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ABSTRACT

Prior research and best teaching practices in L2 academic writing suggest that a combination of information literacy content and language teaching is effective in helping L2 writers learn the skills needed to become effective researchers (Bordonaro, 2011; Grabe & Stoller, 1997; Stoller, 2004). Research has also shown that student and instructor beliefs about learning influence the impact of curricula (Brown, Murphy, & Nanny, 2003; Jackson, 2005; Maybee, 2006; Ouellette, 2011).

Using a mixed methods approach, this study examines L2 writer and instructor perceptions of the effectiveness of the L2 Writer Subject Guide, a curriculum integrated library guide, in developing skills in using the library for research purposes. Student perceptions were analyzed via pre- and posttests, surveys, and focus group data using qualitative and quantitative instruments. Effectiveness of the L2 Writer Subject Guide was also analyzed in the context of student performance on module assessments.

Quantitatively, there was no significant difference in the scores for the pretest and the posttest. Qualitative results among the four instruments reveal that students have diverse perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide's effectiveness and also variable user experiences. Findings also suggest that the L2 Writers Subject Guide builds resource awareness among students, but the purposes of these resources are still misconstrued. Similarly, students reveal much declarative knowledge about the research process but have not yet developed the procedural knowledge to effectively use research resources.
and processes to incorporate sources into their own work. Data show that the L2 Writers Subject Guide complemented current instruction in one ESL writing class and provided diverse teaching and learning opportunities.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 2000, the Marriott Library introduced the Writing 2010 Subject Guide (WRTG 2010 Subject Guide), a series of online learning modules designed to integrate aspects of library instruction into the WRTG 2010 curriculum. To better accommodate the academic and linguistic needs of the second-language (L2) student population at the University of Utah, the English as a Second Language (ESL) program has developed a two-course writing series intended to be the curriculum and credit equivalent of WRTG 2010. ESL 1050 (Composition for Non-Native Speakers of English) and ESL 1060 (Expository Writing for ESL) are the curriculum equivalent to WRTG 2010 for L2 writers, and in light of the WRTG 2010 Subject Guide's success, a partner library guide has been developed to complement the ESL writing series.

Since their inception, the curricula for ESL 1050 and ESL 1060 were aligned to that of WRTG 2010 to maintain the integrity of the 1000/2000 level academic writing requirement for all undergraduates at the University and to standardize the teaching of academic writing skills to L2 writers across sections of ESL writing courses. The most recent realignment with WRTG 2010 was in 2005. Effectively, the WRTG 2010 Subject Guide represents a collaborative effort between the University Writing Program (UWP) and Scholarship and Education Services (SES) in the Marriott Library. This
interdepartmental cooperation has proven fruitful for both the UWP and SES. WRTG 2010 students and instructors have found that use of the WRTG 2010 Subject Guide promotes development of library skills in students and facilitates standard instruction of research skills across sections, and SES has reported increased interaction with students and instructors helping meet information literacy needs (D. Fanning, personal communication, September 1, 2012). The success of a WRTG 2010 Subject Guide aimed toward native speakers of English in addition to the exponential population growth of L2 writers prompted the need for a similar resource addressing the dual academic and linguistic needs of L2 writers.

The alignment of the ESL 1050 and ESL 1060 curricula with WRTG 2010 in 2005 did not include plans to develop an online curriculum-integrated library subject guide to complement the teaching of research and information literacy skills. However, the number of international students studying in the U.S. has risen 30% since 2006 (Open Doors, 2011), and the growth of this population means that universities are tasked with adapting and finding new ways to accommodate and equitably teach international students who are L2 users of English while maintaining academic standards for all students. Part of the challenge facing institutions of higher education (IHE) is adapting curricular support to reach a population with various cultural, linguistic, and academic backgrounds. University of Utah President David W. Pershing highlighted in his 2012 inauguration speech the need to "embrace equity and diversity" and recognize the University of Utah as part of the "global village" by "increasing facilities of support for international students" (Pershing, 2012). International students often experience a lack of support, not necessarily due to lack of resources or opportunities, but to the lack of
awareness among the IHE community about the academic issues they face (Huntly, 1993; Jackson, 2005).

In an effort to further align the undergraduate writing curriculum across departments and foster interdepartmental collaboration in addressing the needs of L2 academic writers, the Department of Linguistics, SES, and the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) asked the researcher, as a representative from the ESL program, to develop the Research Skills for Developing Writers Subject Guide (L2 Writer Subject Guide) for ESL 1050 and ESL 1060 to meet the need for each of the stakeholders listed above. Small-scale assessments were done through the precurriculum and pilot study phases of the guide’s development. Fall 2013 marks the first academic semester the guide was used throughout the ESL program, and this study serves as the first major assessment of the L2 Writer Subject Guide.

The purpose of the L2 Writer Subject Guide is three-fold. First, the L2 Writer Subject Guide is intended to be integrated into the ESL 1050 and 1060 curricula to standardize the teaching and learning of research and citation norms, both within the ESL program (i.e., ESL 1050 and 1060) and alongside WRTG 2010. ESL instructors face challenges in trying to simultaneously teach the academic and language skills necessary to help L2 writers be successful. Furthermore, research suggests that cultivating an awareness of textual borrowing principles and practices is a complex process that is subject to developmental stages similar to those of second language development (Tomaš, 2011); consequently, teaching textual borrowing with a thoughtful pedagogical approach geared toward the developmental learning needs of L2 writers is consistent with effective general L2 pedagogical practices. In the context of the University of Utah,
Teaching Assistants (TAs) and full-time Associate Instructors (AIs) in the ESL program come with a range of experiences and though they follow a common syllabus, choices about research teaching methods and content are largely left up to the individual instructor, leaving some students with knowledge gaps as they advance through the writing courses. Instructor perceptions of the L2 Writer Subject Guide curriculum's effectiveness are important for helping create a standard curriculum that informs all students of the research process standards upheld throughout the University of Utah.

Second, the L2 Writers Subject Guide serves as a 24/7 extracurricular resource that can be consulted whenever students need additional support through the research process. Autonomous learning is an academic expectation of an American university, and many international students' prior academic experiences may not have fully prepared them to participate as independent library resource users. Barriers such as language proficiency, academic expectations, and variable experiences using libraries to conduct research compound their transition to North American academic life (Badke, 2002; Jiao and Onwuegbuzie, 1999; Kahmi-Stein and Stein, 1999; Patton, 2002). Creating and promoting resources that help L2 writers meet their research needs would ultimately help them in their transition to becoming successful autonomous learners.

Third, the partner guide augments resources for instructors both teaching research practice and L2 writers in general. ESL writing courses are often taught by graduate TAs. The ESL program represents the first foray into teaching for many TAs, including their first exposure to pedagogical training. The L2 Writer Subject Guide makes available quality curricula to standardize research instruction among less experienced teachers. It consists of nine modules that are focused on aspects of library instruction:
• the research process,
• meeting your librarians,
• developing a topic,
• using the Marriott Library catalog,
• using library databases,
• evaluating your sources,
• issues with plagiarism,
• paraphrasing, summarizing and quoting, and
• citing your sources.

The content sequence is scaffolded, gradually building on instruction through the use of the skills that students need to develop successful research practices. The guide curriculum follows a content-based instruction (CBI) framework and employs best practices for both content and language pedagogies. In addition to the research content, fully integrated language instruction helps build L2 writers' academic language proficiency. The entire L2 Writer Subject Guide curriculum includes a posttest that assesses L2 writers' knowledge of research and relevant academic. Each individual module begins with a statement of the performance objectives to be achieved and proceeds to interactive prereading activities that activate schemata. Two learning phases follow: the first one highlights a library research skill or resource and the second highlights the language forms and use needed to successfully utilize these skills or resources. Each learning phase ends with a formative assessment (reading check questions). The modules each conclude with a summary, a list of relevant additional resources, and a summative assessment on the module's content and language objectives.
(12 question quiz). Student assessment results are archived by the SES and descriptive data from the posttest could inform stakeholders of the effectiveness of such a support tool for the learning of research skills among L2 writers.

Quantitative data can be collected to describe certain aspects of the L2 Writer Subject Guide's effectiveness, such as L2 writers’ knowledge of the research process and knowledge of relevant academic language structures and vocabulary. Because it is intended to supplement (not substitute) research and library instruction, student and instructor perceptions of how the guide complements the course objectives and curriculum are essential to the L2 Writer Subject Guide successfully being incorporated into the ESL writing curriculum. Research has shown that student and teacher perceptions influence classroom dynamics, motivation, and satisfaction and in order for these factors to be conducive to learning, students and instructors should believe in what they are learning. Perception influences the saliency of information and if students do not believe that the guide is useful, the learned information may not be retained (Kong, 2009; Ouellette, 2011; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010).

The final L2 Writer Subject Guide product is integrated to varying degrees into most ESL program courses. ESL 1060 incorporates the L2 Writer Subject Guide in its entirety because this is the courses that place the most emphasis on information literacy and writing. The first courses in the writing series, ESL 1040 (Grammar and Editing for Non-Native Speakers) and ESL 1050 (Composition for Non-Native Speakers), focus more on paragraph-level and essay-level writing and less on research writing; therefore, only selected modules are incorporated. Likewise is the case with nonwriting courses, such as ESL 1600 (Teaching and Learning across Languages) and ESL 1100 (Integrated
Language Skill in ESL), which engage academic skills and content-based curricula. While these courses do not teach intensive writing, students inevitably produce some writing and research assignments in these classes and would benefit from selected exposure to the L2 Writer Subject Guide as the respective curricula call for it.

ESL 1060 stakeholder groups are most affected by the curriculum changes of the L2 Writer Subject Guide, and focusing on limited ESL populations narrows the scope of the study and makes data collection manageable. Because the purpose of ESL 1060 is to teach research skills and processes and academic language to L2 writers, understanding student perceptions as they relate to the usefulness of the L2 Writer Subject Guide is essential. As ESL 1060 teachers are responsible for the implementation of the Subject Guide, it is critical to seek their feedback as well. The perceptions of the ESL students and instructors are compared to aggregated archived data that are based on student performance on individual module assessments and the posttests.

**Research Questions**

The research questions for this study are

1. What are students' perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide relative to its effectiveness?
2. What are instructors' perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide relative to its effectiveness?
3. What is the nature of the relationship between student and instructor perceptions of the L2 Writer Subject Guide?
4. What is the nature of the relationship between student perceptions of the L2
Writer Subject Guide and student performance on the assessments?

5. What is the difference between student performance on the pre- and posttests?
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

At a Research 1 university in the United States, student research is an integral part of the higher education experience. Preparing L2 writers for success in conducting research requires attention to the content of library instruction that may be novel for L2 writers and the interaction of that content with the development of academic language proficiency. A pedagogy that combines content and language instruction contextualizes both facets helping make all of information literacy more accessible to students. Previous research (Brown, Murphy & Nanny, 2003; Jackson, 2005; Maybee, 2006; Ouellette, 2011; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010) suggests that if information literacy is perceived as difficult or ineffective, learners will engage with neither the content nor the language, which could be detrimental to their long-term academic success.

Information Literacy (IL)

Among the many transitions an undergraduate student makes when entering higher education, developing information literacy (IL) as it relates to applying proper research protocols can be one of the most difficult. The Association for College and Research Libraries (ACRL) is the leading organization defining IL "standards, performance indicators, and outcomes" for North American universities (Association of
College and Research Libraries, 2000). The Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education currently define five standards (each with their own performance indicators and outcomes) that undergraduate students should meet during their academic tenure. These standards are the following (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2000):

1. The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed.
2. The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.
3. The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.
4. The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
5. The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

Accomplishing such research standards is even more challenging for international students because of cultural and contextual difficulties and especially for L2 writers, who may enter the University with the challenges of language proficiency and cultural unfamiliarity. Even though most research is accomplished via electronic means and while many students are tech-savvy, quotidian research skills do not often translate to academic research skills without guidance (Brown et al., 2003; Jackson, 2005). Jackson (2005)
noted that even with previous library experience, international students often approach U.S. libraries with a heightened level of anxiety that is compounded by the overall newness of an experience abroad.

In a perception study similar to Jackson (2005) about the relationships between students' IL skills and self-estimates of IL skills, Gross and Latham (2007) discovered that students’ actual proficiency levels in IL were inversely proportionate to their perceived proficiency: more competent students had higher library anxiety than less competent students. The researchers interpreted this inverse affect as a result of students’ individual engagement with the library resources. Those who were inclined to engage more (i.e., high competency students) found their knowledge of the resources lacking, reporting that the available resources were too cumbersome to navigate. Because lower competency students did not seek out these resources, they were neither aware of the deficits in their knowledge nor the deficits of the resources. Over half of the participants in their study were rated as nonproficient in IL; this is tied to the fact that only one-quarter of them had ever had formal library instruction. Gross and Latham proposed that the "'cure' for incompetence is skill building" (p. 347) and in order to maximize the effectiveness of IL services, the services must "speak to students in ways they can hear" (p. 337). Consideration of student perceptions is necessary for student "buy-in" of IL resource benefits; the partnering of students, librarians, and faculty to create products that promote critical thinking skills is necessary to succeed in converting techno-savvy students to information savvy students (Brown et al., 2003, p. 397). For IL content resources to be approachable for L2 writers, library jargon and terminology must be acquired too in order to gain competency in IL.
The linguistic challenges for L2 writers require increased attention to and interpretation of academic discourse norms. The literature is rich with examples of how student perception influences approaches to libraries and IL resources, but few works focus on the interaction between acquiring IL skills and the academic language necessary to apply them. Specifically, Bordonaro (2010) found that L2 writers use a variety of language strategies (e.g., using a dictionary or thesaurus, guessing words in context, noticing salient words, and trying different parts of speech) when conducting library database searches.

Bordonaro (2010) further suggested that because of their increased metalinguistic awareness from years of language study, L2 writers may have an advantage over their native English-speaking counterparts when it comes to manipulating search terms to change the results. As one of the students noted, "I try different words because that can help me find what I am looking for. Because it [the library database] is a computer, not a brain. So I can try woman instead of female" (Bordonaro, 2010, p. 282). In addition to the student perspective, Bordonaro (2011) illustrated that common L2 pedagogical methods are effective in teaching IL skills to L2 writers.

In an action research study in which Bordonaro (2011) facilitated an IL course for L2 writers, she discovered that inclusion of teaching methods and learning strategies like Think-Pair-Share, skimming and scanning, free writing, and listening for the main point (among others) improved both language and library proficiency in students. What Bordonaro's (2010, 2011) and others' (Brown et al., 2003; Gross & Latham, 2007; Jackson, 2005; Maybee, 2006; Sikinson et al, 2012; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010) research suggests is that access to and awareness of resources are not enough. Resources
must be based in a sound pedagogical theory and practice to be of the most benefit to L2 writers acquiring IL.

