is significant because of the important distinction that is made between the causes of difficulties with academic literacies for Generation 1.5 learners. Much of the literature
on Generation 1.5 learners points to their learning deficiencies as the primary reason for their difficulties with academic literacies (e.g., Harklau et al., 1999). While this may be true with some Generation 1.5 learners, it is not necessarily true with all learners, as evidenced by the results from this study. Furthermore, because much of the literature on Generation 1.5 learners points to their language learning deficiencies as the source of their difficulties with academic literacies, the idea that there may be other sources of difficulties rather than their Generation 1.5 learner status is often overlooked. The findings from this study reveal another source for their difficulties – the situatedness of academic literacies. The situatedness of academic literacies in this study highlights how they are multiple, changing and, in some cases, competing, differing from one academic context to another, which reflects the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000).

Another characteristic regarding the academic socialization of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack that was discovered was that they possessed notions of academic literacies which revealed a less linear, different approach to and interpretation of the academic socialization and literacy learning process than, for example, their instructors. This differing notion of academic literacies as determined by the participants rather than the instructor reflects the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000). It includes the participants’ understanding of what academic literacies are and how this understanding is reflected in their academic literacies practices. For example, Andrew’s understanding of academic contexts was apparent in his discussion of the expected academic literacies genres in certain academic contexts. In his first year of study, Andrew developed a sense of the standard types of academic literacies genres in the courses he took and consequently learned to expect these to be present in other academic contexts. When
they were absent from an academic context, this raised questions for Andrew. For instance, Andrew’s developing understanding of academic literacies genres was present in his inquiry about there being a final exam in his English 110 course. In most of the other courses Andrew took, there was a final exam genre, so his expectation was that this genre would be present in all courses. However, this was not the case in his English 110 course. His anticipation of the presence of certain academic literacies genres in particular academic contexts highlights a part of Andrew’s developing understanding of academic literacies.

Other instances of the case study participants’ notions of academic literacies were evidenced in their discussion of possessing a “feel for good writing”. Tiffany and Zack both articulated what they meant by “feeling good writing” specifically with academic literacies tasks assigned in their First Year composition course. Tiffany’s discussion of this included her understanding and interpretation of the instructor’s expectations for the course, which included an ability to identify the parts of an academic essay, how these parts should be connected within an essay, an understanding of the reasons why she did not get a good grade on the summary analysis assignment for the course, and an ability to include parts of the academic essay into her own writing. Tiffany’s understanding of academic writing provides insight into how she was able to negotiate this particular academic context and the tasks within it. In Zack’s discussion of his feel for good writing, he pointed out that his feeling was not based on his instructor’s feedback or the final grade but him intuitively knowing that his writing would be good if he had the right motivation for writing and devoted time to it.
A third characteristic of the academic socialization and literacy learning process of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study that was discovered was the differences among their levels of academic literacies proficiency, and academic literacies difficulties and practices, which points to the diversity within this group of learners. As previously discussed, current definitions of Generation 1.5 learners in the literature are limited (Harklau et al., 1999) and tend to reduce the diversity of this group of learners rather than highlight it. Of the current definitions of Generation 1.5 learners in the literature, there do not seem to be any promising ones to account for the diversity among within this group of learners. For example, Reid’s (1997) definition of eye and ear learners distinguishes between Generation 1.5 and traditional ESL learners. However, when applied to the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study, this characterization does not necessarily seem to apply to them. Evidence of Andrew being an “ear learner” is seen in his discussion of models of good literacy, which he bases on a person’s ability to discuss writing rather than actually examining their writing. Evidence of Tiffany being an “ear learner” is her native-like oral proficiency. There did not seem to be any evidence of Zack being an “ear learner”. As evidenced in this study, there is more diversity in this group of learners than what definitions in the literature acknowledge. This finding calls for the coining of another term in order to account for the diversity of this group of learners.

One other characteristic of the academic socialization and literacy learning process of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study that was discovered was the advantage the U.S. K-12 literacy experience provided Andrew, Tiffany and Zack as they negotiated academic contexts. As previously discussed, the literature on Generation 1.5
learners highlights primarily two learning strengths, that is, their oral literacy (Reid, 1997) and their U.S. K-12 literacy experience (Schwartz, 2004). The results from this study reveal that Andrew, Tiffany and Zack’s U.S. K-12 literacy experience served as an advantage to them as they negotiated the various academic contexts in their first year of university study, which echoes the findings of Harklau’s (2001). For example, to a certain extent, their experience familiarized them with academic literacies, such as textbook reading and note taking, which they also encountered in their first year of university study. Their U.S. K-12 experience also familiarized them with the American educational system, which helped them with the academic socialization process. This, along with the three other important characteristics of Andrew, Tiffany and Zack’s negotiation of academic contexts, provide us with insight into the process they went through in learning the academic literacies they encountered in their first year of university.

The Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) was chosen as the best frame among others, such as the Skills-Based and the Academic Socialization Models (Lea & Street, 2000), for this study because it presents more of a complete understanding of the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study, despite the idea of academic socialization within this model needing more clarification. For example, the Skills-Based Model focuses only on the skills students learn when acquiring academic literacies, whereas the Academic Literacies Model focuses on the processes of acquiring academic literacies. The results of this study highlight several aspects of the process that Andrew, Tiffany and Zack went
through as they negotiated academic contexts in their first year, such as developing a better understanding of the situatedness of academic literacies.

