MAKING CONFIDENT CHANGES: USING METACOGNITIVE REVISION AS A PEDAGOGICAL TOOL

Isabelle Lundin | Oakland University

In the field of writing studies, many scholars agree that metacognitive reflection activities can impact the quality of students' text and have also been correlated with increased writing self-efficacy. To expand on this preexisting relationship between metacognition and writing self-efficacy, my study explored the impacts of metacognitive reflection, specifically during the revisions stage of the writing process. I used two qualitative research methods to observe the effects of this intervention: field observations of peer review sessions and thematic, deductive coding of participants' responses to an open-ended questionnaire. I found that the metacognitive revision questionnaire encouraged participants to consider revision choices that linked their purpose for writing to their identities and to the ways they appealed to their audience. Making linkages between purpose, identity, and audience through revision choices has implications for fostering writing self-efficacy.

If there is anything my five semesters as an undergraduate writing center consultant have shown me, it's that the revision process brings a diversity of emotional experiences to light. As a fellow peer, my clients have shared their emotions with me: absolute bewilderment that their essay did not address what the assignment was looking for, irritation that they even have to revise at all, frustration that they don't understand their instructors' revision suggestions, and stress and anxiety over making revisions to a paper to receive a much-needed higher grade. Some have even bluntly announced that their professors' comments are bad, and they don't want to change their paper at all. All these instances demonstrate a negative perception of revision

processes in general. More significantly, these reactions illuminate a lack of confidence: students do not trust the relationship they have to the text that they have created and do not feel like they can identify what changes are to be made or even how to make them.

Writing self-efficacy can be defined as a person's confidence in their own writing skills to complete a writing task successfully (Camacho et al.; Camfield; Martinez et al.; Mitchell et al.). Writers can often determine the goal of a writing task but face challenges when they are unaware of how they must revise their own writing to achieve that goal (O'Sullivan-Sachar). One way to alleviate these challenges is to utilize metacognitive reflection strategies, which encourage students to think

about their writing processes in relation to the effectiveness and success of their own writing (O'Sullivan-Sachar). These strategies also provide an avenue for writers to think critically about what can be revised and how a revision choice can better achieve a writing goal. Revising in this way engages writers in a rhetorical self-reflection that deepens student awareness of their thinking, learning, and writing. This type of revision can promote the agency necessary to feel confident in one's writing skills and choices, thus increasing writing self-efficacy.

Several studies in rhetoric and composition have supported a connection between metacognition, transfer, and writing self-efficacy when reflection activities are completed after finishing a writing project or when small exercises are intermittently facilitated throughout the course (Adler-Kassner and Wardle; Bardolph; Chaterdon; Downs and Wardle; Leggette et al.; O'Sullivan-Sachar; Riddell; Stewart et al.; Yancey; Yancey et al.). However, few studies have examined the impact of metacognition at specific points during the writing process, such as the revision stage. The concept of metacognitive revision, which explicitly encourages intentional metacognitive reflection during the drafting and revising processes, as well as its effect on writing self-efficacy, requires further confirmation. My study further defined the relationship between metacognitive revision and writing self-efficacy posited by Holli Leggette and colleagues while responding to Heather Lindemann and colleagues' call for the "hybrid threshold concept" (604) of reflective revision. Instead of transforming instructor feedback into agency-driven revision through

metacognition, the metacognitive revision questions in this study sought to maintain students' ownership of their work as they evaluated their writing from the dual role of teacher and learner (Riddell). Metacognitive revision can facilitate reflective and impactful writing choices because, according to Rollo May, "the capacity to create ourselves […] inseparable from consciousness or self-awareness" (100).

This study investigated the following questions:

1. How does implementing metacognition during the revision stage impact writing self-efficacy?

2. How does implementing metacognition during the revision stage impact revision processes and revision choices?

LITERATURE REVIEW

WRITING SELF-EFFICACY

Researchers in the fields of psychology and counseling have found that self-efficacy, the belief in one's ability to succeed, is a crucial component of a person's success and achievement (Bandura). Self-efficacy is a construct that is unrelated to actual skills or abilities but is dependent on a person's social, emotional, and environmental experiences (Bandura). Since Albert Bandura, many fields outside of psychology and counseling have begun to investigate the significance of self-efficacy in the context of their own disciplinary identity.