**Content and Language Integration**

At the tertiary level, L2 writers are not absolute beginners; consequently, they have the language proficiency that accommodates the pedagogical practice of teaching content and language simultaneously. L2 writers may benefit from an IL program in which they develop new knowledge about IL at the same time they are developing their language skills. Conteh-Morgen (2002) found that stemming library instruction from second-language (SLA) acquisition theory and practice "can significantly impact outcomes of [IL] instruction" (p. 191). The pedagogy of making a dual commitment to language and content is referred to as content-based instruction (CBI).

Content-based instruction is based on research in SLA, educational psychology, and cognitive psychology along with the backing of several CBI training and outcome studies. It offers a three-tiered conceptual model that promotes the learning of content, language, and strategy instruction (Grabe & Stoller, 1997; Stoller, 2004). In addition, CBI emphasizes the engagement of higher-order thinking skills (Bloom, 1956; Brookhard, 2010) and a student's common underlying proficiency (Cummins, 1981; Cummins, 1996) by teaching academic language proficiency via the academic content.

Explicitly focusing on language in a highly contextualized framework with specific content allows L2 writers to employ metacognitive and cognitive learning strategies that they acquired in their first language. Maybee (2006) emphasized that developing an understanding of how students are cognitively conceptualizing IL can lead
to improved IL instruction. In a study that focused on explicit library instruction Maybee found that as the course progressed, students became less concerned with the details of the library technology and more engaged with evaluation, application, and organizational skills, such as synthesizing information in multiple sources, evaluating source credibility, and building a foundation from which they could transfer the IL skills to other applicable areas. In essence, the students built an awareness of their own needs and met them by utilizing existing cognitive strategies to achieve IL objectives. From this point of view, the CBI approach is ideal for improving the content and language pedagogies, but also for increasing autonomous learning capabilities among L2 writers.

**Learner Beliefs and Perceptions**

Mitigating the successful transition to higher education are L2 writers' perceptions of how they should adapt, what they need to adapt, and how the ability to adapt progresses. Beliefs and prior experience with both language and IL influence perception and help define learning experiences (Gross & Latham, 2007; Maybee, 2006; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010). Generally speaking, the role of an American student requires a high degree of autonomy in all aspects of academic life, including the use of the library and the development of understandings about research protocols. This autonomous role may be unfamiliar to many L2 writers; explicit definitions of student and teacher roles as they relate to the development of IL could be beneficial (Patton, 2002; Usuki, 2001). Explicit definition and encouragement of autonomous learning roles reiterate to students that they can succeed independently. It also supports a student's critical thinking mechanisms to recognize when additional support is needed and how to procure those
resources, particularly in library instruction since much of the language use and organizational schemes are not transparent to the inexperienced user.

Ouellette's (2011) study surveyed students' uses and opinions of the subject guides provided at their IHE. Regarding use, students responded that they only use the subject guides in the following ways: 1) as a last resort, 2) when instructors require them, 3) to find other databases for their research topics, and 4) when they want to find ways to improve on their current search methods. Item 4 indicates that students do not use the guides to learn new search techniques; rather, they prefer to utilize methods, such as Internet search engine queries, which they see as more efficient. In general, students prefer to operate autonomously and are open to innovation as long as the innovation does not come up against their current knowledge. Their perception of efficiency is linked to subject guide layout, which students in Ouellette's research reported as "cluttered" with "unclear wording," and as having an outdated layout, including tabs and the need to scroll (p. 444–447).

Similarly with academic language, Storch and Wigglesworth (2010) reported in their study on error correction in L2 writing that students are highly motivated to autonomously correct their own errors; however, if an instructor's advice on how to amend an error runs contrary to their internalized beliefs about how a particular grammar function works, they become resistant. Explicit rationale behind teaching choices and incorporating student feedback into IL resource development would quell some of these complaints, but a truth exists that some of these items cannot be remedied so easily.

The L2 Writer Subject Guide layout used in the current study is subject to the

---

Ouellette did not indicate the language background of her participants. Because the IHE is in central Canada, it is presumed that these students were L1 users of English.
constraints of the Springshare software, and libraries cannot replace such software without great cost. However, Springshare is the dominant library guide software in the field (D. Fanning, personal communication, 2012), so instructing students on its functions despite its flaws not only improves their access to resources at several libraries, but also helps familiarize them with autonomous learner practices. Learning the cultural expectations of appropriate research practices is an important part of an L2 writers’ academic acclimation to IHE and to their language development as well (Tomaš, 2011).

Supporting L2 writers through the intricacies of developing IL, including sourcing and textual borrowing, affects all aspects of their development as students.

In summary, evaluating students’ perception of the L2 Writer Subject Guide is vital for developing it into a successful learning tool (Brown et al., 2003; Jackson, 2005; Maybee, 2006; Ouellette, 2011). Perception influences the saliency of information, and if students do not believe that the guide is useful, the learned information may not be retained (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010). Pedagogical considerations, such as access to content, language, and learning strategies, could increase student competency in all facets (Bordonaro, 2011; Gross & Latham, 2007), perhaps resulting in increased learner autonomy. Kong (2009) argued that coconstruction of knowledge between student and instructor is optimal for the L2 student learning experience. Because students and instructors work together with the L2 Writer Subject Guide content, the opinions of both parties on the effectiveness and ease of use of the tools are necessary for making it a viable resource for L2 writers at the University of Utah.
Clarification of Terms

A few terms that are prevalent in applied linguistics and L2 pedagogy should be defined in the context of this study. The majority of the student participants in this study are international students, meaning they have arrived in the U.S. with the primary intention of pursuing a degree at an IHE. However, not all international students are L2 users; students from English speaking countries like Australia, Canada, or Kenya are international students but not L2 users of English. In this study, the term international students is only used when referring to students who have come to the U.S. with the intention of studying at an IHE, exclusive of their English language use.

The terms English learners or English language learners (ELLs) refer to students whose native language\(^2\) is not English. These students may be international students, refugees, immigrants, or heritage-speakers. The term ELL is typically applied in a K–12 context in which the students are truly in a context of learning English and have limited academic proficiency. It can be assumed that by attaining a position at an American university that an L2 user of English in ESL 1060 has gained a level of fluency that is necessary for participating in an English-based higher education curriculum. Student participants in ESL 1060 in this study are referred to as L2 writers, indicating that they are nonnative speakers of English who are using English to conduct research and produce academic writing. The term ESL is only used when referring to the course program or students actually enrolled in ESL courses. When speaking of the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum, the term module is used when speaking generically about the curriculum sections and the term lesson is used when referring to a specific section (e.g., Lesson 1 The Research Process is a module in the L2 Writers Subject Guide).

\(^2\) Native language is further defined as the language that is spoken at home with the parents.
Library jargon is consolidated for this study, as well. The U.S. National Forum on Information Literacy defines *information literacy (IL)* as "the ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively use that information for the issue or problem at hand" (U.S. National Forum on Information Literacy website, 2013). In the practical application of library sciences, *IL* refers to the promotion of library-related skills including, but not exclusive to, locating sources via catalogs and databases, accessing human resources, awareness of how information is organized, navigating the physical and digital spaces of a library, library instruction courses, evaluating the credibility of an academic source, proper source borrowing and citation practices, and fundamentals of the research process. In the context of this thesis, the term *information literacy* is used to refer to the dual mission of the L2 Writer Subject Guide to promote research skills and academic language proficiency among the L2 writers in sections of ESL 1060.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This chapter describes my orientation towards research, articulates my primary ontological and epistemological concerns, as well as my proposed research design and methodology. Descriptions of the participants, paradigms, procedures, data collection, and data analyses are included herein.

Research Design

The current research is designed as a case study. Hatch (2002) claimed that the term *case study* is often construed as a "catchall for identifying qualitative studies of various types" (p. 31). Consequently, he demanded that researchers conducting case studies further articulate the nature of the proposed study to identify its purpose. As such, this study is highly contextualized, describing the perceptions of a particular group of students in ESL 1060 at the University; therefore, it can be further defined as an *instrumental case study* that is "examined mainly to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization" (Stake, 2000, p. 437). The case participants themselves are not the primary focus of the study. Rather, their reactions to and interactions with the L2 Writer Subject Guide are the focus, and analyses point to how these reactions could be transferred to similar cases. Participants’ perceptions in the study are intended to provide
input into the curriculum development process. Because the case study participants are not the sole users of the L2 Writer Subject Guide, their attitudes will be used to inform decisions about the curriculum that would affect other students and instructors in their shared learning environment. Because of the qualitative nature of data collected in the study, the results are not intended to be generalizable but would support a criterion of transferability among users in University L2 writing community.

**Research Paradigms**

This case study employs both quantitative and qualitative data to evaluate how the L2 writing students' and instructors' perceive the usefulness of the L2 Writer Subject Guide. Students' achievement scores on the comprehensive pre- and postassessments are compared overall as well as for assessments in the individual modules. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) described how a mixed methods research design can exploit the strengths and curtail the weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative paradigms. The authors also asserted that a mixed methods approach "develop[s] techniques that are closer to what researchers actually use in practice" (p. 15). Employing a methodology that reflects an everyday process of curriculum development is important because the L2 Writer Subject Guide is used in real world classrooms in a real academic ESL program.

Designing the study to elicit the types of input that students and instructors would give in the course of their regular duties helps reduce the potential "Hawthorne effect." The Hawthorne effect occurs when the results of the study are more related to the participants' positive feelings about being included in the study than the effectiveness of the research itself (Brown, 1998). Because all curriculum and assessments associated
with the study are a graded part of the students' course work, their motivation to use the curriculum is grounded well outside of their participation in the study.

A mixed methods approach also takes advantage of several sources of data that have been available to the institution in the course of curriculum development. A quantifiable understanding of the L2 Writer Subject Guide's usefulness can be interpreted from the assessment scores; however, to gain a full understanding of its usefulness, qualitative analyses of student and teacher reactions to the L2 Writer Subject Guide's content and layout are essential to developing the most user-friendly and pedagogically approachable resources. If the stakeholders do not believe in its usefulness or if they have difficulty using the tool, they may not be inclined to use it, even if the test scores imply that the curriculum has a positive effect on the students' IL abilities.

Stakeholder investment reflects the elemental nature of a mixed methods approach that is grounded in pragmatism. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) described pragmatism as the philosophical partner to mixed methods research as its tenants emphasize the interaction between the natural world and the idiosyncratic communal world of humans. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie acknowledged that to evaluate the influence of the human experience, a "strong practical empiricism [is] the path to determine what works;" however, any truth found is "tentative and …changing over time" (p. 18) because truth is being constructed from several human viewpoints. Although pragmatism is not always viewed as philosophically sound because the multiple viewpoints of many cannot be logically reconciled (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004), it is an appropriate approach for this case study. The study seeks to "promote incremental change" in the L2 writers experiences and overcomes a traditional weakness of pragmatism by clearly defining who
is meant to benefit from the practical solutions developed (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 19). In this case the beneficiaries are the L2 writers and their instructors at the University.

As a qualitative researcher, I follow a Constructivist paradigm; it is an ideal match for a pragmatic approach. Constructivists believe that knowledge is coconstructed by the researcher and the participants (Hatch, 2002). In addition, the ontological assumption of Constructivism is that knowledge is not universal but that it is constructed through "multiple realities" (Hatch, 2002, p. 13). Epistemologically, knowledge manifests as a product of individual experiences and, therefore, necessitates the input of all learning community participants. For this study, the experiences of students and instructors are essential for interpreting the effectiveness of the L2 Writer Subject Guide. In addition, my own reality as the researcher who is also the primary developer of the Subject Guide, a student of the University, and an experienced ESL instructor is considered in order to fully inform the L2 Writer Subject Guide’s effectiveness.

My own beliefs about research and knowledge construction guide the choices I have made relative to these paradigms. As an experienced instructor of L2 learners, I have intimate knowledge of the challenges that students and instructors face in trying to learn and teach according to best practices. I have previously adapted and developed several curricula and have found that the best ones allow for student autonomy and some power sharing. For example, students in my classrooms are free to choose their own groups and research topics. I am a believer in student feedback and employ the services of the University’s Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) every semester to provide midterm focus groups with my students, the feedback from which often leads
to changes in my teaching behavior and course design.

It has been through the integration of this reflective teaching practice that I have discovered that course design is impacted by both instructors and students. Student input has indeed influenced my own views of teaching and learning. I am one of the first American teachers that many L2 learners have at the University because many of my students are first semester L2 learners. Subsequently, I see that students coconstruct their reality of teaching and learning in this environment through their interactions with me. My awareness of what it means to coconstruct a teaching and learning reality have made me a more responsive and sensitive instructor, which is why I have chosen a research focus that directly influences the students’ and instructors' experiences. This pragmatic Constructivist approach I employ considers the student role essential to creating a fruitful learning environment. Only through consultation and collaboration of all stakeholders can optimal beneficence be achieved.

**Participants**

Participants in this study were students enrolled in and an instructor of ESL 1060 during Fall Semester 2013. The instructor was a full-time, adjunct instructor who is experienced and a career ESL teacher. Even though the majority of the ESL instructors at the University of Utah are graduate TAs with various teaching backgrounds and career goals, I chose an experienced career ESL teacher to participate in this study for several reasons. First, her continued commitment to the field of second-language teaching helped ensure her investment in both using and providing honest input to improve the L2 Writer Subject Guide. Second, I wanted to control for inexperience in teaching and unfamiliarity
with the knowledge base of L2 pedagogy. Because she has many years of classroom and curriculum experience, I felt confident that she would appropriately integrate the L2 Writer Subject Guide as it was designed into her course curriculum. Outside of my influence as the designer of the L2 Writer Subject Guide, I interacted with her classes if invited as part of my teaching duties with the Marriott Library; all that was otherwise agreed upon was that the students complete all assessments by the end of the academic semester.

The student participants were enrolled in two sections of the instructor’s ESL 1060 course. While this sample may not represent a truly random pool, it does represent a real-world pool. Students often choose courses based on the time they are offered, their relationships with instructors, and their desire to be with friends. In the confines of this research design, there is no way to assess how the students enrolled in these courses compared to their counterparts in other courses, so it is assumed that the two courses represented the full spectrum of student ability and motivation in the ESL program. During Fall Semester 2013, there were seven sections of ESL 1060 with a total enrollment of 142 students; therefore, the participants in this study represented 27% of the total target demographic for the L2 Writer Subject Guide. Student participants were nonnative (L2) speakers of English—that is, students who have a home language other than English. There were no gender, language background, nor age criteria for participants, only enrollment in ESL 1060.
Data Collection

Two types of data were collected in order to answer all of the research questions about the L2 writer and instructor perspectives and the L2 Writer Subject Guide. Quantitative data provided an objective tool to measure how much knowledge the students gain by interacting with the curriculum in the L2 Writer Subject Guide. The pre- and posttests and individual module assessments were designed to determine how much IL and academic language knowledge the students had prior to interacting with the modules and what knowledge they gained via the interaction. These data are essential for answering questions like Research Question 4 (What is the nature of the relationship between student perceptions of the L2 Writer Subject Guide and student performance on the assessments?) and Research Question 5 (What is the difference between student performances on pre- and posttests?).