Another model of academic literacies that is yet another incomplete understanding of the academic literacies experiences of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study is the Academic Socialization Model (Lea & Street, 2000). The view of academic literacy within this model is static, in other words, there is no variation in literacy from one context to another. However, the results from this study point to a dynamic view of literacy, that is, the academic literacies the participants encountered from one context to the next were different, even within the same context the notion of literacy differed. Furthermore, the Academic Socialization Model focuses only on the tasks that students are required to complete in order to become effective participants in the academic discourse community. Whereas the Academic Literacies Model focuses on the academic literacies practices of the students, which was a primary focus of this study, and showed us not only what difficulties Andrew, Tiffany and Zack encountered with academic literacies, but also what practices they used in order to overcome these difficulties and complete the required tasks. This helps us to have a better understanding of the nonlinear and unpredictable process of acquiring academic literacies the participants went through in their first year of university study. It also helps us to better see what the participants’ notions of academic literacy were and that they sometimes differed from their instructors’ notions of academic literacies, which were more static. Finally, the use of the Academic Literacies Model as the frame for this study helps us to see how academic discourse communities are changed by Generation 1.5 learners’ negotiation of them, rather than believing they remain unchanged, which is an Academic Socialization Model view.
In addition to the use of the Academic Literacies Model to frame this study for a more complete understanding of the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study, the use of the Academic Literacies Model as a frame for this study has resulted in its extension. One way in which the model was extended by this study was from the use of it to look at the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners. In Lea and Street’s (2000) original application of it, they used it to examine the academic literacies experiences of L1 learners. However, because of the academic literacies differences between L1, ESL and Generation 1.5 learners, as previously discussed in Chapter 2, it could be assumed that their academic literacies experiences may not be the same when compared with each other. It was with this assumption that the Academic Literacies Model was used as a lens through which to examine the academic literacies experiences of the three Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study. By doing so, it provides a better understanding of the academic literacies and socialization process of this particular group of learners, and how they are similar to and different from them in these regards to other groups of learners.

Another way in which the Academic Literacies Model was extended by the use of it as a frame for this study was by using it to look not only at the Generation 1.5 learners’ academic writing but also at the other academic literacies that are interconnected with academic writing, such as academic reading and information literacy, which the participants encountered in the various academic contexts they negotiated in their first year of university study. By using the model in this way, one can have a better picture of the multiple literacies in various academic contexts and how they play a role in the academic writing that is done within these contexts. By examining these other literacies,
we are then able to better determine the sources of difficulties with academic literacies that students like Generation 1.5 learners might have with academic writing tasks.

The discussion of the academic literacies experiences of Generation 1.5 learners and the Academic Literacies Model, as well as the answers to the research questions that shaped this study, suggest that instructors and researchers should clearly understand the complexity of academic literacies and the diversity within the group labeled Generation 1.5 learners. This point, then, leads to the discussion of the pedagogical implications that arise from the results of this study, and are discussed in the next section of this chapter.

**Pedagogical Implications**

The major findings of this study suggest that instructors and researchers should clearly understand the complexity of academic literacies and the diversity within the group labeled Generation 1.5 learners. These findings provide valuable insight into issues regarding teaching and curriculum and professional development that instructors can consider and possibly change to account for Generation 1.5 learners as they negotiate academic contexts in their first year of university study. One of the major findings regarding the academic socialization of the three Generation 1.5 learners in this study was that the situatedness of academic literacies is the cause of some difficulties with academic literacies for Generation 1.5 learners rather than their status. This finding points to the pedagogical implication of helping Generation 1.5 learners better understand the situatedness of academic literacies through our pedagogy. These students can better understand the situatedness of academic literacies through the representations we include of them in our courses, such as in our course syllabi or in course assignment descriptions. By making expectations for course tasks explicit in course syllabi and assignment
descriptions, students can have a clear understanding of what academic literacies are in that particular context and then be able to juxtapose this understanding with their understanding of academic literacies in other contexts. They can also better understand the situatedness of academic literacies with the use of assignments that raise their awareness of the differences and similarities of academic literacies in various contexts by being ethnographers of academic literacies (see Hirvela, 1999). In these ways, we can help to raise the awareness of the situatedness of academic literacies for the Generation 1.5 learners in our courses.

Another important finding in this study is the Generation 1.5 learners’ notions of academic literacies, which revealed a less linear, different approach to and interpretation of the academic socialization process than, for example, their instructors. This includes the participants’ understanding of what academic literacies are and how this understanding is reflected in their academic literacies practices. Models of academic literacies and socialization (Lea & Street, 2000) were used as a lens through which this study was viewed. The Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000) highlights a pedagogical implication of this study which is knowing more about Generation 1.5 learners’ notions of academic literacies. So much of the literature on academic socialization presents the instructors’ perspective which focuses on the academic literacies tasks the Generation 1.5 learners have completed rather than from the learners’ perspective which focuses on how they have gone about completing the academic literacies tasks. This model helps us to adjust our focus to look at the Generation 1.5 learners’ process of academic socialization and literacy learning rather than just their products. From knowing more about this process, we can better understand them as
learners and use this understanding to possibly help other Generation 1.5 learners who may be struggling with the process.

