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APPENDIX 5

INTERVIEW CODEBOOK

The extended codebook, complete with representative quotations of code exemplars, can be found on our Fulcrum platform at https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.10079890

1. ** Archived work.** This code describes any discussion of either the work that nonminor students have uploaded to the study archive or the process of uploading. *This code is specific only to the nonminor interviewees.*

2. ** Audience awareness.** This code describes any instance in which the speaker considers a reader or readers, whether real or ideal.

3. **Collaboration or peer feedback.** This code indicates any mention of students’ reactions to collaborative writing experiences or peer feedback, whether assigned or not.

4. ** Feedback (instructor).** This code describes any mention of instructor feedback or response to written work *that is not specifically tied to an instructor’s grade or formal assessment of that work.* (Note: There is a separate code for specific references to grades or evaluation, which may overlap with some of these instances. Also note that there is a separate code for collaboration and peer review.)

5. **Good teaching.** This code describes the speaker’s evaluation or consideration of pedagogical approaches, whether positive or negative.

6. ** Good writing.** This code describes the speaker’s conception of effective or successful writing, in whatever discipline. This can include claims about notions of correctness (grammar, spelling, etc.) in writing.

7. **Grades and teacher evaluation.** This code indicates moments where the interviewee refers to a teacher’s assessment of written work, whether in the form of a grade or not. (Please note the separate code for feedback (instructor).

8. **Kinds of writing.** This is a fairly broad category, encompassing any instance where the reader refers to differences in genre, disciplinary differences or conventions, differences in approach or subject matter,
or writing flexibility. For some students, descriptions of or distinctions between kinds of writing can become vague; we coded these moments as well, because they seem telling regarding students’ abilities to distinguish between genres (see final example).

9. **New media.** This refers to any mention of new media and the technology that supports it. We did not code mentions of the writing minor eportfolio with “new media” unless the technological aspects of the portfolio were explicitly mentioned.

10. **Portfolio.** This primarily refers to any mention of the eportfolio created for the Gateway course, although we also looked for mentions of any kind of portfolio use. See also note about *new media*, with which this code can but does not necessarily overlap.

11. **Process.** This refers to any mention of composing, including explicit discussion of brainstorming, prewriting, organizing, and revising. It sometimes overlaps with the *feedback (instructor)* code. For this code, we did not include references to how a paper ends up looking, in terms of organization, etc.

12. **Professional goals.** This refers to any discussion about the intersection of writing and the student’s professional goals, including future graduate or professional school writing.

13. **Purpose.** This refers to the intention behind a particular piece of writing, one’s clarity of purpose in the writing itself, or the larger ideas that might motivate one’s writing, whether professional, academic, personal, etc. It encompasses any awareness that writing is driven by intention. (Note, however, the separate codes for *writing goals* and *professional goals*, which may but do not necessarily overlap.)

14. **Reflection.** This refers to any explicit discussion of writerly self-awareness, reflective writing, or thinking back on specific writing assignments or growth. This also can refer to specific instances of not reflecting when a student is asked about reflective writing but does not or cannot respond. However, we did not include in this code moments that may indicate a writer’s attitude toward their writing without the writer purposefully articulating or engaging in reflection.

15. **Transfer.** This refers to any mention of how ideas or lessons transfer from class to class or apply in other contexts. *When possible*, please try to code as specifically to an individual course as possible: *Transfer 125, Transfer 220 (minor Gateway course), Transfer 225*, and/or *Transfer General* for discussion of any other courses where writing assignments
appear to apply in other contexts. This category also can refer to specific instances of nontransfer when a student is asked about his or her first-year writing requirement and specifically comments about the class not having a later benefit.

16. **Voice**. This refers to any mention of issues of style or tone, personality, or authenticity in writing.

17. **Writerly self-conception**. This refers to any description of oneself as a writer—how, what, and why one sees oneself writing, whether past or present. It often coincides with *professional goals* and *writing development*. This category includes any discussion of student’s confidence around writing assignments and writing tasks.

18. **Writing development**. This is a broad category that refers to any discussion of how a student sees his or her writing developing or improving over time. It was frequently co-coded with *writerly self-conception*. It also surfaces in some discussions of reflection, or looking back on growth from previous writing.

19. **Writing goals**. This category refers to any comments about specific goals a student has for his or her writing. This category may overlap with *professional goals*, such as when a student indicates an interest in publishing or pursuing other work as a writer.