Perceptions of learning cannot always be measured in numbers. Because this study is designed to explore student and instructor perceptions of curriculum and how these perceptions can inform curriculum development, it is necessary to gather qualitative data. Qualitative data are essential when answering research questions such as Research Question 1 (What are students' perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide relative to its effectiveness?) and Research Question 2 (What are instructors' perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide relative to its effectiveness?).

Quantitative Data

Quantitative data were collected via the aggregated assessment scores from the cloze (a type of response requiring learners to fill in the blanks) section of the pre- and
posttests and each individual module assessment. Interpretation of test scores is a common educational practice for measuring students' knowledge of material and an instructor's ability to teach. In particular, language programs use test scores to assess students' knowledge of language for course placement or exemption from language courses.

The pre- and postassessments cloze (Appendix A) for this study consisted of eight questions that surveyed the combined content and language use of the L2 Writer Subject Guide modules. The cloze paragraph described the basic research process with several blank lines. Students chose from a drop-down list of four options to fill the blank. Each potential selection included a verb and complement that represented the language needed to conduct the research process (e.g., evaluating scholarly sources, develop research questions). Four verbs were present-progressive and four were simple present in order to narrow the choices based on grammaticality of where they were in the paragraph. For example, *You are now ready to begin evaluating scholarly sources* is grammatical in a way that *You are now ready to begin develop research questions* is not. The paragraph construction was dependent on completing the modules and the way the process was described therein. Though it did not assess the student’s ability to conduct effective research, the cloze did assess their ability to talk about their process and the steps and identify resources available. The pre- and postassessments were presented as quizzes on Canvas so that their place in the study curriculum was seen as parallel to the regular curriculum. The pretest was administered as an online quiz with a 1-week timeframe for completion and was not proctored; the posttest was administered in a similar fashion at

---

3 The nonproctored administration of the assessments was meant to represent how the guide is intended to be used—as a classroom supplement to instruction and as an autonomous learning tool. It is true that
the end of the semester. The individual module assessments were taken by the students via Canvas as well and as per the instructor's preference. These were administered at the instructor's discretion as out-of-class work.

Teacher supervision of the individual module assessments was minimal, allowing students considerable autonomy. This approach has pros and cons. One benefit includes allowing the instructor to lead the class sessions as she normally would. Because the L2 Writer Subject Guide is intended to be a supplement to instruction and not the primary mode, it is reasonable to assume that the instructor would prefer to keep as much of the class time as possible available for other activities. Because the students can complete the module and assessment at their own pace, the negative affective aspects of the assessments may be reduced as students are not being evaluated by their instructor. There are also possible disadvantages to the minimal teacher supervision approach, such as the increased opportunity for students to work together on the assessments as the website is open to all. Even though such an open approach could result in some students doing very little work, it is also the case that giving learners the freedom to make that determination is central to autonomous learning, and events like this do represent the reality of how the guide is intended to be used. The instructor may try to encourage students to view module assessments as practice for the individual posttest. The instructor could likewise make the

---

students may collaborate when completing these study assessments but that is a reality that would occur under nonstudy conditions as would the instructor's preference for using the materials primarily out of class. Likewise, many of these students had already been exposed to some of the module lessons during the Summer 2013 pilot in which teachers volunteered to integrate two modules into their curriculum and provided feedback on its use. Because the Fall 2013 ESL 1060 students were in various writing courses over the summer, it is impossible to know which students had worked with which modules and which students had used the tool between the pilot and the study. One of the purposes of this study is to examine how students' and teachers' choices and input inform the curriculum development process; permissions such as prestudy exposure and less controlled assessment are indicative of the real world curriculum development process I am seeking to model.
effect on a student's grade for module completion minimal, thereby encouraging them to try to complete the modules on their own. Of course, it is important to remember that there are also benefits for students in working together, and cooperative learning has been shown to improve student-learning experiences (Grabe & Stoller, 1997; McGroarty, 1992).

Comparisons between the student performances on the individual modules versus the posttest assessments may also provide insight as to how the students are using the modules as supplemental materials. Scores from the assessments were aggregated by Canvas, and I stripped all identifying information from them once they had been downloaded.

Quantitative data regarding student and instructor perceptions of the L2 Writer Subject Guide's usefulness were gathered using a survey tool. Surveys are a common method for gathering information on student and instructor experiences in a course or with a curriculum. As part of regular protocol, the University collects survey data feedback from students for every course offered at the end of each semester. Surveys also allow for the collection of a large amount of data in a short period of time, and these features combined with their quotidian occurrence at the University makes them an ideal method for soliciting perceptions for this study. The quantitative portion of the surveys includes questions on a 0–3 Likert scale about specific features they liked or did not like and their projections of future use. The survey tool was informed using the analysis of the pilot survey. For example, the pilot survey revealed that students have high confidence in their ability to do research, so exploring further how they use and value resources to facilitate this is addressed in the survey.
Qualitative Data

The qualitative data for this study were collected using three methods. First, the same surveys used for the quantitative data were used to gather qualitative information on student and instructor perceptions. Modeling techniques from Cox (1996) and Thomas (1999), the qualitative questions activate schemata, elicit impressions of the affect around using the curriculum and offer qualifying explanations for why the students feel the guides' features were useful or not.

Second, the qualitative data were collected via focus groups with students and an oral interview with the instructor. Questions for these were designed based on the interpretations of the quantitative and qualitative survey data and the themes identified in the pre- and posttest. I attempted to identify key areas that merit discussion about the L2 Writer Subject Guide's usefulness but will also allow the conversation to deviate naturally around other relevant topics as the students and instructor may have perceptions to share that I did not anticipate from prior analysis. I conducted one student focus group for each course section (two focus groups). Per the instructor's preference, the focus groups were conducted with the entire class during a chosen class period late in the semester. Students were verbally reminded that their participation was voluntary. Due to the large number of students, the focus group contained two parts. During the first portion students brainstormed answers to some questions about their experience using the L2 Writers Subject Guide (Appendix B). This piece was meant to activate learner schemata and allow them to prepare their ideas about the use. The second portion was a guided discussion to elicit more information from their brainstorm session and introduce more questions to tease out details of their experience and perceptions of the curriculum. Focus
groups were audio recorded, and the recording was transcribed by the researcher for analysis and coding.

Third, 20 open-ended questions of the pre- and posttest were coded and analyzed for student conceptions of the research process before and after interacting with the full curriculum. These questions are meant to provide a picture of how students conceptualize the research process at the various stages and to identify which themes dominate this conceptualization.

**Data Analysis**

This section describes the methods and processes for analyzing the quantitative and qualitative data.

**Quantitative Analysis**

Quantitative analyses were comprised primarily of descriptive statistics to determine the mean scores and standard deviation on the individual modules. These results were used to refine the individual modules and further understand the perceptions of the students and instructor. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data from the surveys to interpret the general attitude toward the L2 Writer Subject Guide and to analyze student performance on the individual module assessments and the pre- and posttest cloze. Because the cloze results represent the same group without a control, a paired *t*-test was also run to determine if there was a significant difference between the pre- and posttest cloze results. The results of the *t*-test were not meant to be generalizable nor speak solely to the L2 Writers Subject Guide but were used to understand the overall
performances of the students in this initial group in relation to the integration of the L2 Writer Subject Guide. First, the L2 Writer Subject Guide is a supplement to regular IL instruction; the students received information not only from the Subject Guide, but from their instructor and other outside resources (e.g., librarians, the Internet, courses and seminars). This study was not designed to control for the effects that other sources may have on the students’ knowledge of IL, but a t-test could inform the researcher if the L2 Writer Subject Guide had an effect for this particular group.

**Qualitative Analysis**

The qualitative analysis was the primary means of interpreting the student and instructor perceptions of the effectiveness of the L2 Writer Subject Guide as a learning tool. To analyze and apply the qualitative input from the pre- and posttests, survey answers, focus groups, and interview, I used an inductive analysis method as defined by Hatch (2002) using the following steps:

1. Read the surveys and transcribed data and identify *frames of analysis*. Frames of analysis are defined as individual ideas, segments, or incidents; for this study, the curriculum content and design of the L2 Writers Subject Guide directed the identification of the frames of analysis since this is the context from which the questions were designed.

2. Determine semantic relationships between the different frames of analysis. Frames of analysis with semantic ties are reorganized into domains. For this study, domains were derived from the frames of analysis by grouping according to general question content (e.g., search
strategies, resources, plagiarism, etc.).

3. Identify the salient domains and assign a code to each one. Nonsalient frames of analysis are disregarded. To ensure rigor, each comment was coded prior to discarding any nonsalient domains or frames of analysis.

4. Review the data and refine the domains. Records were kept of where relationships were found in the data.

5. Search for specific data points that support the domains and for examples that do not coincide with the relationships and domains.

6. Conduct an analysis within each domain. This analysis served to identify salient trends among student responses.

7. Identify themes among domains. While the domains represented the content themes of the study, themes represented the students' perceptions of the curriculum and conceptualization of the research process.

8. Construct an outline illustrating the thematic relationships within and among domains (Appendix C).

9. Choose specific data points to support key elements of the outline. These data points were the support for the analysis.

Initial themes were identified from the survey responses, and these themes were also used to write the focus group and interview questions. The focus group and interview recordings were analyzed and coded independently of the surveys. After domains and key themes had been identified, all three sources were analyzed in total, and dominant themes were identified and analyzed across the entire pool of data.
Issues in Qualitative Research

Positivist views in research have had a powerful influence on educational research; consequently, the issues of validity, reliability, generalizability, and objectivity, which provide the framework for quality research, must also be used to define rigor in qualitative research. Qualitative research is judged by standards of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The data collection and analysis procedures for the qualitative data in the current study have been designed with these standards of rigor in mind as the basis for establishing academic integrity.

Rigor in Qualitative Research

Credibility is defined as "the probability that the findings will be…approved by the constructors of the multiple realities being studied" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 296), and it is established through a description of the study participants and parameters of the study. The study population was chosen because ESL 1060 students and instructors would be most directly affected by the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum and because the researcher has extensive personal experience with both the ESL program at the University and the L2 Writer Subject Guide. Though the results of this study are not generalizable outside of the specific group of L2 writers and instructor who are directly involved, they do illustrate an element of transferability.

Transferability is defined as "the degree of similarity between sending and receiving contexts" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 297). Because the specific students who enroll in ESL 1060 represent a cross-section of the L2 writer population at the University
and its diversity, the perceptions of the subject pool are likely to be representative of the affected L2 writers, stakeholders for the use of the L2 Writer Subject Guide, and the University. Stemming from the notion of transferability is the issue of dependability.

*Dependability* is defined as "taking into account both factors of instability…, factors of phenomenal or design induced change" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 299). Because the study tasks and data collection methods are integrated into normal classroom activities, they are expected to provide a dependable reflection of the coconstructed reality that takes place outside of the study. For example, students in this study completed surveys and focus groups about the L2 Writer Subject Guide just as they complete end-of-semester surveys and CTLE midterm focus groups. These instruments and processes are intended to give feedback on university courses every semester. More specific to this context, many of the ESL 1060 students in this study participated in the summer 2013 pilot of the L2 Writer Subject Guide. The pilot included the students using one or two of the lessons and providing feedback via surveys. The parallel procedures between both phases of the L2 Writer Subject Guide study further ensured the dependability of the data collection procedure.

To ensure *confirmability* (e.g., an audit of characteristics of the data to ensure their genuineness [Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 300]), and check the negative effects of researcher biases, I employed suggested methods from Marshall and Rossman (1999, p. 194–195) for interpreting data from a study in which I am also a participant. I employed a triangulation\(^4\) strategy to check and recheck data in order to identify any possible alternative explanations. Triangulation also supports the *credibility* of the research. For

\(^4\) Triangulation is defined as the process of auditing study data and interpretations by employing alternative methods or investigators by Marshall and Ross (1999).
this study, triangulation was accomplished through the comparison of themes across the various data sources (pre- and posttests, surveys, interview, and focus group). After all sources had been analyzed and themed separately, they were brought together to see how the themes intersect and diverge across data sources.

**Researcher as Instrument**

Under a Constructivist paradigm, the researcher is an active participant and instrument in the study; her viewpoint is considered essential to the construction of knowledge and reality (Hatch, 2002). I believe I am well suited to oversee this specific project and conduct the research because of my experience and place within the learning community being studied. I am an American female who moved to Utah 2 years ago. Like many of my students, I moved to the area with the primary purpose of pursuing an advanced degree. Also like many of my students, I did not transfer directly from another American locale. The three years immediately prior to my tenure at the University were spent teaching English abroad, first as a Peace Corps volunteer in rural Mauritania and Rwanda, and more recently as an English teacher at a primary school in rural France. I believe that this extensive experience living and working abroad has provided me with the cultural perspective of the challenges University international students face in adapting to new academic and linguistic expectations and had provided an initial context for my teaching. When I came to the University I was keenly aware of my students' situations, and this awareness allowed me to recognize the possibilities that can emerge when they are invited to take control over their learning situation. There is so little else they can control in this new environment, and empowering them to take control of their academic success helps quell feelings of helplessness that are part of expatriate life.
The above description of my desire for developing autonomy in students indicates one of the prevalent biases of which I need be aware. My success integrating into my own foreign communities means that I expect the same from my students; however, the reality is often that students do not have the same level of deference I had for my foreign living situations, and this could be frustrating as a researcher because I may be inclined to see them as ungrateful. Also, being students, they are often not passionate about their learning experiences in general. Students may consent to participate because their instructor asks them to, they know it is research, and they experience peer pressure. Their reasons for participation may not necessarily be because they have a personal and vested interest in helping create better resources. I anticipated checking these biases as I collected data and was supported by my own vested interest in seeing this project as a snapshot of a standard academic life and experience for these students. In the real world of the University, some international students are not passionate about university life and if their responses about the L2 Writer Subject Guide reflect that reality, then that authenticity is the optimal example of the coconstruction of reality.

As the primary developer of the L2 Writer Subject Guide, I have spent a great deal of time and energy developing the tool and am tied to the project professionally and emotionally. I have done well in developing the tool with sound research foundations and a base of best L2 pedagogy practices. To believe that hearing the criticisms from my colleagues and students should not trigger defensive feelings would invalidate my role in the knowledge construction process; creating a viable, valuable, and sustainable resource for L2 writers and their instructors is of the utmost importance, and this long-term view helps me view these criticisms as requests for a better resource for the targeted
stakeholders.