In terms of teaching and curriculum development, instructors must keep in mind that they may have Generation 1.5 learners in their courses and critically examine their pedagogy to see that it is as inclusive as it can be. For example, academic lexicon was one of the most frequent difficulties the Generation 1.5 learners in this study faced in their academic reading. However, as previously mentioned, academic lexicon was not part of the teaching and curricula examined in this study, with the exception of the ESL composition course Tiffany took. Based on knowing about the difficulty with academic lexicon Generation 1.5 learners have, the place for and instruction for developing academic lexicon in the ESL and First Year composition curricula is something instructors should consider. Although Generation 1.5 learners may possess practices for deciphering academic lexicon, they may not always be effective. For example, Parry’s study (1991) that looks at how L2 learners develop their academic vocabularies examines the practice of guessing meaning from context. The results show that none of the participants in her study were effective in doing this, which raises the question of how effective this practice is. Folse (2004) echoes what Parry (1991) found in his review of several studies on the strategy of learning vocabulary from context. He highlights findings that further explicate why some lexicon practices, like guessing from context, are not always effective. For example, with the practice of guessing the meaning from context, studies show that the context in which an unknown word appears is not always clear and guessing requires a vast vocabulary (Pino-Silva, 1993; Schatz & Baldwin, 1996). Consequently, it is important for instructors to examine their teaching and
curricula to ensure they are meeting Generation 1.5 learners’ academic literacies needs and helping them to establish and/or adjust the academic literacies practices they may already possess.

Furthermore, although this discussion primarily focuses on the academic reading difficulty of lexicon, it is important not to overlook the role that academic reading plays in all university courses. The results of this study indicate that the primary form of academic literacy of the Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study was academic reading and included large amounts of it. According to the research literature, a lack of direct vocabulary instruction at the secondary school level and in university course curricula can leave Generation 1.5 learners feeling overwhelmed with the seemingly enormous task of navigating these large amounts of reading in the limited time between class meetings (Blanton, 1999). Moreover, academic reading instruction is often neglected in the ESL and First Year composition classroom for several reasons, such as a lack of time and space in the composition curriculum and the assumption that students already possess certain background knowledge that enables them to comprehend assigned academic texts (see Carson & Leki, 1993). As previously stated, many Generation 1.5 learners may be inexperienced academic readers (Blanton, 2005), as a result of not having had much experience with this in high school, in English, and often in their L1s. Consequently, their academic reading (and writing) skills are often hampered by this. This calls for courses on academic reading offered in the first year of university study that include academic vocabulary with curricula designed with the academic literacies needs of Generation 1.5 learners, and possibly other learners with similar academic literacies needs, in mind (Zhang, 2004).
From the results of this study, we can also see that instructors were the greatest source of academic literacies practices for the case study participants, which indicates the importance of critically examining our academic literacies practices. Some questions that can aid us in examining and reflecting on our academic literacies practices are: Are the academic literacies practices I am utilizing to help my students effective for them? Do my students know how to apply these practices to their learning situations to effectively overcome learning difficulties they encounter? What changes do I need to make in my academic literacies practices to be more helpful to the diverse Generation 1.5 learners I am teaching? How can I help Generation 1.5 learners tap into and apply the academic literacies practices they already possess when they come to my classroom? What can I do in order to learn more about their academic literacies practices?

Because the negotiation of anything involves two parties, it is important to remember that although the focus of this study was primarily on the students, the course instructors obviously play an important role in this negotiation process as well, which is by presenting course expectations to students in various forms. However, a mantra of the participants in this study was the importance of knowing what the instructors expected of them, like it was for Dave in McCarthy’s study (1987). For some courses, this was clearly stated in written form in the course syllabi and assignment descriptions as well as orally in class; however, for other courses, this was not the case. Consequently, like others in the field have, I would like to issue another call to instructors to explicitly and repeatedly articulate their expectations regarding academic literacies to students in several forms throughout the duration of a course, keeping in mind what it means to be new to an academic discourse community, and that how instructors conceptualize
entrance into and participation in a community is not necessarily the way in which students conceptualize this, particularly Generation 1.5 learners who have experience in differing educational systems.

The findings of this study also highlight the different difficulties the participants had with academic literacies. For instance, as discussed above, Andrew and Tiffany reported difficulties with lexicon in their academic reading, whereas Zack reported no difficulties with academic reading in any of the contexts he negotiated during the study, including his First Year composition course, which is unlike what the research reports on the academic reading of Generation 1.5 learners and raises the question as to why Andrew and Tiffany encountered the same difficulty in their academic reading, whereas Zack did not. With regard to academic writing, grammar was a frequent problem Andrew discussed having with academic writing in the writing he did primarily for his First Year composition course. Consequently, grammar instruction for Generation 1.5 learners in ESL and First Year composition courses is important and may include what Valdes (1992) suggests, which is providing students with editing exercises that target their fossilized errors. At the same time, it is important to keep in mind that most Generation 1.5 learners do not possess the meta-language of English grammar that the majority of traditional ESL learners do. Generation 1.5 learners learn grammar through oral input by forming rules of the language and practicing these rules in a seemingly unsystematic way. On the other hand, traditional ESL students learn English grammar through textbooks and exercises that were part of the grammar courses they took in their own countries prior to coming to the U.S. From this learning experience, they developed a meta-language of English grammar. Because Generation 1.5 learners do not possess a
meta-language for grammar, it is important to make sure the grammar work we provide them in our courses is understandable to them, with minimal grammar jargon, keeping in mind that they are learning how to use grammar rather than learning about grammar.