In the fields of writing studies and rhetoric and composition, self-efficacy has taken on a distinct character. According to Ed Jones,

writing self-efficacy is "composed of confidence in the ability to accomplish particular tasks and perform particular skills…it is also composed of confidence in self-regulatory strategies to accomplish those tasks" (qtd. in Stewart et al. 4). Writing self-efficacy is intimately tied to writing performance: when students believe in their capabilities to accomplish a writing task, they tend to produce higher quality writing (Camfield; Hetthong and Teo; Wacholz and Etheridge). Additionally, the presence of writing self-efficacy in students also fosters self-regulatory behavior, which includes help-seeking, autonomous motivation, and goal setting (Camacho et al.; Campbell and Batista; Cui et al.; Jahin; Mitchell et al.). Writing self-efficacy, writing performance, and self-regulatory behavior demonstrate a circular relationship: when self-regulatory behaviors increase, writing self-efficacy increases. Similarly, self-regulatory behaviors impact writing performance and foster writing self-efficacy through a positive experience (Leggette et al.; Mitchell et al.; Stewart et al.).

One such self-regulatory behavior is metacognitive reflection. Many scholars suggest the positive effects of metacognition are most potent when reflection is "consistent, systematic" (Chaterdon) and treated as a significant part of the writing process (Leggette et al.; Stewart et al.; Yancey; Yancey et al.). Metacognitive reflection questions such as "What moves do I make, as a writer, to meet the needs of my audience or genre? Am I effective at meeting their needs? Are there things I could do differently? What do I do well?" (Chaterdon 60) encourages students to think more deeply about their rhetorical choices, fusing internal and external reflection to encourage "meta-awareness" of "author and audience" (50). Similarly, Kurt Stavenhagen and Timothy Daugherty's process of "kairotic composure" used reflection to "help one compose oneself, the subject, and others in relationship with a given moment in a given place" (66). These concepts use metacognition to frame the writer's rhetorical situation, fostering and maintaining the intimate connection between a writer's identity and the way they reflect on their writing. In this same way, metacognitive reflection proposes students become "agents of their own learning… in a process that is product becoming known" (Yancey 5), thus tying metacognition to writing self-efficacy (Bardolph; Downs and Wardle; Leggette et al.; O'Sullivan-Sachar; Stewart et al.; Yancey et al.)

METACOGNITION AND REVISION

While most metacognitive reflection activities occur at the end of students' writing processes (Chaterdon 60), those same metacognitive reflection questions also have pedagogical significance when asked during the revision stage of writing because of their relationship to a writer's rhetorical choices. There are few studies that focus on metacognition specifically during the revision stages of writing, despite the extant literature's support for the positive effects of metacognition on writing processes as a whole. Revision is a complex, emotional task that can be difficult for students to confidently identify what might need to be revised, and students may struggle to carry out those thoughtful revisions as a result (Ballenger and

Meyers; Lindenman et al.; Oliver). Lindenman and colleagues expressed that their findings necessitate "more opportunities to explore how revision and reflection are connected and how creating strong links between the two might help them compose more effective writing" (601). They advocated for a new "hybrid threshold concept" of reflective revision (604) that incorporates metacognitive thinking into the revision process. Jessica Riddell explored such a concept, studying how metacognitive approaches to student essay writing impacted their perceptions of the revision stage. By increasing the number of feedback loops, or the cycles in which students write, receive feedback on their writing, and revise, the participants in her study developed a deeper appreciation of the revision process. Cassandra O'Sullivan-Sachar's study implemented a scaffolded metacognitive revision activity into an essay assignment where students identified their revisions and provided a rationale for each change; O'Sullivan-Sachar's results indicated that overall writing quality and number of global revisions increased.