**Ethical Concerns**

Participant safety and confidentiality are of utmost importance in this study. Part of the motivation for designing the study as it is described here is to reduce the potential negative affective aspects of participating in research. The participant feedback and data collection methods mimic those of regular University operations, so there is no anticipated additional stress for the participants. All information that could be used to identify individual participants was stripped from the data. All study related documents were kept on the researcher's password-protected personal computer. I am current in my research ethics training and am in the process of seeking Institutional Research Board (IRB) approval for working with human subjects on the proposed project, as per University protocol. A prior phase of the Subject Guide development has already been through the IRB process and was exempted. All participants were informed, in writing and verbally, of their rights to decline, to participate, or for withdrawing from the study. All data collection commenced in accordance with IRB study approvals.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter describes the results of the analyses of various data sources. Quantitative results describe the pre- and posttests and the individual lesson assessments. Quantitative results are discussed in the context of the qualitative results from the students' and instructor's perceptions of the L2 Writer Subject Guide. Qualitative results describe the pre- and posttests, the postuse student survey and focus group, and the postuse instructor interview.

Quantitative Results

This section describes the results of the analyses from the quantitative data: the cloze section of the pre- and posttests, the individual module assessments, and the student survey.

Pre- and Posttest Cloze

Table 4.1 describes the results from the pre- and posttest cloze exercises. There were a total of eight points available. The correct responses (# correct) and percentage correct (% correct) represent the number of participants ($N = 20$) who chose the correct response for that filled blank; the anticipated response is indicated in *italics* (e.g.,
choosing a topic; see Appendix A for paragraph context).

Tables 4.2 and 4.3 describe the descriptive statistics and results from a paired samples $t$-test conducted using SPSS to compare cloze scores in the pre- and posttest. There was no significant difference in the scores for the pretest ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 2.26$) and the posttest ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 2.35$); $t(19) = -1.27$, $p = .220$.

**Individual Module Assessments**

Table 4.4 summarizes the results from the individual module assessments for both course sections combined. Each assessment had a total of 10 possible points, and the number of participants varies with the number of students who completed the assignment.

**Student Survey**

Descriptive statistics from the student survey (Appendix D) reflect the study group’s perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide's usefulness for acquiring research skills and academic language proficiency. Table 4.5 reports the students’ perceptions of the usefulness of individual Subject Guide lessons. In the survey, they were asked to choose the three lessons they found the most useful and the three lessons they found the least useful. These choices were not intended to be hierarchical but rather holistic impressions of the lessons that students found useful. Twenty-five students contributed to this question and provided 71 responses for most useful lessons and 72 responses for least useful. Table 4.5 reports the number ($N$) of students who chose the lesson among the most/least useful categories, the percentage of students (% students) who chose this lesson among the most/least useful, and the percentage of the total responses each lesson
received (based on 71 responses for *most useful* and 72 total responses for *least useful*).

Table 4.6 represents student perception of the usefulness of specific curriculum features of the L2 Writers Subject Guide. Students were asked to rank the features on a scale of 1–7, with ‘1’ being the most useful feature and ‘7’ being the least-useful feature. They were allowed to rank two features the same if they felt they were equally useful. Table 4.6 reports the average ranking for each feature. Because ‘1’ represents the most useful, a lower average indicates a higher ranking in this scale. The *Overall place* column represents the place among the seven features based on the average ranking. Table 4.7 illustrates students’ perceptions of how the guide contributed to their academic language proficiency. Using a four-point Likert scale, student’s rated how the L2 Writers Subject Guide contributed to their English skills.

Finally, when asked if they would use the L2 Writers Subject Guide again as a research reference, 71.17% (19/24) of students responded that they would use it again. Because the L2 Writers Subject Guide encompasses the use of several research resources, Table 4.8 represents student perceptions of the usefulness of the various resources to which they were exposed through the L2 Writers Subject Guide by asking participants to rate on a four-point Likert scale the likelihood of using the resources in their future research work.

**Qualitative Results**

This section describes the results of the analyses of the qualitative data: the pre-test, posttest, student focus group and survey, and the instructor interview.

The methodology that frames the analysis for the qualitative data (Hatch, 2002)
was largely driven by the curriculum content. Because the L2 Writer Subject Guide curriculum looks at content specifically related to research and at academic language needs for beginning researchers, these are the frames in which student and instructor perceptions are relevant. Most questions on all data collection tools are based on the research skills and academic language content of the curriculum. Identification of domains was motivated by content because during the identification process, I saw that the type of responses and volume of responses about a topic were determined by the types of questions that were asked. For example, five pre/posttest questions explicitly asked about citation and plagiarism; therefore, the high numbers of coded responses about these topics were indicative of the test design and not necessarily the students' awareness of these issues. Domains were derived by grouping questions with related frames of analysis and completed after the initial round of open coding had taken place.

Whereas domains reflect the content of the questions themselves, the themes that emerged offer insight into how students conceptualize research and writing and how they perceive the usefulness of the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum. The pretest themes indicate how students understand research and writing processes at the beginning of ESL 1060. The posttest, survey, and focus group themes indicate how students' conceptualize research and writing processes after ESL 1060, how they perceive the usefulness of the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum, and how they practice research as developing writers after completing the course.
Pretest Data

Pretest domains were identified categorizing questions based on how they addressed the different aspects of the curriculum:

1. Act of research. This domain includes responses from questions that investigate students' approaches to searching for and finding sources to use for their writing projects, including resources they use to access sources, how they use search terms, and the types of sources they use. (Example question: How is Google Scholar different than the Marriott Library catalog?)

2. Language use and writing. This domain includes responses from questions that investigate students' awareness of the academic language proficiency and writing skills that research demands. Student responses speak to the role of reading strategies, paraphrasing, summarizing, choosing search terms, and so on in the research and writing process. (Example question: Describe your paraphrasing process.)

3. Understanding the research process. This domain entails how students conceive the processes that are involved in conducting research, such as developing a timeline of a research project and developing a topic and research questions. (Example question: How can 'funnel' or chart methods help you develop your research idea into a research question?)

4. Quality control and evaluation. This domain involves how students conceive of the criteria for choosing the sources they will ultimately use in their research and writing. (Example question: You are writing a report on recent developments in sports medicine. You find a book from 1905 about the invention of American
football that does not talk about injuries. Explain why this book is or is not appropriate.)

5. Research as collaboration. This domain draws from student responses pointed to how and from whom they seek additional help through the research and writing process. (Example question: Whom can you talk to if you are having trouble citing your sources or if you are unclear about plagiarism guidelines?)

6. Understanding academic honesty. This domain includes responses that illustrate how students are conceptualizing source borrowing and documentation, both in their impressions of the University's expectations and their own personal practice. (Example question: Describe when you should cite a source.)

Pretest results revealed that among these domains, students' conception of the research process and its role in writing expressed itself in five intersecting themes:

1. Affective factors. This theme includes responses in which participants expressed emotional responses to research or writing. These responses could be related to motivation, anxiety, confidence, etc. Themes related to Affective Factors are present in the Understanding Academic Honesty and Language Use and Writing domains.

2. Efficiency and ease. This theme includes responses in which participants discussed their perceptions of ease in research and writing tasks or their decision to practice a certain research skill because it makes the process more efficient. One pervasive concept in this theme is the idea of time. Themes related to Efficiency and Ease are present in the domains of Language Use and Writing, Understanding the Research Process, and Research as Collaboration.
3. Narrowing strategies. This theme includes responses in which participants discussed the strategies they employ for refining the scope of their research topics and processes; participants also note several reasons for their desire to narrow the research process. The Themes related to Narrowing Strategies are present in the Act of Research, Language Use and Writing, Understanding the Research Process, and Quality Control and Evaluation domains.

4. Process and strategies. This theme includes responses in which participants discuss the strategies they employed during the research and writing processes in general. All process related comments that do not concern refining or narrowing were included here (e.g., when they start a project, how they go about searching for sources, etc.). Themes related to Process and Strategies are present in the Act of Research, Language Use and Writing, Research as Collaboration, and Understanding Academic Honesty domains.

5. Awareness of resources. This theme includes responses in which participants reveal knowledge of available resources, how they access these sources, and their ignorance of available resources. These resources do not include nonhuman resources (e.g., web or library related sources); all human resources or face-to-face interaction (e.g., librarians, Writing Center) are categorized with Research as Collaboration, reasons for which will be discussed in the next section. Themes related to Awareness of Resources are present in the Act of Research, Quality Control and Evaluation, and Understanding Academic Honesty domains.
Posttest Data

To ensure the posttest analysis was conducted with the same rigor and independence as the pretest, posttest domains were categorized only after the first round of open coding. Because posttest domains were based on the same questions as the pretest, domains are similar between the two assessments:

1. Research process in practice. This domain details responses in which students described how students conduct research including search strategies, evaluation strategies, idea development processes, and resource selection. This domain does not include responses that concern the results of the research process, only the procedure. This domain’s pretest counterpart is Act of Research. (Example question: *Describe a situation in which a keyword search would help you find the best sources for your research.*)

2. Language use and writing. Like its pretest counterpart of the same title, this domain includes responses in which students' responses include elements of language awareness, use, and the challenges they face. Many responses centered on writing and its relationship to research and communication with librarians. (Example question: *List three things to avoid when writing an email to a librarian?)

3. Conceptualization of the research process. This domain includes responses from across the posttest. When a salient factor was mentioned by students in several contexts, it implied that this factor is integral to their beliefs about how research should be practiced, the purpose of research, or their beliefs about the usefulness of the L2 Writers Subject Guide. This domain also included responses that reflect
a misunderstanding of the research process or the purpose of research; though these are considered misunderstandings of how the academy defines research, they are important for understanding how the students are conceptualizing research. Its pretest counterpart is *Understanding the Research Process* and reflects similar questions and themes. The purpose of the title change between the pre- and posttest domains is to represent the experience students have with research and research curriculum. Prior to ESL 1060, students had variable experiences with academic research, so the idea of *understanding* is meant to reflect how they may be practicing research (or imagining research) prior to any formal instruction. At the posttest, it is known that the students have had a formal and standardized guidance in academic research and have used this new information to inform prior research practice and reconceptualize previous notions of academic research; therefore, *conceptualization* is used to describe this process. (Example question: *How does strategic reading help you during the research process?*)

4. Research products in practice. This domain includes responses that include references to what kinds of sources to look for, what types of information research should yield, what type of information they are finding versus what they are actively searching for, which sources they choose to use, and so on. Narrowing and related concepts are included here because they imply the types of results students believe research should produce. In short, any response speaking to a research goal belongs in this domain. Its pretest counterpart is *Quality Control and Evaluation*. (Example question: *You are writing an argument paper about*
obesity in the U.S. and you find a private blog about dieting that is written by someone who is neither a nutritionist nor works in the medical field. Explain why this website is inappropriate for your research.)

5. Conceptualization of academic honesty. Similar to the rationale provided for the Conceptualization of the Research Process domain, the Conceptualization of Academic Honesty domain reflects the students' opportunity to reimagine their ideas on plagiarism and citation after participating in a thorough research curriculum; the pretest counterpart Understanding Academic Honesty represents students' conceptions of academic honesty prior to any verifiable instruction on the topic. Responses in this domain included student thoughts on source borrowing practices and norms, motivations for plagiarism, and resources for discussing learning more about University standards of academic honesty.

(Example question: Describe a method to cite sources in your research.)

There are six intersecting themes among the posttest domains that offer further insight into students' conceptualization of research processes and experience with the curricula. Unlike the domains, the posttest themes vary more from the pretest themes, though there is some crossover between the two assessments.

1. Academic evaluation. This theme entails students' rationale behind the choices they make when deciding if an action or resource serves an academic research purpose. Examples include detailing ideas about academic versus popular sources or from what level of discourse they borrow information (word-level or idea-level). The Academic Evaluation theme is found in the Conceptualization of the Research Process, Research Products in Practice, and Conceptualization of
Academic Honesty domains.

2. Research-writing paradigm. This theme illustrates how students perceive the relationship between research and writing in ESL 1060. Comments analyzed here reflect ideas that students carry about the interdependence or separation of these processes and also if they are viewing research as a function of their larger academic career or as an isolated function of ESL 1060. The **Research-Writing Paradigm** theme presents itself in the Conceptualization of Academic Honesty, Language Use and Writing, and Conceptualization of the Research Process domains.

3. Resource preference. This theme includes students’ descriptions of which resources they prefer to use and how they employ these resources during their research process. Many of these comments include examples of how the students used resources specific to their ESL 1060 research projects. **Resource Preference** is present in the Conceptualization of the Research Process, Conceptualization of Academic Honesty, Research Process in Practice, and Research Products in Practice domains.

4. Process and strategy preference. Similar to Resource Preference, the **Process and Strategy Preference** theme reflects students’ partiality to and exemplified use of specific research strategies (e.g., search strategies, evaluation strategies, etc.). This theme is found in the Conceptualization of the Research Process, Conceptualization of Academic Honesty, Research Process in Practice, and Research Products in Practice domains.

5. Developing expert knowledge. Throughout the analysis, a dichotomy appeared as
to how students view the purpose of research. Some viewed research solely as a function of an academic career. However, this theme represents how students viewed research and writing as a means to develop expert knowledge on a certain topic, discipline, or as part of learning strategy development (in lieu of a strictly academic exercise). This theme occurs in the Language Use and Writing, Research Products in Practice, Research Process in Practice, and Conceptualization of the Research Process domains.

6. Research as collaboration. Whereas this theme was present as a domain in the pretest, posttest analysis revealed that after their experiences in ESL 1060, students viewed collaboration as part and parcel of other research processes and strategies as opposed to an isolated strategy. For example, in response to the question *Who can you talk to if you are having trouble citing your sources or if you are unclear about plagiarism guidelines?*, one student responded, “It is best to talk to your instructor, because she/he has a certain way of citing formation that he/she wants.” By explicitly including the interaction with the instructor as part of the citation process, this student reveals that the interaction has a specific function in his/her process. Illustrations of the interdependence of collaboration and research success reflect more thematic information than domain information. *Research as Collaboration* is present in the Language Use and Writing, Research Products in Practice, and Research Process in Practice domains.
Student Focus Groups

After the open coding process, student focus group domains were organized according to the topic of the questions that were addressed during the focus groups:

1. Accessibility of resources. This domain refers to the students’ reflections on their ability to efficiently and confidently access research resources and the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum. This does not include references to resources or curricular features they used but rather the components of the curriculum or other resources they think make accessing the resources easier; in other words, this domain speaks to the affective response to the library and L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum. (Example question from the focus group: In terms of the ‘user-friendliness’ [computer use], was the LibGuide easy to use or difficult to use? Provide examples.)

2. Conceptualization of research. This domain includes student input on how they believe the research process and the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum should be. Responses here illustrate what students consider to constitute research, what they still find difficult, and how they wish the research process or research curriculum would be different. (Example question from the focus group: If you could change 1–2 things about the Research Skills for Developing Writers Subject Guide, how would you change it?)