In contrast to Andrew, development of writing content was a difficulty Tiffany and Zack discussed having with academic writing. These results echo the case studies done by Frodesen and Starna (1999), which show that Generation 1.5 learners also struggle with the rhetorical issue of writing development. Practices for writing development need to be taught to Generation 1.5 learners, and other students with similar academic writing needs in courses, like ESL and First Year composition, which focus primarily on issues of academic writing. This can be done by explaining to the learners how to develop content in their writing and providing them with readings that are understandable to the learners. As previously discussed, Andrew and Tiffany had difficulties in understanding the readings they were assigned to write on for their First Year composition courses. However, the problems they had with these readings made it difficult for them to complete the assigned writing tasks. Therefore, it is important for instructors to carefully choose readings to include as part of writing tasks and to not assume readers have a certain level of background knowledge or cultural knowledge.

Another means of helping Generation 1.5 learners develop their writing is by providing them with various exercises and activities that introduce them to practices to develop support in their writing, such as what Bloch and Crosby (2006) did with the use of blogging and Generation 1.5 learners in a beginning ESL composition course. Because these learners came to the course with relatively no understanding of academic literacies but strong oral proficiency, blogging assignments were given each week for
these students to develop their writing proficiency without needing to be concerned about
issues of rhetoric or composition. Gradually, these Generation 1.5 learners were
introduced to the conventions of academic writing by, for example, having students see
their blogs as an outside source to be incorporated into the academic writing, such as a
synthesis essay they were writing for the course. In addition, highlighting development
in writing samples may help Generation 1.5 learners see the structure and organization of
it, which may in turn help them better conceptualize this aspect of academic writing.
Also, helping Generation 1.5 learners identify parts of their writing that need
development will provide them with the tools they need to move toward being
autonomous writers.

These differences in writing difficulties among the three participants in this study
point to the diversity of this group of learners and how the current descriptions of
Generation 1.5 learners are inadequate (Harklau et al., 1999). This inadequacy calls for a
close examination of how teachers and researchers of Generation 1.5 learners are
defining and categorizing them in our classrooms and constructing them in our research.
The finding of diversity within the group labeled Generation 1.5 learners also points to
the fact that it is important for instructors to be aware of the academic literacies practices
we assume Generation 1.5 learners possess entering our classrooms. In other words, what
academic literacies practices do Generation 1.5 learners possess that are similar to the
academic literacies that are a part of our curricula? The findings of this study show that
digital literacy tasks are common across academic contexts in the first year of university
study. Consequently, there is a need for Generation 1.5 learners to already possess a
certain level of ability of this literacy in order to carry out these tasks. However, as
evidenced by the results of this study, not all Generation 1.5 learners may possess the academic literacy that is needed to complete these academic literacies tasks. Therefore, it is important for instructors to discover the academic literacies practices that Generation 1.5 learners in our courses possess, which can be done with the administration of a simple needs assessment. It is also important to be aware of the academic literacies practices the tasks in our courses assume Generation 1.5 learners possess and, if necessary, incorporate formal and informal instruction in our curricula to help these learners gain the academic literacies practices they need to complete the tasks. As was discussed, some of the academic literacies tasks the Generation 1.5 learners completed assumed that they neither possessed nor learned from the tasks or the contexts. For example, Tiffany struggled to understand an article on sociology which she did not have the background knowledge to understand. This points to the need on the part of instructors for an increased awareness of the background knowledge Generation 1.5 learners possess and structure instruction and curricula accordingly. As previously discussed in this section, the major findings of this study suggest that instructors and researchers should clearly understand the complexity of academic literacies and the diversity within the group labeled Generation 1.5 learners. This point, then, leads to the limitations of the study and a presentation of directions for further research that arise from the findings and are discussed in the final section of this chapter.

**Limitations of the Study**

Understanding how Generation 1.5 learners negotiate academic contexts in their first year of university study is a complex process that is addressed to some degree in this study. In the process of unveiling this understanding, I discovered that there is more
involved in understanding this process of negotiation, which points to several study
limitations as well as several directions for further research. One of the limitations of this
study is that because of the limited number of participants, it was not possible to capture
the entire picture of the diversity of Generation 1.5 learners and their academic literacies
experiences in their first year of university study. If more Generation 1.5 learners had
been included in the study, such as three more, one from each of the countries
represented by the participants in this study, this would have broadened our
understanding of the academic literacies experiences of these Generation 1.5 learners.
Moreover, if more Generation 1.5 learners from other countries with different language
and educational backgrounds, such as those from East Africa, had participated, this
would have broadened the picture of diversity that Generation 1.5 learners portray and
how this plays a role in their academic literacies experiences. However, an increase in
the number of case study participants may have resulted in a loss of data richness.

Another limitation of this study was in terms of the focus of the study and
methodology employed, in that it did not include instructor interviews and class
observations. While the original design of this study included these methods, low
instructor participation made it impossible to include these methods in the final study
design, thus limiting the examination of the participants’ academic literacies.
Furthermore, in keeping with the Academic Literacies Model (Lea & Street, 2000),
which was the theoretical frame for this study, the primary focus was on the student
participants rather than the instructors. While it is recognized that instructors make a
worthwhile contribution to the examination and discussion of academic literacies, there is
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a call in the literature for more discussion of students’ experiences regarding academic literacies, hence, the student participants were the primary focus of this study.

A third limitation of this study is the length of time the Generation 1.5 learners’ academic literacies were examined. As previously stated, the primary time frame for the study was the first year of university study. However, because of a delay in receiving approval to do the research, it was not possible to begin the actual data collection until the second quarter of the first year. Consequently, the results from the study include an examination of only two quarters of academic literacies practices of the Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study. Despite this delay, the two quarters of data collection proved to be quite useful in examining the participants’ academic literacies experiences during this time.