Additionally, there are not many studies that address the connections between metacognition, revision, and writing self-efficacy. Leggette and colleagues asserted that "reflective writing is also transformative and a point of growth in the process of becoming a holistic writer" (93), connecting growth in writing skills to growth in writing confidence through reflection. When studying metacognitive revision, O'Sullivan Sachar reported that students' perception of themselves as writers were positively impacted during the study, suggesting that utilizing metacognition in the revision process encourages students to feel more confident in their writing abilities (59). Graeme Stewart and colleagues found a threefold relationship between metacognition, writing self-efficacy, and writing anxiety, positing that "to the extent that perceptions of using metacognitive writing strategies results in the actual use of metacognitive strategies in writing, one may expect improved student writing outcomes when self-efficacy is encouraged and anxiety reduced" (12). If metacognitive reflection can positively impact writing self-efficacy, it follows that metacognitive reflection during the writing process may have a similar effect.

METHOD

This research took place at a small, midwestern R2 public university. After receiving IRB approval, I recruited participants from three upper-level Writing and Rhetoric courses in the Fall 2022 and Winter 2023 semesters. This study utilized two main qualitative data collection methods: transcriptions of audio-recorded peer-review sessions and an open-ended questionnaire on *Qualtrics.* Participants were asked to use one in-progress writing assignment for the duration of the study and had the option to upload a copy of that assignment before and after taking the questionnaire. Participants' names and any other identifying information have been decoded using pseudonyms (Jack and Lily).

The study yielded two participants, neither of whom chose to upload a copy of their draft.

PEER REVIEWS

Peer review sessions took place during participants' regularly scheduled class time. I audio-recorded each peer review session for the purposes of transcription only, destroying the audio recordings once transcription was complete. Because Jack and Lily had consented to participation in the research and their respective peer review partners had not, only their words were included in the transcription.

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

After Jack and Lily completed their peer reviews, I distributed a *Qualtrics* questionnaire via email (Appendix). This questionnaire utilized a mixture of "select all that apply," Likert scale, multiple choice, and open-ended questions.

At the beginning of the questionnaire, Jack and Lily first explained what their purpose for writing this assignment and whether they had any personal connections to the topic. Next, they identified how confident they were that their writing "achieved the stated purpose and goal of the assignment from [their] instructor's assignment instructions" and elaborated on the nature of their writing and revising processes. They also identified which aspects of their writing from a multiple-choice list they felt most confident about, such as their thesis statement or analysis of evidence.

For the remainder of the questionnaire, Jack and Lily were asked to choose two aspects of their writing from a multiple-choice list as revision items #1 and #2. For each revision item, they rated their confidence levels about each item's effectiveness in conveying their purpose for writing and appealing to their audience. They were asked to justify their confidence level with evidence from their own writing. Lastly, Jack and Lily elaborated on ways that each revision item could be changed to convey their purpose and appeal to their audience more effectively.

DATA ANALYSIS

I analyzed both participants' audio transcriptions and questionnaire responses as individual narratives using descriptive coding. Loosely borrowing feminist and ethnographic methodologies, I paid special attention to the ways in which Jack and Lily's identities were constructed and impacted through metacognitive revision. I employed thematic codes in my analytical memos, such as "writerly ethos," "appeals to audience," and "connected to overall purpose." For example, Lily demonstrated "writerly ethos" when her identity as a Women and Gender Studies major was connected to her reason for writing, where she could share her own experiences to "impact readers and make a change in academia. In another example, as Jack thought about "adding more implications of the research" to appeal to his audience more effectively, I applied the "appeals to audience" code. This same example received the "connected to overall purpose" code because Jack also felt adding more research implications to his conclusion would more effectively address the purpose he stated at the beginning of his questionnaire, which was to fulfill assignment instructions.