3. Usefulness of curriculum. This domain includes responses that refer the usefulness or preference for specific aspects of the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum like learning features (e.g., graphic organizers, quizzes, text, videos, etc.) and content (e.g., research and academic language content). (Example
question from the focus group: *Do you believe that the quizzes were useful?*

4. Using resources. This domain describes how students report *how students actually used resources* and why they choose to use those resources. This is separate from their thoughts on the usability or accessibility because they may be using resources they do not actually like to use (e.g., because the teacher tells them to); in other words, this domain describes their pragmatic use of research resources and the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum. (Example question from the focus group: *Which resources [e.g., catalog, databases, librarians] do you use the most? Why?*)

Focus group results revealed four intersecting themes that offer insight into the participants' perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum and ideas about the research process.

1. Awareness of resources. This theme includes all responses in which participants explicitly discuss their knowledge of research and/or academic language resources, how they use these resources, and their attitudes about the usefulness of these resources. For the focus group data, resources may include all human (e.g., librarians, the Writing Center, etc.) and nonhuman (e.g., databases, catalog, etc.). The *Awareness of Resources* theme intersects among all domains: *Accessibility of Resources, Conceptualization of Research, Usefulness of Curriculum,* and *Using Resources.*

2. Coursework and assessment. This theme represents responses in which participants discuss research or writing in the context of the ESL 1060 course. Responses may include references to homework, grades, course requirements,
instructor demands, or writing assignment types (e.g., the argumentative essay, a summary paragraph). *Coursework and Assessment* themes are present in the *Conceptualization of Research, Usefulness of Curriculum, and Using Resources* domains.

3. Learning process and progress. This theme offers insight into how participants practice research, what their learning preferences are, how they believe their research and/or language skills have progressed, where they feel they are still lacking in research and/or language skills or support, and affective factors surrounding the research process or academic language proficiency. The *Learning Process and Progress* theme intersects among all domains: *Accessibility of Resources, Conceptualization of Research, Usefulness of Curriculum, and Using Resources*.

4. Research-writing paradigm. In this theme, participants view research as a function of their academic career or a means to develop knowledge. Similarly, responses that indicate the students see the research and writing processes as inherently linked are included here as well. For example, participants talking about research in the context of the topic they wrote about versus as an argumentative essay reveals different views on the purpose of research and academic language. *Research-Writing Paradigm* contrasts the *Coursework and Assessment* theme in which students express a narrower view of research and writing as the function of a single course. The *Research-Writing Paradigm* theme intersects among the *Conceptualization of Research and Usefulness of Curriculum* domains.
Student Survey

The data generated by the student survey are distinct because, unlike the module assessments and focus group questions, the questions here are perception-oriented as opposed to content-oriented. The questions were open ended so that students could express their feelings about the curriculum as a whole and less focused on their opinions toward or knowledge about a specific content aspect. For example, *Do you think you will use the Research Skills for L2 Writers LibGuide again to get information about doing research, even if a teacher does not ask you to?* represents a perception-oriented question from the survey because it references the curriculum as a whole and does not specify to what aspect of the curriculum the student should speak. In contrast, from the focus group, *Do you believe that the quizzes were useful? Did you learn anything from taking them?* asks the students to directly speak to the quizzes and rarely did students mention other curriculum content in these responses. Because the survey questions were open ended, domains were not defined by the content from characteristic questions as they were for the other qualitative domains; nearly all questions were represented in every node.

During the open-coding process, the data from the student user survey revealed that there were two distinct domains in how the students discussed their reactions to the curriculum:

1. Attitudes toward the curriculum. Responses in this domain characterize student perceptions of the usefulness of the curriculum in the context of specific curricular features, like a lesson, activity, or feature. Comments here also reflect how the students felt about having to use the curriculum, how they anticipated using the curriculum again, and reflections of what they felt was unnecessary in the curriculum. Furthermore, any specific reference to the ESL 1060 course,
grades, or assignments were also categorized here as they indicated that the students were identifying the curriculum and the skills taught therein with coursework (as opposed to an opportunity to develop a more versatile skill set for future research or career goals).

2. Resource awareness and learned skills. This domain contains salient mentions of specific resources and skills that students felt the curriculum helped improve. Contrarily, this domain also included comments in which the students expressed that they have not gained awareness of certain resources or gained certain skills. This lack of awareness or learning could be because students said they already knew about that resource or skill or their comments indicated a misunderstanding of the resource or skill and therefore, they did not learn them.

Between these two domains, there are four intersecting themes:

1. Developing academic language proficiency. In this theme, students view the curriculum in the context of their English ability in the context of vocabulary, speaking, and English as a medium of study. Writing is dominant among these language references, specifically the context of paraphrasing and summarizing. Because paraphrasing and summarizing are integral for ethical source borrowing in ESL 1060, student comments about citation and plagiarism are also included here as they are seen as part of source borrowing. Themes of Developing Academic Language Proficiency are present in both domains.

2. Developing research proficiency. This theme reflects students experience with the curriculum in the context of research resources (e.g., databases, the library catalog) and research processes (e.g., narrowing search results, developing a
topic). Not present here are students references to seeking out additional information from alternative sources or from human resources, the reasons for which are explained in the next theme. Themes of Developing Research Proficiency are present in both domains.

3. Autonomy and academic skills. This theme includes comments revealing how students navigate research in the context of coursework, time management, and using support resources. Seeking help from other people and nonlibrary resources are represented here because throughout the data; students revealed that research was a largely solitary venture; they only sought help from other people on occasion when they felt their skills were not adequate to approach the library sources alone. Therefore, the act of seeking additional help reflects a resourcefulness that students' autonomy is at its limits and additional input is needed. Themes of Autonomy and Academic Skills are present in both domains.

4. Perceptions of usefulness. This theme exhibits comments in which students speak explicitly to their feelings about how they used the curriculum and how they believed it is useful. Remarks are related to perceptions of the user experience, perceptions of the scholarship of research, and perceptions of specific curricular features (e.g., assessments, videos). Because this theme reflects student affect, themes of Perceptions of Usefulness are present only in the Attitudes toward the Curriculum domain.
Instructor Interview and Survey

The instructor data came from two sources: the survey (Appendix E) and the interview (Appendix F). The sources were analyzed together because of the scope of this study. Between the questions in the interview and the survey, there was some overlap; therefore, there was often overlap in the content of the responses. Because only one instructor participated in the survey and the survey and interview were conducted in a relatively short amount of time, initial open coding revealed that the responses between the sources were nearly identical. The relatively small amount of data in the survey did not merit its own analysis, so those questions were analyzed in the same context as the more data-rich interview. Similar to the student survey, because questions were less content-oriented and more perception oriented, all questions were well represented among the nodes. After open coding, the data were organized into three domains reflecting the instructor's use and perceptions of the curriculum:

1. Curriculum as reinforcement. Responses in this domain illustrate the instructor's use of the curriculum primarily as reinforcement of writing and research concepts she incorporated into ESL 1060 prior to the development of the L2 Writers Subject Guide. Comments show using the curriculum as reinforcement supports student-centered practices and language learning. Likewise, reflection on reinforcement also reveals instructor intentions for future use of the curriculum, programmatic concerns, and opportunities to improve the curriculum.

2. Instructional focus. This domain embodies the research skills (e.g., employing search strategies), processes (e.g., evaluating sources), and language (e.g., writing analysis) the instructor focused on during the semester. Many of these were talked
about in the context of reinforcement but though the coding process, a preference for certain skills and practices became evident.

3. Perceptions of student engagement. This domain reflects the instructor perceptions on how students responded to the curriculum on both affective and academic levels. Comments reveal instructor thoughts on student motivation, attitudes, and benefits from interacting with the curriculum. Specifically, a focus on student skills and processes is present here, as well as research-related challenges the students continued to face.

Among these three domains are three intersecting themes:

1. Skills and processes. This theme reflects how the instructor used the curriculum to support learning of research skills and processes. In addition, themes here reflect which skills and processes she views as preferential and her perception of which skills and processes students improved. Themes of Skills and Processes are present in all three domains.

2. Concepts. This theme illustrates the research and language concepts prevalent in the instructor's reflection of the course. The theme offers instructor insight into which concepts are most important for students to learn and how these concepts can be best supported in future contexts, such as her future use of the curriculum or on a programmatic level. Her perceptions of student interaction with the concepts of research are reflected largely in the challenges students continue to have when approaching academic research. Themes of Concepts are present in all three domains.

3. Attitudes. This theme reflects the explicit instructor attitudes about the value
of the curriculum as a reinforcement tool and her perception of students' attitudes and motivations in interacting with the curriculum as part of ESL 1060. Themes of *Attitudes* are present in the *Curriculum as Reinforcement* and *Perceptions of Student Engagement* domains.
Table 4.1

Descriptive statistics of pre- and posttest cloze results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th># correct</th>
<th>% correct</th>
<th># correct</th>
<th>% correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1 choosing a topic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 performing background research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 develop research questions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 identifying scholarly resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5 evaluating scholarly sources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6 analyze the texts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7 synthesize the findings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 preparing your paper or presentation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2

Paired samples statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>2.2000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.26181</td>
<td>.50576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>3.1500</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.34577</td>
<td>.52453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3

Paired samples test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.95000</td>
<td>3.34782</td>
<td>.74860</td>
<td>-2.51683 - .61683</td>
<td>-1.269</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: p ≤ .05, two-tailed

Table 4.4

Descriptive statistics of individual module assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Title</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1: The Research Process</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2: Meeting your Librarians</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3: Developing a Topic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4: Using the Marriott Library Catalog</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 5: Using Library Databases</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 6: Evaluating your Sources</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 7: What is Plagiarism?</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 8: Summarizing, Paraphrasing, and Quoting</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 9: Citing your Sources</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.5

Most and least useful L2 Writer Subject Guide lessons by percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 25</th>
<th>Most useful</th>
<th>Least useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1: The Research Process</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2: Meeting your Librarians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3: Developing a Topic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4: Using the Marriott Library Catalog</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 5: Using Library Databases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 6: Evaluating your Sources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 7: What is Plagiarism?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 8: Paraphrasing, Summarizing &amp; Quoting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 9: Citing your Sources</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.6

Usefulness of curriculum features for learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 25</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Average ranking</th>
<th>Overall place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links to outside resources</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texts/Readings</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-reading activities</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic Organizers</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading checks</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Videos/Games</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.7

Student perception of Subject Guide contribution to academic language proficiency

$N = 24$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DID NOT IMPROVE (0)</th>
<th>IMPROVED SOMEWHAT (1)</th>
<th>IMPROVED OK (2)</th>
<th>IMPROVED A LOT (3)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using more academic vocabulary in my writing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using more academic vocabulary when speaking.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding more academic terms when I read.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding more of what I read.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing more professionally.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and being able to come up with synonyms.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing how to contact and communicate with library professionals.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring a sentence to put it in my own words.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing which information to include in my citations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8

Student projection of future research resource use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>NEVER (0)</th>
<th>RARELY (1)</th>
<th>SOMETIMES (2)</th>
<th>OFTEN (3)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Commons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Search Premier or other databases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott Library website &amp; catalog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills for Developing Writers^5 lessons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask-a-Librarian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher or TA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Organizers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoodleTools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^5 L2 Writer Subject Guide
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of a content- and language-integrated library skills curriculum, the L2 Writers Subject Guide, in the context of students and teachers experiences using the guide as part of their ESL 1060 courses. This study's mixed-methods approach used both quantitative and qualitative data to investigate the usefulness of the curriculum.

The qualitative data reveal several intersecting themes across content and across data collection tools. Because quantitative data are not generalizable, the descriptive statistics and percentages support the themes identified in the qualitative data, thereby ensuring the confirmability of data sources through triangulation. Using the qualitative themes as a guide, I discuss student and teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the L2 Writers Subject Guide as exemplified through qualitative and quantitative data tokens.6 Perceptions of effectiveness are reflected through a discussion of usefulness, likes, dislikes, and perceptions on the practical use of the curriculum. In the discussion, I examine these perceptions in the context of the themes, their relationship to the domains, and how the themes and domains intersect.

---

6 In line with the Constructivist nature of this study, all tokens were transcribed using the original grammatical constructions; that is to say, no token was edited for grammar. Misspellings were corrected as they do not change the essential meaning of the utterance.
Among the five data collection tools, there are 13 intersecting domains and 22 intersecting themes. With this amount of qualitative data along with data from the three quantitative measures, it would be impossible to discuss all of the perceptions and practices of the students and the instructor in the context of this thesis. For the sake of this discussion, I have chosen to focus on the themes that are most often reflected in the data. Because many of the themes emerged across domains and data collection tools, the discussion that follows is streamlined into three sections: student perceptions, instructor perceptions, and the relationship between perceptions and assessments.

**Student Perceptions of the L2 Writers**

**Subject Guide’s Effectiveness**

Student perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide were manifested in several ways. In the focus group and surveys, students spoke explicitly of their feelings about the curriculum; however, just as often, implicit expressions of perception were present in statements of what they learned about research from the Guide and how their experience conducting research in ESL 1060 influenced their learning processes and academic skills. Of course, these comments were made in the context of the L2 Writers Subject Guide specifically, so it is difficult to say if the academic awareness they demonstrated is transferable to other learning contexts. Further study of student attitudes would seem necessary to determine this.
Learning Process and Progress

Outside of the research and academic language context, students indicated that the L2 Writers Subject Guide helped them progress their academic learning processes. Through positive and negative affective responses about their experience with the curriculum, students offered descriptions of how their learning practices and preferences had changed through this experience and inferences about their progress as academic learners specifically as it relates to their navigation of the research-writing process and time management.

Students continued to experience much anxiety and frustrations around conducting research assignments using the language skills and research resources promoted through the L2 Writers Subject Guide, perhaps indicating that while the guide increases this declarative knowledge, it did not increase a student's ability to source effective academic research for their written work. One student commented, "Before I [did] the library research, I only use the Google to do the research because it is very comfortable and convenient, especially using the Wikipedia. But after I knew how to use the library research, our teacher just ask us to use the library research and it's too difficult for an international student." Through the referencing of the instructor and a comparison to informal strategies (e.g., Wikipedia and Google), this comment reveals the student is seeing the research process as something expressly linked to the ESL 1060 course—not a larger skill that can be applied to other courses or quotidian research—and that this academic process is too difficult to be useful.

Difficulty approaching the sourcing was further qualified by other students who indicated, "I don't know which searcher is better for my topic because there are many
searchers”—a sentiment mirrored by other comments to the effect of "there are too many sources, need be more accurate," "cannot find better sources," "finding the right source to use on paper," and difficulty "use the key words to find the right resource we want."

While the posttest data have shown that students have much declarative knowledge about the types of sources they are expected to use in academic research and can identify where to locate such sources, they continue to struggle with implementing these databases searches to find sources with which they are satisfied. Part of this continued challenge of finding "the right source" is indicated by the fact that students do not articulate what qualifies "a right source." In other words, they do not discuss their process for evaluating sources. In response to the question about which research processes are still difficult, one student stated using the L2 Writers Subject Guide created difficulty when trying to find appropriate sources: "My title is should drink age will be young than 21. I use the LibGuide to find the information but it is difficult to find the thing that I want to use."