**Directions for Further Research**

Understanding how Generation 1.5 learners negotiate academic contexts in their first year at the university is a complex process that has been addressed to some degree in this study. In the process of unveiling this understanding, it was discovered that there is a great deal involved in understanding this process of negotiation, which points to several directions for further research. The findings here only scratch the surface of all that still needs to be done to extend our knowledge of the academic literacies of Generation 1.5 learners and calls for more research in this area. To begin with, one of the original purposes of this study was to examine the expectations of Generation 1.5 learners and their instructors toward academic literacy tasks across the curriculum. However, because of a very low instructor participation response, the instructors’ focus was eliminated. Still, it would help to address such questions as: What are instructors’ expectations for
academic literacies tasks? How do these compare to Generation 1.5 learners’ expectations? How are they similar? How are they different? What is the basis for the differences that exist between the instructors’ and Generation 1.5 learners’ expectations for academic literacies tasks? What can we learn from these differences? How can instructors and Generation 1.5 learners better communicate and exchange what they want or need from each other when it comes to negotiating academic contexts?

Second of all, a more encompassing socio-cultural examination of the academic contexts the Generation 1.5 learners negotiated would have provided more of the larger picture of their learning experience, including ideas about all the socio-cultural contexts the participants negotiated during the study and that possibly impacted their academic literacies in their first year. With this in mind, a direction for further research of this group of learners would be to focus on the other factors of their experience that possibly influence their negotiation, such as what are the out-of-school literacies of Generation 1.5 learners in their first year of university study (Hull & Schultz, 2001)? How might these influence their academic literacies experiences? What are other influences on Generation 1.5 learners’ negotiation of academic contexts? What power structures are in place that might influence this process of negotiation?

Moreover, a longitudinal examination of the academic contexts the Generation 1.5 learners negotiated in this study would have provided a broader view of their academic literacies difficulties and academic literacies practices. Would the participants continue to struggle with the same academic literacies difficulties over time? What would their academic literacies practices be after two years of university study? What would they be after four years? Would they be similar to the ones the participants used in their first
year? Would they be similar to the ones they used in their introductory courses? What kind of development in academic literacies practices would be seen? Future research of a longitudinal nature would help address these questions.

Another direction for further research would be to more closely examine other aspects of the Generation 1.5 learners themselves, such as their identities and if and how these were influenced by their negotiation of academic contexts. Because learners’ identities are a component of situated literacies (Barton et al., 2000), it is important to extend the research that has been started here and include identity research to broaden the picture of who the Generation 1.5 learners are within the academic contexts that are studied. Furthermore, the cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1985) of Generation 1.5 learners would be another aspect of these learners to examine. Much of the research that focuses on this states that it is another difficulty they have. That is, despite the time they have spent in the American culture, Generation 1.5 learners still do not seem to possess the cultural capital that is necessary for them to easily negotiate academic contexts (Preto-Bay, 2004). However, the basis for this argument is, like most of the research on Generation 1.5 learners, a deficit portrayal of these learners, which is not always an accurate portrayal of this group of learners (Harklau et al., 1999). With this in mind, a direction for further research would be to examine the cultural capital Generation 1.5 learners possess when entering the university and how this helps them in navigating academic contexts.

One other aspect of Generation 1.5 learners that calls for further research would be the influence of their “ear learnedness” in academic contexts. Although an examination of this was not a primary purpose of this study, it was quite prevalent in the
participant interviews and seemed to be a rich linguistic source of the Generation 1.5 learners in this study. However, there were not many academic literacies tasks in the academic contexts the participants negotiated that provided opportunities to utilize this learning strength. These findings echo Carson’s (2001) study of academic literacies tasks at the university, where she found that of the four language skills required for these tasks, speaking was the least important. This raises the question of how to incorporate the learning strengths of diverse learners like Generation 1.5 students in and across academic contexts by extending academic literacies genres and tasks to include all language skills, particularly speaking.

Finally, one other suggestion for further research would be to conduct more studies that allow for students’ voices to be heard. According to the literature, very little of what we do as instructors and researchers gives students center stage. For example, Kroll (2002) states, “We teachers spend a lot of our professional lives talking about students…and talking to them, but we need to spend more time talking with them” (p. 21). Furthermore, not only in our conversations, but also in our research do students receive little attention (Alvermann, 1998). However, our students are the basis of instructors’ conversations and research, so it is important that they are given a more prominent place within them. This can be done, as was the case in this study, by incorporating an Academic Literacies (Lea & Street, 2000) approach to our examination of the academic literacies of students. By doing so, as Leki (2001) points out, we can gain more insight into “the nature of people and systems…and perhaps of how to stimulate further reflection…among ourselves” (p. 26).
In conclusion, this study has illustrated how three Generation 1.5 learners negotiated various academic contexts in their first year of university study. Although the findings present only a small part of a much larger picture of the academic literacies experiences of these learners, the three participants in this study help us to more clearly see from their perspective what it means for students with a 1.5 Generation background to negotiate academic contexts in their first year of university study. This study has contributed to the Generation 1.5 literature an in-depth look at how this process of negotiation unfolds and what it entails. The directions for future research just described will further enrich the knowledge base regarding the academic literacies practices and experiences of university level Generation 1.5 writers.
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APPENDIX A

EDUCATION, LANGUAGE AND LITERACY BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE
Education, Language and Literacy Background Questionnaire

Name __________________________________________________

Sex M___ F___

Ethnicity ____________________________________________

Native Language(s) ______________________________________

Foreign Language(s) ______________________________________

Educational Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Siblings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten – Name –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School – Name –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School – Name –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School – Name –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University – Name –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What was read and written in your family as you were growing up? (e.g., Did your parents read books to you before you went to bed?) In which language(s) was the reading and writing done?