RESULTS

Even though Jack and Lily were enrolled in different classes, tasked with different writing assignments, and possessed different strengths and weaknesses as writers, similar patterns emerged in their stories as they utilized metacognitive revision. Both Jack and Lily connected their writing topics to their identities and pondered revision choices that might more effectively connect their audiences to their purpose for writing. These patterns draw attention to:

1. How writers mediate the relationship between audience, identity, and purpose during the revision stage when using metacognitive reflection, and

2. How mediating the relationship between audience, identity, and purpose during revision through metacognition lays the foundation for fostering agency and writing self-efficacy.

To employ an ethnographic case-study approach to this study's data, this section will present the narratives of each participant individually. The discussion section will synthesize both narratives with the extant literature to address the research questions.

LILY

During data collection, Lily (pseudonym) was enrolled in an upper-level writing course about race, social justice, and professional communities. The assignment she brought to the study utilized course material to understand conversations about race within an academic or professional space—in this case, her own discipline of Women and Gender Studies (WGS). Overall, she indicated that her purpose is "to synthesize the points made by the authors of the three readings I have chosen and to add onto the conversation that they are having." This first aspect of her writing's purpose was informed by the assignment's instructions. However, as a WGS major herself, she stated that her purpose was also to "inform and persuade my audience that Women and Gender studies (WGS) majors and educators have work to do to incorporate topics and race and racism within the department and to counter racism that I argue does exist within our department."

She had a personal connection to the topic not only because it is her major, but her identity as an intersectional feminist encouraged her passion to bring "awareness to things ... I want to add to the conversation and suggest ways for improvement through my position as a writer." These aspects of her identity also revealed her passion for WGS as a scholarly discipline and the values that the discipline upholds, especially in her commitment to self-reflecting "about my experiences and my contribution to race discourse and the state of affairs in my educational institution and in my life in general."

In addition to her identity as a WGS major and a feminist, she also acknowledged her position as a writer and how that impacted her decision to write about the topic. She indicated that "I take my opportunities to write very seriously and I think it's important to speak about things that matter to me." By connecting her purpose as a writer with those important aspects of her identity, her intent to "impact

readers and make a change in academia" worked to construct her writerly ethos.

During the drafting stage of her writing process, Lily identified who her audience was and why they would think her topic is important. Her audience for this particular assignment was WGS departments that are working to dismantle racism in their field, especially those who may not realize how prevalent racism still is. From there, her goal in writing to her audience is "both [to] inform and persuade them." By using outside sources and her own experiences as a WGS major, she wanted to "persuade them that the department has work to do in countering racism and effectively teaching students about race and racism."

In her questionnaire, she chose her analysis of evidential support as revision item #1 and expressed that she is "not confident" about its effectiveness in her writing right now. Lily did indicate that her use of "evidence show[s] clear links between the conversation that is being had about racism in present day America, especially in regards to rhetorical criticism and white academics (and white Americans in general)." But to more clearly align her evidential support with her writing's purpose, she noted that she

> could explain some of my evidence on color-blind racism further so that my point is stronger. I had trouble articulating the ideas put forth by the author in a full-formed manner, so I would like to expand upon and clarify what I have so that my readers are clear on what color-blind racism is and how I see it show

up in my major. I also was not sure if I included enough background detail on the article by Flores (2016), I had trouble explaining it. And the way I broke up the info about that reading with my own thoughts seems like it could be better organized so that Flores (2016)'s material stands out on its own before I jump into my own thoughts.

Although she was hesitant that her evidential support effectively conveyed her writing's purpose, Lily was very confident that her analysis of evidential support is tailored to her audience, because her analysis was "set up in an academic manner…I expand upon those main points with specific examples of how that topic has applied to me in my academic experiences. My audience would be interested in this information and in seeing explicit examples of how it applies to someone like them." Expanding on her idea for revision in clarifying her purpose, she noted that she could also revise her evidential analysis to better appeal to her audience:

> I think if I revise this for clarity, it will appeal to my audience even more because they will clearly see the point I am trying to make and the link to the examples I give. I can help direct them toward my purpose by being clear in my language and organization and by being thorough in my analysis. I want my audience to understand the importance of my topic and to see my examples from my own life as a way for them to relate to what I am saying and see themselves in my call to action.