The impression here is that the L2 Writers Subject Guide itself can be used to locate sources, which it cannot. An alternative view is that the processes and resources promoted by the curriculum are not sufficient for locating quality sources. Resources like databases are only as good as their researcher, and locating effective sources and incorporating them operatively into their writing is dependent on a student's ability to evaluate sources using skills and processes like employing strategic reading, applying credibility and relevance criteria, and selecting specific information to perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide to be ineffective for teaching source evaluation and the analytical skills necessary for source borrowing.

Students are not equating locating appropriate sources as the only qualifier for
improving the effectiveness of the research process. Understanding research to be a time-consuming process, students found the L2 Writers Subject Guide an effective method for encouraging time management. In the user survey, one student credits the curriculum in helping him/her "do a relevant research and find the relevant source in shorter time." Another student mirrors this sentiment by saying the curriculum, "help me how to find research as soon as possible." Recognition of the time management benefits of a resource is evidence that that these students are aware of their independent learning preferences and indicative of a desire to be more academically efficient.

While students perceive the L2 Writers Subject Guide taught some time saving research strategies, they often viewed the time spent on the curriculum itself as wasted. As one student stated in the focus group, "I mean took those quiz lessons more than for three semester and exactly same and not difference for me." Realigning the instruction and assessments with the skills students report as being deficient (e.g., evaluation of sources, academic language proficiency) are integral changes for creating more meaningful experiences with the L2 Writers Subject Guide, especially if students will be exposed to the curriculum multiple times throughout the ESL writing series. Repeated exposure to concepts and activating schemata can have positive learning outcomes (Conteh-Morgen, 2002), but ensuring that students stay engaged is important to the learning outcomes as well (Conteh-Morgen, 2001; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010).

Language proficiency itself could also be playing a role in the students' perceived effectiveness of the curriculum, meaning there could be a proficiency threshold below which an L2 writer does not have enough proficiency to benefit from additional resources. Though all students passed ESL 1050 (the only criteria for ESL 1060
admittance), this does not necessarily ensure the language proficiency and higher-order cognitive skills to conduct effective research, namely the evaluation and synthesis aspects or research (Benjes-Small, 2013; Conteh-Morgan, 2001, 2002; Kahmi-Stein & Stein, 1998).

Student feedback on this initial use of the curriculum indicates that it helps create an awareness of the resources and research expectations of ESL 1060 and the University; however, their perceptions indicate that the guide is not as effective in providing the guided practice and feedback needed to actually carry out effective research and writing processes. Of course, the instructor provided more of this support and feedback needed, so in the context of the course, students may feel more confident in their research-writing ability, but that confidence is not reflected in the results of this study.

**Awareness of Resources**

One factor that prompted the development of the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum and realignment of research initiatives with the ESL writing curricula was consistent anecdotal feedback from ESL instructors that their students lacked awareness of the resources available to them (Fanning, 2012). By the end of their L2 Writers Subject Guide user experience, students' awareness of the various resources was evident. Despite no significant difference between the pre- and posttest quantitative scores, student conversation after using the curriculum reveals much more awareness of the research resources available to them. To be clear, per the pretest, students were aware of many of the resources available even before using the curriculum in ESL 1060; however, practice with the resources through the L2 Writer Subject Guide and ESL 1060 curricula
yielded mixed perceptions as to the usefulness of the curriculum for building awareness and comfort with the resources. While some students reported that the curriculum helped them feel more comfortable and gain more confidence doing research (e.g., "I am feeling more comfortable for finding the sources to the tools in the library and it is very relevant to the topics that I am doing for research"), several also reported that the curriculum did nothing to help here (e.g., "It doesn’t mean I feel uncomfortable. Because I used to take content class before the ESL 1060 so I used the library a lot so I didn't feel like I changed").

Students' conceptualizations of academically acceptable sources is widely discussed in the literature and reported as a primary concern among instructors (Brown et al., 2003; Jackson, 2005). The pretest saw more comments about using non-academic sources, like Google or the Internet in general whereas the posttest had more references to academic resources like databases, journals, and Google Scholar. Moreover, students' pretest comments made no explicit references to the concepts of academic or scholarly sources, whereas the posttest saw several explicit references to these types of sources. While it is presumed the students had some concept of what qualified as an academic source prior to ESL 1060, what becomes clear from the data is that they are more capable of discussing this concept and offering concise and contextualized examples of this after their ESL 1060 experience. For example, in the pretest, examples of appropriate scholarly sources included music or movie, book materials, academic report, professional books, novel, and several other nondescript or generally inappropriate examples. The posttest saw descriptions of academically acceptable sources evolve into scholastic resource, academic sources, Google Scholar, Marriott Library catalog, and several uses of the
word journal. Through the ESL 1060 research experiences, students became more capable of talking about research as a practice and process. They became more articulate in their descriptions of how to conduct research and which sources and resources are best used in relation to ESL 1060 and overall academic studies.

**Perceptions of Usefulness**

Students' perceptions of the usefulness of the L2 Writers Subject Guide offer a complex picture of how the students feel the curriculum affected their experience in ESL 1060. Many comments offer general perspectives of their user experience and the curriculum's usefulness toward research scholarship; other comments spoke directly to usefulness of specific curricular features like texts and assessments.

Many of the comments indicating negative perspectives of the L2 Writers Subject Guide surrounded issues of interest and how the curriculum did not contribute to their knowledge base. Vague comments on interface and content like, "it is hard for me to use it," "looks boring and not helpful in writing my essays," and "it is not informative and it is boring" were better elaborated in the context of the students' opinions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide's contribution to their scholarship. Several students made comments to the effect of already knowing the content, even equating it to common knowledge:

Because I already study those things on other courses and places, like ESL 1050 class. There are some things kind of common knowledge, that's why they are useless.

I already knew it. It's the common knowledge.

I know what the knowledge when I just got here in the U.S.

Because most of the students already know how to do a research effectively and cite a source.
I already know it, why should I do it again?

This last comment in particular emphasizes the need for the curriculum to be redesigned to better serve student needs. Students feel as if they already know what they need to know about doing research, so repeated use of the curriculum needs to become more engaging and less repetitive throughout the three-course ESL writing series in order for the curriculum to remain relevant and productive. Coursework opportunities for more application, more introductions to information theory, and more mingling of the research-writing process could be developed for students. As students' final exercise in guided research and writing practices before heading out into their majors, ESL 1060 should provide exactly that: purposeful and critical practice in effective research.

In addition to more application opportunities, students could benefit from more explicit rationale as to why they are being asked to complete the curriculum and how the curriculum is intended to serve the greater academic objectives of the University. Student comments such as, "It is time consuming," "Pre-reading activities, I think we don't really need to do this," and "It's inconvenient for me to take the pre-test because I don't know what is use for? After I take that, I cannot get anything," suggest that students do not fully understand the reasons for the specific curricular choices that were made. Informing students more explicitly of why they are being asked to learn what they are being asked to learn could help increase motivation (Conteh-Morgen, 2001; Ouellette, 2011; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010).

Positive perceptions of the guide and its curricular features further inform the need for more practical application opportunities with focused feedback. Students who feel the guide was useful frequently reference how these skills or the curriculum factor
into their future success:

"I need for many classes. Helpful for my future classes."

"I think if helps me improve my paper, so I might use it for my next paper."

"We will use it in our major class. We need to do many research for our future study."

In order for the L2 Writers Subject Guide experiences to be fruitful in the future, revisions to the curriculum should be tailored more specifically to student perceptions towards the two major aims of the curriculum: developing academic language proficiency and developing academic research skills.

**Developing Academic Language Proficiency versus Developing Research Skills**

The L2 Writers Subject Guide is meant to address two facets of an undergraduate L2 writer's scholarly development: academic language proficiency and research skills. While the research skills development goal is a more salient curricular goal as part of an ESL writing class, students recognize the inherent language goals as well. Student experience with the L2 Writers Subject Guide indicates distinct views on how the curriculum contributes to their academic language proficiency and research skills development. When asked about how the curriculum influenced their academic language and research skills development in the survey and focus group, students prefer to use the curriculum more as a language and research resource than as a primary instrument in their language and research learning processes. This tone appears in line with the student sentiment that they already knew a lot about research prior to using the guide in ESL 1060; if students believe they already know the content and processes, the L2 Writers
Subject Guide would better serve as a resource.

In the context of learning, students found the curriculum to be a better resource for language than for research. For some students, the clarity of the curriculum's purpose as a research resource was less accessible than its use as a language resource. One student in the focus group described

When I took the chapter related with language, it was much easier to understand, like, how to write email and citation and avoid plagiarism but it was really great chapter. When I think of my research, it was so hard you have to read through all the documentation. But it was, uh, like, if the research-related topic was on the YouTube video, and show some example and step-by-step skill it would be much happier to do research.

Another student used the curriculum exclusively for language learning purposes, mentioning that he did not complete the curriculum as assigned at all but rather used the quizzes as a language learning activity:

So, I think it's better to learn the language for me personally because usually I would go back and check the words I couldn't understand so I can do 100% on the answer on the quiz so I don't really care any lesson on LibGuide.

Furthermore, the quantitative data provide further evidence of the curriculum's value as a language-learning tool in that students ranked vocabulary as the most useful curricular feature of the guide (Table 4.6). Referring to the module that includes instruction on signal phrases in source borrowing, another student credits the L2 Writers Subject Guide for teaching her to "use good or better verbs change my sentence. Develop my writing skill" connecting the discrete language features like vocabulary to more holistic language skills like writing. Students often talked about the guide in the context as their writing development. This is unsurprising since the curriculum is embedded to the ESL 1060 writing curriculum; however, comments about their writing development illustrate how students view the research-writing processes as symbiotic.
Particularly, ESL 1060 students perceive writing processes as research processes. For example, when asked if the L2 Writers Subject Guide was more useful for their research or language development, students often indicated that it helped more for research, then cited the curriculum's contribution to their citation, paraphrasing, and summarizing skill sets. Student perceptions of these processes express themselves in two fashions. First, students discuss the two processes in a completely intermingled fashion; they are not separating them out in the procedural or cause/effect type relationship in which research and writing are traditionally taught. Research is not seen as something they do to validate their writing, but as a necessary component of writing:

They will help me to write a good essay, like to help me find the academic resources and how to avoid plagiarize.

These lessons help me to cite my paper and doing research for my paper. It is also taught me some skill when I write paper and finding sources.

Because it taught me how to narrow research and how to paraphrase and summarize.

Beginning to understand the research and writing processes as symbiotic is evidence of deeper cognitive development moving students out of the either-or cognitive domain and into a domain where ambiguity is more acceptable (Benjes-Small et al., 2013).

Second, students are referring to writing processes as research processes; the consistency and contexts in which they are doing this suggests that it is not a convolution of terms, but rather, further evidence of how they are hybridizing the research-writing process in their minds. One student responded that the L2 Writers Subject Guide was more helpful for learning research skills because "summarize and paraphrase and quotation and citation is all about research so it's useful about research than language."

Similarly, when asked to Describe the kinds of projects and topics you wrote about this
year in ESL 1060 in the focus group, students’ perceptions of "projects and topics" were divided. About half of the responses talked about topics in the context of the content they researched (e.g., "Should company market to children," "Should country control immigration," "I wrote about should we allow the death penalty"). Responding to this prompt by talking about what content students learned about in ESL 1060 implies that they view the research-writing process as a means for acquiring knowledge and not merely a course assignment.

Comparatively, the other half of responses described their projects and topics in terms of genre like, "expository essay, exploratory essay, argument paper" or "outline, summaries," among others, and excludes any reference to research as part of the writing process. By not acknowledging research in terms of a parallel process or knowledge product suggests that many students still see it as a separate function from writing. Again, more advanced cognition allows for learners to see learning and language processes as more ambiguous. The ability to handle ambiguity may infer that a student is more ready to conduct and write independent research more successfully as autonomous and evaluative learners (Benjes-Small et al., 2013). The data from this study were not analyzed according to individual student responses, but a point of further study could be to see how individual student attitudes align among the phenomena of the internalization of a research-writing process and curriculum as a learning resource instead of a teaching tool. It is possible that the students who have internalized the research and writing as symbiotic processes meant to promote knowledge development are the same students who view the L2 Writers Subject Guide as a resource more than a primary teaching and learning tool, but no conclusion can be made to this end without further research.
Of course, seeing the curriculum as a resource has its pitfalls. Several student comments suggest that students are unable to differentiate the purpose of the L2 Writers Subject Guide as a resource from other scholarly resources like library databases and the catalog. For example, one student indicated that, "the LibGuide is difficult to use. Ex. My title is should drink age will be young than 21. I use the LibGuide to find the information about it is difficult to find the thing I want to use." This student is likely referring to the use of databases as difficult but has conglomerated all research resources under the L2 Writers Subject Guide; his/her inability to articulate various functions of resources indicates this person likely has trouble using resources effectively, which would realistically lead to research frustration as communicated through the comment.

Another student commented that, "I don't know which searcher is better for my topic because there are many searchers." While it is true that databases are often discipline-specific and better for certain topics than others, the comment communicates that the student has not acquired the confidence or strategies for manipulating resources and search terms to produce more favorable results; they have simply resigned themselves to the options being too many and too vague. Other comments to this degree include, "There are too many sources, need to be more accurate" and "We still not find the accurate information that we want." Clarifying misunderstandings and providing explicit instruction in the L2 Writers Subject Guide of the function of resources and the evaluative nature of research appears to be essential based on how these ESL 1060 students conceptualize research after using the curriculum. These evaluative and circumventing strategies—similar to strategies exploited in communicative language situations—appear to be just as relevant when teaching research skills, and guiding
students to access these skills in the research domain could lead to more autonomous language learning and research experiences.

**Instructor Perceptions of the L2 Writers**

**Subject Guide’s Effectiveness**

The cooperating instructor's perception of the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum offers contextual support and parallels to the student perceptions. As a career ESL instructor in an IHE, she already had a repertoire of research instruction from her years of experience teaching L2 writing. Additionally, the cooperating instructor and the researcher partnered in the summer of 2013 to realign the ESL writing curricula with that of the University's Writing Program. In reformulating the program outcomes, assignments, and texts in that process, the instructor was intimately aware of the integration goals of the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum. Understanding how she used the curriculum as a part of ESL 1060 and by examining her perception and its contribution to the program, she provided additional insight to how students and instructors construct learning together. The instructor's reflections on how the curriculum affected research skills, processes, and concepts in the teaching and learning environment are particularly salient. More specifically, the instructor talked about how the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum reinforced the ESL 1060 curriculum and supported her instructional focus.