2. What kind of reading and writing assignments did you do throughout (high) school? (e.g., novels, textbooks, websites; personal essays, literature response, e-mail) In which language(s) was the reading and writing done?

3. Did you take an (ESL) writing class(es) at a community college or other university before coming to OSU? If so, what kind of writing assignments did you do?
4. Did you take a course(s) at a community college or other university before coming to OSU? If so, what kind of course(s) did you take? What kind of reading and writing assignments did you do in the course(s)?

5. How much experience do you have with the computer? (e.g., Do you know how to turn it on? How to type? How to use Word? PowerPoint? Excel? Other software? Give examples. Search the Internet? Send e-mail? Chat online? Other – please specify.)

6. If you took a course or courses at a community college or other university before coming to OSU, did you use the computer in the course(s)? If so, how did you use it? To access the course webpage? To search for information related to the course? To send e-mail to classmates and the professor? Other – please specify.
APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Student Participant Interview Questions

Questions regarding academic literacies difficulties and practices -

1. What kind of reading do you do for your courses here at the university (e.g., textbooks, class notes, course website, etc.)?
2. What kind of writing do you do for your courses here at the university (e.g., response writing, essays, e-mail)?
3. What kind of computer work do you do for your courses here at the university (e.g., WebCT, blogging, etc.)?
4. What difficulties do you face in the reading you do for your courses?
5. What difficulties do you face in the writing you do for your courses?
6. What difficulties do you face in the computer work you do for your courses?
7. How do you overcome the difficulties you face in reading?
8. How do you overcome the difficulties you face in writing?
9. How do you overcome the difficulties you face in the computer work?
10. How have you changed since you started studying at the university (e.g., who you are, your thinking, your writing, your reading, at the university and outside the university)?

Questions regarding academic literacies documents –

1. What was the assignment you were asked to complete? What do you think the instructor was asking the students to do with this assignment?
2. How did you write/complete this? What did you do first? Then what did you do? etc.
3. What difficulty(ies) did you face in completing this assignment (e.g., writing, technology, etc.)?
4. What practices did you use to help you overcome the difficulty(ies) to complete the assignment (e.g., talk with the instructor after class, during office hours or via e-mail, etc.)?
5. How did the instructor evaluate the assignment? What feedback did you receive from him/her regarding your performance? Did the feedback help you to understand how you could improve?
6. How do you feel about what you have written/completed? Are you satisfied with it? If so, why? If not, what could you have done differently to make you satisfied with what you have done?
APPENDIX C

ACADEMIC LITERACIES LOG
Case Study Participant Academic Literacies Log

Name ________________________________

Winter/Spring Quarter, 2006 (circle one)

Week of the Quarter ____________________

Directions: Fill in the log with the reading and writing tasks you do each week for your courses. Be sure to include the amount of reading and writing you’re doing as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

279
Literature-Based and Data-Driven Codes and Categories
(Allison (forthcoming); Benz (forthcoming); Blanton (2005); Davies (1995); Harklau et al. (1999); Leki (1995); Linggi (2003); Johns (1997); Raimes (1987); Spack (1997))

Reading Difficulties –
Reading Comprehension - Lack of efficient reading practices; lack of background knowledge to scaffold academic texts; speed; lack of purpose/engagement; genre

Lexicon - Inadequate amount of academic vocabulary to effectively incorporate in writing and decipher academic texts; lack of vocabulary learning practices by which to develop their academic vocabulary; limited in knowledge of basic academic words; inadequate control of abstract language

Purpose for Reading – Inability to make connections between reading and writing

Reading Practices – External engagement; reading; schemata; skimming; examples; courses; planning; use of online/dictionary; use of translator; lecture notes

Writing Difficulties –

Writing Process -
Writing Development – Not understanding the assignment task; unfocused introductions; lack of coherence in and between paragraphs; poor paragraph development; faulty reasoning; lack of audience awareness; inability to distinguish between different writing genres; plagiarism; assignment lacks content, purpose, and engagement; difficulties with the rhetorical form; difficulty choosing a topic; missing components; difficulty with writing conventions; lack of experience; not enough time

Revision – Lack of practices to know how to incorporate instructor feedback in writing in order to improve it

Grammatical - Confusion with a, an, the; incorrect word choices, word forms; subject/verb agreement errors; systemic errors/fossilization; verb tense; verb form; lack of subject-verb agreement; incorporation of forms and lexical items from informal spoken English not appropriate for academic registers; use of colloquial expressions; borrowing of grammatical features more typical of spoken English; lack of explicit knowledge of English grammar; inability to identify parts of speech; word form errors; inappropriate words; “acoustic approximations”; confusion between similar words; preposition errors; spelling; zero subject; sentence fragments; word choice and word form

Writing Practices - Relying on current or past ESL/writing experiences; models; planning; rehearsing; rescanning; rereading the assigned topic; revising and editing; feel for good writing; developing support (examples; explanation; expansion; reading course materials, outside sources; use of lecture notes; personal experience; class discussions);
writing process (thinking; planning; outlining; note taking; writing; multiple drafting; peer feedback; revision; editing; getting feedback); following instructors’ practices

Sources of Academic literacies practices – University; department; course (curriculum; materials); instructor; classmates; room/dormmates; friends; parents; resident assistant; researcher
APPENDIX E

ACADEMIC LITERACIES DIFFICULTIES AND ACADEMIC LITERACIES PRACTICES OF ANDREW
Academic Literacies Difficulties and Academic literacies practices of Andrew

(From A.1. to A.8.)