**Curriculum as Reinforcement**

The instructor described the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum as an effective method of reinforcement for the research instruction repertoire she already employs.
Without modifying her existing research instruction, she rearranged the proposed order of the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum in order to use the modules and quizzes as previews and introductions to the research skills that would be needed for relevant assignments that "follow our writing process," as she put it. Introducing the students to the curriculum beforehand helped clarify some of the content concerns but also the language concerns that arise. For example, regarding databases, the instructor described,

The database one was nice because I had them do the database module the night before we went to the computer lab. So then they had some familiarity with databases, they had some of the language down. So then when we went to the lab and I taught and I took them through using the database, there weren't as many questions about, just like, "What is this? Where am I? What's the library site good for?" So, that's one where I could have them do it the night before.

She observed that students were able to begin using the databases more readily during the lab time as less instruction was required for database concepts and purposes. Second, the above theme of having "some of the language down" is frequent in her reflections of the curriculum's usefulness. She states that the L2 Writers Subject Guide language support was the curricular feature that best enhanced her curriculum and the student's academic language proficiency:

It took a little bit of the onus off me and we didn't have to spend 10 minutes talking [with] me explaining the language or something before we could move on. I could refer to plagiarism and they would know what I was talking about.

Well, now they know, they can use the word reference, citation, sources pretty interchangeably and know what they're talking about. Um, so a lot of the language about citations, um, has started to click, so that's helped. But, I didn't really measure their vocabulary in that way. But in conversations, they're starting to know the lingo.

Part and parcel to the language support, though, is the idea that the L2 Writers Subject guide constitutes an opportunity for repeated and varied exposure to the content and language pieces of research. As mentioned previously, one of the student frustrations
is that they are exposed to the L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum across several of the ESL writing courses, and they find the verbatim repetition unengaging. Contrarily, the repetition that the curriculum provides in ESL 1060 is one of the notable contributions made from the instructor perspective on two levels. First, the L2 Writers Subject Guide contextualizes the kinds of vocabulary the students will need to master to be successful researchers. Second, the alternative instruction formats, both of the online curriculum and the opportunity to have library professionals come to teach research sessions, provide a different voice for the content. The instructor indicates the value of this diverse content and language exposure to the research curriculum in both the context of the classroom and in allowing her to better manage time and instructional planning:

I did notice to a certain extent that there were certain times where there were, there seemed to be more familiarity with something we were discussing in class when they had recently done a module.

But I would say that having another voice telling them about actually using the library in terms of the databases and vetting articles is, I think they can't hear enough, they need to hear that… I think that for what I'm doing in that class, we are talking about research so much that I'm like, "they need to hear it from something else" other than me. They need a different view of it.

I think it gives them new vocabulary in an alternative format taking pressure off of the teacher as being responsible for giving all of the new language. Additionally, it gives teachers extra time to focus on other tasks because learners come to class with some familiarity with language rather than no familiarity.

Negotiating conflicting perspectives between instructors and students on the repeated exposure to concepts and language reinforcement provided by the L2 Writers Subject Guide is reflective of the constructive nature of the classroom. Preserving teacher autonomy, student engagement, and best teaching practices are integral for any curriculum to be successful (Conteh-Morgen, 2001; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010). In addition to continuous assessment of any curriculum, this quandary illustrates the
importance of being transparent to students about the motivations behind instructional
decisions. Second-language instructors understand well the benefit to repeated exposure
in language and content learning, but students are not necessarily aware of this and in a
situation in which a curriculum is integrated into several courses in a program, being
explicit in this could become more important for student buy-in. While it may not make
the curriculum more exciting, explicit rationale for why they are repeating information or
experiences could inform their reactions and perhaps their own choices as learners. As for
the L2 Writers Subject Guide, though performance objectives are provided to students at
the beginning of the lessons, they do not necessarily know how to interpret objectives.
Either teaching students to interpret objectives or including purpose statements (in the
curriculum or by the instructor) is recommended as the curriculum continues to be used
as part of the ESL 1060 courses.

**Instructional Focus**

Another perceived benefit of the L2 Writers Subject Guide is its ability to be
tailored to the instructional focus of the instructor. In addition to successfully reordering
the content for her instructional needs, her emphasis on certain content foci from the
curriculum indicate that she was able to choose concepts that were more important for her
as a writing teacher. The primary example is the instructor's priority on teaching database
skills over other scholarly resources like Google Scholar or the library catalog and the
importance of having "that conversation to explain to explain to them what this database
is, and why we're using it and not just going to Google." As is common when teaching
information literacy (Benjes-Small et al., 2013; Brown et al., 2003; Jackson, 2005), the
instructor mentions the difficulty of teaching students what constitutes a website in source evaluation:

I say most of them think that everything’s kind of...they... I give them examples of websites but I don't think, they have a hard time distinguishing between like a credible website and a noncredible website. And then, trying to distinguish something they found on Google Scholar, they're like, "I still found it on the web."

She also indicated that the databases provide the most salient examples of how scholarly sources actually help narrow the search for students. Though they express a preference for searching on the open web and using popular sources like Google or Wikipedia, the instructor’s rationale for using databases begins to generate student buy-in to using academic resources for information:

The first thing you [the students] can do, why don't you limit it to full text articles. It's not like you need that weird abstract. You're going to find what you need limiting it that way. And I think that kind of...that takes a little bit of the pressure off because they know they can see the article right there.

So where you might take a search term on Google and get 3 million results, you might put that same search term into a research database on the library site and get a million results, so it's one way to start to narrow it down.

I tell them, "Well when you're in Google Scholar through the library site, even if the link isn't open there, there's a link" and then I show them how the library will find it, what database you can go to find it for free. And, I think that's starting to kind of click. Because I've had fewer students wanting to use Google Scholar. Now that they see the limitations you can put on some of the other databases.

Additionally, she uses the databases as a starting point for teaching differentiation in citation. By treating the database sources as print sources, she is able to clarify the web/database distinction to students:

I think it's a confusing thing anyway in APA, is you know you're citing your journal article from the database that you've read online versus seeing it on paper. That's difficult because for them, almost everything they're doing is on the web... they're like "everything is kind of a website, everything needs a web address." So what I do to kind of differentiate that is when we're doing APA; I have them cite
the journal as if it's the print source.

Finally, students appear to have internalized the database priority as well; mentions of databases through the various data far outnumber references to any other resource. The instructor witnessed this internalization, too, in student practice:

No, they did say in the past when they've asked me questions about "I can't find enough stuff, I can't..." and I'll say, "one part of research is that you may need to keep doing more research." And so, several students did say to me explicitly, "OK so I have to go back to the databases," which I had never gotten before, like they're just floundering, kind of looking around trying to figure out where to go but now it seems they know exactly where to go, and that's a big step too.

While the L2 Writers Subject Guide had not necessarily informed the instructor's opinion on databases, its emphasis supports her instructional priorities. Like the students, she shares sentiments that they struggle most with evaluating sources and distinguishing between scholarly and popular sources, which reiterates the importance of the L2 Writers Subject Guide to devote more of its curriculum to application and practice using these skills. Per the instructor's and students' perspectives, this is where library and research resources can better serve the needs of both stakeholders.

**Relationships Between Perceptions Assessments**

While none of them can be considered as significant or correlations due to the limitations of the test design, there are some interesting comparisons to be made between the pre- and posttest assessment results, individual module results, and the student and instructor perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide. First, between the pretest and posttest results (Table 4.1), the mean score rose from 2.20 to 3.15, and all responses saw an increase in the number of students who got it correct with the exception of the two responses in the following excerpt (in bold):
As you begin collecting and evaluating scholarly sources, carefully **analyze the texts** to decide which ones are the most relevant: take notes and decide what information you will use. After you have evaluated and chosen enough sources, you will begin to **synthesize the findings**, meaning you will reorganize the ideas in the best way to answer your research questions (Appendix A).

Analysis and synthesis are essential aspects of source evaluation; as a student reads a source and decides which information to borrow to support his/her work, he/she breaks down the information into useable and relevant chunks and reincorporates it into a new context. Student and instructor perceptions both suggest that source evaluation is one of the toughest skills for students to master, so their misunderstanding of these processes as part of the research process could be expected. From a language standpoint, analysis and synthesis as verbs could be largely unknown to the students, partially their meaning in the context of academic research; nowhere in any of the qualitative data did students use the terms "analysis" or "synthesis" to describe their research process. However, the design of this pre/posttest does not allow for definitive conclusions as to the root of this misunderstanding and further research into either content or language goals would be necessary to understand the reasons.

Student scores on the *Lesson 7 What is Plagiarism?* assessment merit further examination in relation to their perceptions of the L2 Writers Subject Guide. The results from this assessment stand out in several ways. First, it had the highest number of participants (35 students) and the lowest mean score (5.46 out of 10) of any assessment. However, in the user survey, Lesson 7 received mediocre ratings for most or least useful lesson and frequently throughout the data, students expressed that they already knew about plagiarism with comments like: "I think everyone know what is plagiarism, so we don't need to learn what is plagiarism." and "I have known what is plagiarism. There are
boring to listen what is plagiarism." If students understand plagiarism as they believe then higher scores on this lesson assessment should be achievable. Presumably, there are other developmental, cognitive, or affective discrepancies with the content of this assessment, and students' understanding and perceptions of plagiarism should be examined more deeply to try to understand why.

In a related lesson assessment for Lesson 9 Citing your Sources, mean student scores were higher (8.53; see Table 4.1) and were rated as the most useful, with 56% of students reporting they thought the citation lesson was among the most useful (Table 4.5). However, because students believe that plagiarism is a trite topic, their poor performance is more likely the result of their disengagement with the topic reiterating the importance of student engagement and buy-in into a curriculum for it to be successful (Conteh-Morgen, 2001; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010).

Alternatively, the comparison between the attitudes toward Lesson 7 and Lesson 9 could also illustrate the dichotomy between students having declarative knowledge of a topic and being able to apply it. Lesson 7 on plagiarism is highly declarative in nature with text and video descriptions of plagiarism, university expectations, and identification exercises; Lesson 9 on citation, on the other hand, requires students to apply their knowledge of citation by creating citations. Likewise, these citations are ultimately assessed by the instructor as part of the students' papers, so students get real feedback on them; a student's ability to define plagiarism declaratively is rarely assessed. Students recognize this as well with one noting his/her opinion of the lesson teaching about paraphrasing and summarizing by saying, "paraphrase the paper, I think, is not a procedure that could teach us how to do it on Canvas. Should be a practice in our life, just
like language." Their disengagement with the declarative aspects of the curriculum compared with the applied aspects supports the earlier suggestion that in order for the L2 Writers Subject guide to remain relevant for students in ESL 1060, it should exploit the students' need for more meaningful opportunities to apply, reflect upon, and refine their individual research processes as part of becoming effective undergraduate researchers.

**Conclusion**

The L2 Writers Subject Guide curriculum was initially developed in an effort to standardize the teaching of research skills among all University writing personnel. Additionally, reports from ESL instructors at the University indicated that ESL students were not aware of expected research protocol, and those instructors, not necessarily being research experts, requested additional support in teaching research as part of the ESL writing curricula. These anecdotal reports are corroborated by a body of literature from L2 pedagogy and information literacy. The version of the curriculum assessed in this study was designed with true beginners in mind, from both the teaching and learning camps.

The results of this study suggest that both the students and instructor need more advanced research curricula. Both student and instructor perceptions indicate that the curriculum plays a relevant role in the ESL 1060 class, providing elaboration on various research concepts like databases use and citation, additional academic language support, and a resource that these stakeholders report will continue to be useful in the future. However, students were unimpressed with the curricular demands of the L2 Writers Subject Guide and often saw the curriculum assignments as busy work. Student
perceptions reveal that they have confidence in their knowledge of research. But similar to what Gross and Latham (2007) suggest, their confidence in their declarative knowledge of the research process could suggest that they simply do not have adequate enough information literacy skills to be able to self-assess their information literacy abilities. In order for students to build this awareness of the information literacy skills they need to succeed as undergraduates at the University, more comprehensive application and opportunities for feedback must be offered.

The current version of the L2 Writers Subject Guide does not offer many of these application opportunities and meaningful experience that students need to become competent researchers; it provides a comprehensive reference for students and basic support for teachers. Future curricular revisions should include more alternatives for students to practice research and writing together. Particularly in the context of a 1000-level composition course, research and writing cannot be divorced. Developing a more compressive applied curriculum that emphasizes this symbiotic relationship could help ready students in ESL 1060 with the academic skill set needed to achieve in their major classes. The design of this study does not yield any concrete conclusions but it certainly confirms that further research is needed to better understand the pedagogical and theoretical implications of an L2 writers approach the research process.
APPENDIX A

PRE- AND POSTTEST

PART I: Short Answer

Directions:
- This quiz is to assess your knowledge of the content and language skills addressed in the Research Skills for Developing Writers Subject Guide used in ESL 1060.
- Answer each question using 2-3 complete sentences.
- Good luck!

1) Describe one way to contact the librarian for your major at the Marriott Library.
2) List three things to avoid when writing an email to a librarian.
3) How can ‘funnel’ or chart methods help you develop your research idea into a research question?
4) Describe one situation when a keyword search would help you find the best sources for your research.
5) Describe one situation when a subject term search would help you find the best sources for your research.
6) How is Google Scholar different than the Marriott Library catalog?
7) What types of resources may be located using the Marriott Library catalog?
8) Give three examples of facets you can use to narrow your search (in the Marriott Library catalog or in a database).
9) What kinds of sources do you typically find in a database, like Academic Search Premier?
10) Give an example of how AND, OR, and NOT can help you find relevant sources when searching.
11) You are writing a report on recent developments in sports medicine. You find a book about the invention of American football that was written in 1905 that does not talk about injuries. Explain why this book is or is not appropriate.
12) You are writing an argument paper about obesity in the U.S. and you find a private blog about dieting written by someone who is neither a nutritionist nor works in the medical field. Explain why this website is inappropriate for your research.
13) You are giving a presentation about the positive effects of listening to music while studying. You find a commercial website for a math tutoring service that uses music when tutoring. Is this an appropriate source for your research? Explain why or why not.
14) How does strategic reading help you during the research process?
15) In your opinion, why might students plagiarize?
16) Who can you talk to if you are having trouble citing your sources or if you are unclear about plagiarism guidelines?
17) Describe when you should cite a source.
18) Describe your paraphrasing process.
19) Describe a method to cite sources in your research.
20) Describe how NoodleTools helps you learn proper citation formatting and organize your research.

PART II: Fill in the Blank

Directions:
- This quiz is to assess your knowledge of the content and language skills addressed in the Research Skills for Developing Writers Subject Guide used in ESL 1060.
- Choose the phrase from the drop-down list that completes the sentence best. Each phrase will only be used once.
- Good luck!

The Research Process

Developing your research process will help you conduct ethical and effective research. The process begins with choosing a topic that interests you. Next, look for basic information on your topic using the library catalog, the Internet, or encyclopedias; performing background research will help you narrow your topic and start to develop research questions. Every idea you put in your research project should help answer your research questions.

You will start by identifying scholarly resources which are appropriate for academic research, like periodicals or books. As you begin collecting and evaluating scholarly sources, carefully analyze the texts to decide which ones are the most relevant: take notes and decide what information you will use. After you have evaluated and chosen enough sources, you will begin to synthesize the findings, meaning you will reorganize the ideas in the best way to answer your research questions. You are now ready to begin preparing your paper or presentation.
APPENDIX B

STUDENT FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONNAIRES

AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

PART 1: INDIVIDUAL BRAINSTORM

Directions: Brainstorm some responses for the following questions about ESL 1060 and the Research Skills for Developing Writers Subject Guide.

1. Describe the kinds of projects and topics you wrote about this year in ESL 1060.
2. If you could change 1-2 things about the LibGuide, how would you change it?
3. In terms of the 'user-friendliness' (computer use), was the LibGuide easy to use or difficult to use? Provide examples.

PART 2: GROUP BRAINSTORM

Directions: With your group, brainstorm some responses for the following questions about ESL 1060 and the Research Skills for Developing Writers Subject Guide.

1. How do you use the library find sources? Which resources (e.g., catalog, databases, librarians) do you use the most? Why?
2. After using the LibGuide, what do find to be easier about doing research than it was before? What do you understand better?
3. After using the LibGuide, what do you still find difficult to do in research?
4. How did your teacher use the library guide as part of your class? What do you think she did well? Do you wish she had done it differently?

PART 3: GROUP DISCUSSION

1. Did you usually work on the LibGuide alone or with friends? Why?
2. Was the LibGuide more useful for learning about research or for learning about academic language? Why?
3. Are you more comfortable in the library now than before ESL 1060? Why or why not?
4. Do you believe that the quizzes were useful?
APPENDIX C

OUTLINE OF DOMAIN AND THEMATIC INTERSECTIONS

Domains
Pretest
   a. Act of Research
   b. Language Use and Writing
   c. Understanding the Research Process
   d. Quality Control and Evaluation
   e. Research as Collaboration
   f. Understanding Academic Honesty
Posttest
   g. Research Process in Practice
   h. Language Use and Writing
   i. Conceptualizations of the Research Process
   j. Research Products in Practice
   k. Conceptualization of Academic Honesty
Student Focus Group
   l. Accessibility of Resources
   m. Conceptualization of Research
   n. Usefulness of the Curriculum
   o. Using Resources
Student User Survey
   p. Attitudes toward the Curriculum
   q. Resource Awareness and Learned Skills
Instructor Interview
   r. Curriculum as Reinforcement
   s. Instructional Focus
   t. Perceptions of Student Engagement

Major Domain Groups
   1. Research Process and Products
   2. Curriculum Use
   3. Academic Language Proficiency
   4. Attitudes & Beliefs
Themes
Pretest
a. Affective Factors
b. Efficiency & Ease
c. Narrowing Strategies
d. Process & Strategies
e. Awareness of Resources

Posttest
f. Academic Evaluation
g. Research-Writing Paradigm
h. Resource Preference
i. Process and Strategy Preference
j. Developing Expert Knowledge
k. Research as Collaboration

Student Focus Group
l. Awareness of Resources
m. Coursework and Assessment
n. Learning Process and Progress
o. Research-Writing Paradigm

Student User Survey
p. Developing Academic Language Proficiency
q. Developing Research Proficiency
r. Autonomy and Academic Skills
s. Perceptions of Usefulness

Instructor Interview
t. Skills and Processes
u. Concepts
v. Attitudes

Major Thematic Groups
1. Research Skills & Processes
2. Resources
3. Academic Language Proficiency
4. Learning Concepts
5. Attitudes & Beliefs
APPENDIX D

STUDENT SURVEY

PART 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

1) Circle the section of ESL 1060 you were in during the FA13 semester.    ESL 1060-4
   ESL 1060-5
2) How long have you been a student in the U.S.?  ________________________
3) Are you a transfer student? (Circle one)              YES             NO
4) List 3 things you learned about the research process by using the LibGuide?

PART 2: FEELINGS

5) Check each word that describes how you feel about your experience using the
   Research Skills for L2 Writers LibGuide to learn research in ESL 1060.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>useful</th>
<th>boring</th>
<th>practical</th>
<th>inefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>frustrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productive</td>
<td>confusing</td>
<td>unnecessary</td>
<td>user-friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inconvenient</td>
<td>needed</td>
<td>effective</td>
<td>informative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 3: LIBGUIDE LESSONS

6. a) Check the three (3) L2 LibGuide lessons that are the most useful for learning research in ESL 1060.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Research Process</th>
<th>Using the Marriott Library Catalog</th>
<th>Evaluating your Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is Plagiarism?</td>
<td>Summarizing, Paraphrasing, &amp; Quoting</td>
<td>Developing a Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Library Databases</td>
<td>Meeting your Librarians</td>
<td>Citing your Sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. b) Give 2 reasons why you found these lessons the most useful (2-3 sentences).

7. a) Circle the three (3) L2 LibGuide lessons that are the least useful for learning research in ESL 1060.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Research Process</th>
<th>Using the Marriott Library Catalog</th>
<th>Evaluating your Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is Plagiarism?</td>
<td>Summarizing, Paraphrasing, &amp; Quoting</td>
<td>Developing a Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Library Databases</td>
<td>Meeting your Librarians</td>
<td>Citing your Sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. b) Give 2 reasons why you found these lessons the least useful (2-3 sentences).

PART 4: LIBGUIDE FEATURES

8. a) Using the numbers 1-7 (1= the most useful and 7=the least useful), rank each of these features of the L2 LibGuide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-reading Activities</th>
<th>Texts/Readings</th>
<th>Videos/Games</th>
<th>Graphic Organizers</th>
<th>Glossary</th>
<th>Reading Checks</th>
<th>Links to outside resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. b) Explain why you chose the feature you ranked #1 (2-3 sentences).

8. c) Explain why you chose the feature you ranked #7 (2-3 sentences).
PART 5: YOUR LANGUAGE SKILLS

9) Rate how the LibGuide helped improve the following English skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DID NOT IMPROVE:</th>
<th>IMPROVED SOMEWHAT:</th>
<th>IMPROVED OK:</th>
<th>IMPROVED A LOT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The LibGuide did not help me improve this English skill.</td>
<td>The LibGuide helped me improve this English skill a little.</td>
<td>The LibGuide helped me improve this English skill some.</td>
<td>The LibGuide helped me improve this English skill a lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Using more academic vocabulary in my writing. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Using more academic vocabulary when speaking. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Understanding more academic terms when I read. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Understanding more of what I read. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Writing more professionally. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Understanding and being able to come up with synonyms. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Knowing how to contact and communicate with library professionals. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Restructuring a sentence to put it in my own words. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Knowing which information to include in my citations. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
PART 6: FUTURE USE

10) How often do you think you will use the following resources in your future research assignments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Commons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Search Premier or other databases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott Library website &amp; catalog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills for L2 Writers LibGuide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask-a-Librarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher or TA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Organizers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoodleTools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) Do you think you will use the Research Skills for L2 Writers LibGuide again to get information about doing research, even if a teacher does not ask you to? (Circle one)

YES  NO

Explain why or why not. (2-3 sentences)
APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTOR SURVEY

PART 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

1) Approximately how many **L2 writing courses** have you taught **in a higher education** setting over the course of your career? ___________________________

2) How many **total sections** of **ESL 1060** have you taught for the University of Utah? ___________________________

3) Did your own understanding of the research process or knowledge of available resources change while **Research Skills for Developing Writers LibGuide in your teaching**? If so, how?

PART 2: FEELINGS

5) **Highlight** each word that describes how you feel about your experience using the **Research Skills for L2 Writers LibGuide** to teach research in ESL 1060.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>useful</th>
<th>annoying</th>
<th>practical</th>
<th>inefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>cumbersome</td>
<td>comprehensive</td>
<td>frustrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unproductive</td>
<td>confusing</td>
<td>unnecessary</td>
<td>user-friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convenient</td>
<td>needed</td>
<td>effective</td>
<td>informative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 3: LIBGUIDE LESSONS

6. a) There are nine available lessons in *Research Skills for Developing Writers*.

**Highlight** the three (3) lessons that are the *most useful* for teaching research in ESL 1060.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Research Process</th>
<th>Using the Marriott Library Catalog</th>
<th>Evaluating your Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is Plagiarism?</td>
<td>Summarizing, Paraphrasing, &amp; Quoting</td>
<td>Developing a Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Library Databases</td>
<td>Meeting your Librarians</td>
<td>Citing your Sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. b) **Explain why** you found these lessons *the most useful*.

7. a) **Circle** the three (3) L2 LibGuide lessons that are the *least useful* for teaching research in ESL 1060.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Research Process</th>
<th>Using the Marriott Library Catalog</th>
<th>Evaluating your Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is Plagiarism?</td>
<td>Summarizing, Paraphrasing, &amp; Quoting</td>
<td>Developing a Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Library Databases</td>
<td>Meeting your Librarians</td>
<td>Citing your Sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. b) **Explain why** you found these lessons *the least useful*.

7. c) Additional comments, critique, or suggestions about specific lessons or items:
PART 4: LIBGUIDE FEATURES

8. a) Using the numbers 1-10 (1 = the most useful and 10 = the least useful), rank each of these features of the Research Skills for L2 Writers LibGuide.
   (NOTE: If you feel two items rank equally, please rank them the same.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content &amp; Language Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-reading Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts/Readings/Videos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Language Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Organizers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Checks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to outside resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (Lesson Quizzes &amp; Summative Assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Support Guide for Instructors (Canvas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. b) Explain why you chose the features you ranked #1 and #2.

8. c) Explain why you chose the feature you ranked #9 and #10.

8. d) Additional comments, critique, or suggestions about specific features or items:
PART 5: STUDENT IMPROVEMENT

9) Reflect on your experience interacting with your students as they used the Research Skills for L2 Writers LibGuide. Rate your impression of how each content lesson contributed to your students’ development of knowledge of the research process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1: The Research Process</th>
<th>DID NOT USE</th>
<th>DID NOT DEVELOP</th>
<th>DEVELOPED SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DEVELOPED OK</th>
<th>DEVELOPED WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 2: Meet your Librarians</th>
<th>DID NOT USE</th>
<th>DID NOT DEVELOP</th>
<th>DEVELOPED SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DEVELOPED OK</th>
<th>DEVELOPED WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 3: Developing a Topic &amp; Search Terms</th>
<th>DID NOT USE</th>
<th>DID NOT DEVELOP</th>
<th>DEVELOPED SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DEVELOPED OK</th>
<th>DEVELOPED WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 4: Using the Marriott Library Catalog</th>
<th>DID NOT USE</th>
<th>DID NOT DEVELOP</th>
<th>DEVELOPED SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DEVELOPED OK</th>
<th>DEVELOPED WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 5: Using Academic Search Premier</th>
<th>DID NOT USE</th>
<th>DID NOT DEVELOP</th>
<th>DEVELOPED SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DEVELOPED OK</th>
<th>DEVELOPED WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 6: The CRAAP Test</th>
<th>DID NOT USE</th>
<th>DID NOT DEVELOP</th>
<th>DEVELOPED SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DEVELOPED OK</th>
<th>DEVELOPED WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 7: What is Plagiarism?</th>
<th>DID NOT USE</th>
<th>DID NOT DEVELOP</th>
<th>DEVELOPED SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DEVELOPED OK</th>
<th>DEVELOPED WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 8: Summarizing, Paraphrasing, &amp; Quoting</th>
<th>DID NOT USE</th>
<th>DID NOT DEVELOP</th>
<th>DEVELOPED SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DEVELOPED OK</th>
<th>DEVELOPED WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 9: Citing your Sources</th>
<th>DID NOT USE</th>
<th>DID NOT DEVELOP</th>
<th>DEVELOPED SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DEVELOPED OK</th>
<th>DEVELOPED WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments, critique, or suggestions about specific lessons or items:
10.a) Understanding that there are innumerable factors that influence a student’s language

---

7 Interaction could be in any academic capacity during the semester, including but not exclusive to: face-to-face interaction (in class, office hours, etc.), reviewing their writing, in the library, reviewing their homework & quizzes, etc.
proficiency, **reflect** on your ESL 1060 students' **overall ability to perform these classroom tasks** and **put a check (✔) in the column that best reflects your opinion.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use academic, discipline-appropriate vocabulary in writing.</th>
<th>Students are not able to perform these tasks at a proficient level for a university freshman.</th>
<th>Students are able to perform these tasks at a proficient level for a university freshman.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use academic, discipline-appropriate vocabulary when speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret academic readings (~first-year university level).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating professionally (e.g., F2F, emails).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop synonyms or alternative phrases for academic, discipline-appropriate vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize out-of-class resources independently, efficiently, and effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose sources that are sufficient for their research needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select and incorporate information from sources to serve their research needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructure an idea or passage into own words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include the appropriate information in citations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.b) To what degree do you feel the *Research Skills for L2 Writers* curriculum contributed to student language proficiency, particularly in language skills that are necessary to conduct scholarly undergraduate research.

11) Which lessons, texts, features, etc. of the *Research Skills for L2 Writers LibGuide* curriculum would you use again to help teach research? Why?

---

8 *Think of proficient here in terms of students possessing the skill-set necessary to accomplish tasks at a level that would enable the student to achieve a passing grade in any first-year college course, while having access to all available resources. Proficient is not meant to imply native like language ability, expert knowledge or ability, or complete autonomy in accomplishing the task.*
APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTOR INTERVIEW QUESTIONS DRAFT

1) Give a brief description of how you incorporated the LibGuide into your 1060 curriculum.
2) Which lessons did you find to be the most useful for curriculum enhancement? Why?
3) Which lessons did you find to be the least useful for curriculum enhancement? Why?
4) Describe what was useful when using the LibGuide in-class?
5) Describe what was useful when using the LibGuide out-of-class?
6) How did you motivate students to use the LibGuide?
7) Describe how you believe students used the LibGuide. Did they only do it because you asked them, did any use it on their own, in groups, alone, etc.
8) After using the LibGuide, what do find to be easier about teaching research than it was before? What do you understand better?
9) If you could change 1-2 things about the LibGuide, how would you change it?
10) What kinds of problems did you students report having using the LibGuide? What problems did you have using it?
11) How do you feel the LibGuide affected your students' academic language proficiency? What features/lessons were most helpful for teaching these skills?
12) Regarding incorporation or timing, what do you think you did well? What do you wish you had done differently?
13) Would you use the LibGuide again in teaching ESL 1060? How would you use it differently?
14) How did you use the Instructor Support Guide? What features did you find useful/not useful?
15) Do you feel the LibGuide resources helped you balance the class focus on research needs vs. writing needs? How?
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