Task Descriptions - University
   Reading – 36 (lab procedure; essays; lectures; handouts; syllabus; textbook; notes; lab manual; handbook; skimming; response; evaluating sources)
   Writing – 39 (pre-lab; answering questions; lab reports; analyze; use sources; mini-papers; essays; note taking; math hw; copying; peer response; e-mail; bibliography; summary; analysis)
   Research – 7

Missed Opportunities
   Reading – 9; 1 (high school)
   Writing – 7
   Feedback - 1

Task Descriptions – High School
   Reading – 6 (books; short stories; textbooks; sample essays; lectures)
   Writing – 5 (journals; grammar; reflections; school work; essays)

Reading Difficulties
   *Reading Speed/Time – 4; 1 (high school)
   *Lack of Purpose/Lack of Engagement/Distraction – 5
   *Ineffective Reading Strategy – 4
   *Amount – 5

   **Lexicon across the curriculum – 15; 1 (high school)
   **Genre/Interpreting Literature - 2

Reading Practices
   *External/Engagement – 2
   *Reading – 2
   *Schemata – 2
   *Skimming - 2
   *Examples – 2
   *Courses – 1

   **Pre-Reading – Planning Practices – 1
   **Use of Online/Dictionary – 2 (high school)
   **Use of a Translator – 1
   **Lecture Notes - 2

Writing Difficulties
   *Lacking/Wrong/Too Much Support – 5
*Not understanding/knowing the assignment/genre/source/expectations/topic - 7
*Connection between ideas – 5
*No interest/disengagement/distraction/motivation – 5; 1(high school)
*Time – 6
*Analyzing – 2
*Affective Variables – Anger; Fear – 1
*Lack of Experience/Practices/Schemata – 2

Grammar/Mechanics – 12
Expression/Language – 6

**Imagination/finding something to write about – 3
**Coherence – 2
**Writing Conventions – 4
**Revision/not understanding instructor’s feedback – 1
**Writing/missing parts of writing task - 7

Writing Practices
*Developing Support – Examples; Explanation/Expansion; reading/outside sources; use of lecture notes; personal experience; finding appropriate quotes; class discussions; class materials (e.g., textbook, course pack; course readings) – 5
*Writing Process – 15 (thinking; planning/outlining; note taking; multiple drafting; peer feedback; revision/rewriting; editing; writing/taking a course that includes writing in the curriculum; get instructor’s feedback on drafts)
*Following instructor’s strategy/use of instructor provided criteria/instructor’s help/variation thereof – 2
*Feel for good/writing – 1
*Time/Waiting until the last minute – 4
*Course that help w/ writing - 4

*Reading/Writing Connections – 10

Research Difficulties
*Finding appropriate sources/keywords – 6

**No access/experience – 2 (high school)

Research Practices
*Using Google/online databases – 2
*Knowing the library - 1

Sources/Environmental Practices – the socio-cultural context
*Course Environment - 4
Living Environment – how this is designed to help socialize students into the university community - 5
*Room/Dormmates in Scholars Dorm - 2

*Instructor – 22
 *Writing Practices – 18 (peer evaluation; feedback; tutorials; evaluation criteria; samples; grammar/editing; use of sources; paraphrasing; analyzing texts; assignment description; handouts; outline)
 *Research Practices – 4

*Researcher – 4 (tutorial; feedback)

*Course Content Learning Practices
 *Knowing how/when to use class notes – 3

Knowing when to do hw problems - 3
Study Together – 1

**Knowing how/when to read - 2

CCA –
 *Feel for good writing (T&Z)
 *Lack of engagement when reading (T&Z)
 *Being motivated to start writing (T&Z)
 *Community college experience (T&Z)
 *Difficulties with analyzing (T&Z)
 *Repertoire of academic literacies practices (T&Z)
 *Reading & Writing Practice (T&Z)
 *Lexicon (T&A)
 *Dependence on Sources for Academic literacies practices (T&A)
 *Identity (T, Z, A)
 *Perception of reading and writing in English (T&A)
 *Came to the U.S. w/ an exchange program (T&A)
 *Took English 110 during the study (T, Z, A)
 *Use of dictionary/translator (T&A)
 *Schemata (Z&A)

*denotes connections with Zack
**denotes connections with Tiffany
APPENDIX F

ACADEMIC LITERACIES DIFFICULTIES AND ACADEMIC LITERACIES PRACTICES OF TIFFANY
Academic Literacies Difficulties and Academic literacies practices of Tiffany

(From T.1. to T.8.)

Reading Difficulties
Incomprehension - 32
   Lexicon across the Curriculum – 11; 1 (high school)
   Genre/Interpreting Literature – 4
   Guessing the “right” meaning – 1
   Other – 6
   Tone – 3
   Ideas – 1
   Sentence Structure – 1
   Illegible Handwriting – 1
   Limited Knowledge about the topic – 1

Reading Practices
Comprehension Practices - 15
   Memorization – 1
   Lexicon – 10 (highlighting; asking native speakers; pronunciation

3)
   Use of Online/Dictionary - 4
   Use of Translator - 1
   Guessing from Context -3
   Writing Meanings in Margins - 1
   Tell Professor - 2
   Lecture Notes – 2
   External/Engagement – 7; 1 (high school)
   Reading – 3 - Re-Reading – 1; Read Aloud – 1 (high school);
   Selective Reading - 1
   Interpretation/Talk about reading – 2
   Watch movie based on book/reading – 1
   Thinking/Imagining – 2
   Highlighting/Note taking while reading – 1 (high school); 2

Writing Difficulties

Lacking/Wrong/Finding Support – 26; 1 (high school)

Writing Practices

Following instructor’s strategy/use of instructor provided criteria/instructor’s help/variation thereof – 19; 1 (high school)
Writing Process – 15 (thinking; planning/outlining; revision/rewriting; editing; writing/taking a course that includes writing in the curriculum; getting instructor’s feedback on drafts)

Developing Support – 11 (Examples; Explanation/Expansion; reading/outside sources; use of lecture notes; personal experience; finding appropriate quotes)

Source

Instructor – 60
Looking up unknown words from lecture slides
Support Development –
Template Language
Reading Practices – text explanation/interpretation/lecture notes; re-reading; reading schedule – 15; 1 (high school)
Writing Practices – 23 (choice of sources – stimulate student dis/engagement; questions to answer; writing process – peer evaluation; multiple drafts; revision; discuss articles; present to class; take notes to use in paper; turn in parts of the writing process; feedback; tutorial; development)
Technology – website rec. – online dictionary/thesaurus (instructor) – 1
Lexicon – 1
Research Practices – 4
Learning/Knowledge Practices – 3
Making expectations transparent – 1; 1 (high school)
Instructors’ knowledge of what good writing is/understanding of writing conventions – 1
Understanding Department/Course Procedure/Structure/Curriculum -7
Department Learning Center/Tutor Room – 3

*Transcripts from interviews with Tiffany were coded first, hence the lack of cross-case analysis with the other two participants.
APPENDIX G

ACADEMIC LITERACIES DIFFICULTIES AND ACADEMIC LITERACIES PRACTICES OF ZACK
Academic Literacies Difficulties and Academic literacies practices of Zack

**Code Development** – December 10, 2006

(from Z.1. to Z.8.)

Task Descriptions - University
  Reading – 34 (sources; lab procedure; film script; NYT; formulas; short stories; speeches; essays; poems; plays; stories; textbook; pre-lab instructions; course pack; student samples)
  Writing – 22 (summary response; pre-lab; bibliography; answering questions; multiple drafts; notes; lab reports; short papers; description; comparison/contrast; opinion; group presentation; collaborative writing; research proposal; short answer/essay exam)
  Research – 1
  Visual – 2
  Missed Opportunities
    Reading – 7
    Writing - 3

Task Descriptions – High School
  Reading – 5 (books; short stories; short passages w/ comprehension questions; background information; textbooks; notes)
  Writing – 6 (research paper; lab response; short responses; essays; letters; e-mail; notes; division/classification essays; book reports)
  Research – 1 (Google/online databases; online journals)

Task Descriptions – Community College
  Reading – 1 (prescriptions)
  Writing – 2 (note taking; answering questions)

Reading Difficulties
  *Reading Speed/Time – 1
  *Lack of Purpose/Lack of Engagement – 5
  No Source – 1
  Dense – 1
  Ineffective Reading Strategy – 1
  Amount - 1

Reading Practices
  *External/Engagement – 2
  *Reading – 5
*Re-reading - 1
*Highlighting/Note taking while reading – 1
Schemata – 5
Skimming - 6
Examples – 1
Courses – 1
Grammar – 1
*Following reading schedule – 2

Writing Difficulties
*Lacking/Wrong/Too Much Support – 6
*Not understanding/knowing the assignment/genre/source/expectations - 3
*Connection between ideas – 2
*No interest – 1
*Time – 3
*Analyzing – 3
*Audience – 1
Focus – 1
Socialization -
Formatting – 1
Motivation to Write – 2
Fear – 2
Multi-tasking – 1
Finding Sources – 1
Lack of Experience – 1

Writing Practices
*Developing Support – Examples; Explanation/Expansion; reading/outside sources; use of lecture notes; personal experience; finding appropriate quotes; class discussions; class materials (e.g., textbook, course pack; course readings) – 4
*Writing Process – 12 (thinking; planning/outlining; note taking; multiple drafting; peer feedback; revision/rewriting; editing; writing/taking a course that includes writing in the curriculum; get instructor’s feedback on drafts)
*Following instructor’s strategy/use of instructor provided criteria/instructor’s help/variation thereof – 8
*Feel for good/writing – 1
Collaborating – 2
Time – 2
Course that help w/ writing - 1

*Reading/Writing Connections – 3

Research Difficulties
*Finding appropriate sources/keywords – 4
Research Practices
*Using Google/online databases – 2
Knowing the library - 1

Sources/Environmental Practices – the socio-cultural context
*Course Environment - 5
  *Classmates - 5

Living Environment – how this is designed to help socialize students into the university community - 5
  *Room/Dormmates in Scholars Dorm - 1

*Instructor – 16
  *Reading Practices – reading schedule – 1
  *Writing Practices – 12 (peer evaluation; feedback; tutorials; evaluation criteria; “write outside the box”)
  *Research Practices – 3

*Researcher – 1 (audience awareness)

*Course Content Learning Practices
  *Knowing how/when to use class notes – 1
  Study Together - 1

CCA –
*Feel for good writing (T&Z)
*Lack of engagement when reading (T&Z)
*Being motivated to start writing (T&Z)
*Writing (Z,A,T)
*Community college experience (T&Z)
*Difficulties with analyzing (T&Z)
*Repertoire of academic literacies practices (T&Z)
*Reading & Writing Practice (T&Z)

*denotes connections with other participants