Lily chose her introduction as revision item #2. She was confident that it effectively conveys her purpose because "I start the introduction with a personal touch, explaining my lack of prior educational knowledge of race and racism and how I want to address the racism within my higher academic experiences in a way that conveys to the audience that this will be the focus of my paper." She also highlighted that her introduction has "an academic tone and language choices that reflect my perspective as a WGS major," which also effectively appealed to her audience. However, she felt that her introduction is "a bit wordy and could be streamlined. If there are too many words and what I'm saying isn't clear, that gets the essay off to a rocky start. I want to be very clear and concise about bringing my audience into my topic and my goals for the essay." Lily also expressed that "streamlining" her introduction would help her audience "connect with the writer's words and their topic more easily and quickly, thus holding their interest and gaining their trust of my voice."

JACK

Jack, a creative writing major, was enrolled in an upper-level writing course that introduced students to writing center theory and pedagogy. At the time of this study, he was working on a research paper assignment that asked him to investigate an issue in the writing center field. Jack chose to research the lack of writing center pedagogy and scholarship on creative writing students. His purpose for writing was "to find an area of writing centers research that interests me and to further its discussion," knowing it is his purpose "mostly because it is in the writing assignment's directions." His identity as a creative writing major played a significant role in his topic and his purpose for writing because the "topic represents my experience as a creative writer in college—four year's worth of experience. This, as a result, forms my identity in writing."

Jack indicated that his audience was "First, creative writers who felt left out in a college setting that values academic writing more than creative writing; and second, researchers who contribute to writing center studies and the tutors who work in those writing centers." He noted that "creative writers likely already know they aren't represented in the writing center. Likewise, tutors notice their absence." His goal in writing to his audience is "to inform, first, and then offer some solutions based on research and my own experience."

In Jack's peer review, he discussed revisions he had already made to his paper since the last time he had met with his partner. He had added an additional source to address a topic more thoroughly, a revision choice that helped to achieve the assignment's overall purpose: "I added [this] source here to tie into the lack, or gap in research." He also talked about how he has a plan for utilizing the evidence and sources that he has. However, when explaining the sources that he already had, he acknowledged the limitations of the assignment and the paper's scope—"But my paper—I don't want to go too deeply into that, because that is more or less like explaining the situation, kind of defogging what's on right now." After receiving a revision suggestion from his partner, he

expressed that the suggestion "was good advice and I have an idea going forward of how I'm going to plan this."

In the questionnaire, revision item #1 was his thesis statement. He felt "neutral" about its effectiveness in his writing. He stated that his thesis

> answers my curiosity of the topic—why is there a creative writing gap in writing center research—but it may not be specific enough. It is a vague question, and maybe even a bit too large? I needed to attach the student's and tutor's perspectives to the thesis to make it more specific, but I'm not sure if it's working.

He grappled with the scope of the assignment and whether the thesis statement addresses his purpose the clearest way possible. When pondering revision choices, he went back and forth between making his thesis more specific or keeping it general: "perhaps making my thesis more specific could focus my argument and make the essay feel like it's more in conversation with itself. Given I am not an expert in the field, I think a more general approach to the topic may be better—so, in other words, keeping everything the same." He was not able to pinpoint exactly what he wanted to do with his thesis and eventually deferred to seek advice from others.

He knew that his thesis is tailored to his audience because it "acknowledges a gap in writing center research, which would appeal to those affected by the gap and those writing the research." To better appeal to his audience, he once again grappled with making his thesis

more specific or keeping it general: "Either I could tailor it more towards creative writers, providing more advice throughout the paper, or I could keep it the same."

Jack chose his conclusion as revision item #2. Again, he felt "neutral" about its effectiveness in conveying his purpose for writing. To make his purpose in his conclusion clearer, he wondered if he should include "more about how the topic impacted me. As is, the conclusion only includes solutions that tutors and researchers could make. Being the author of the paper, though, an added presence in the conclusion may be helpful." He considered bringing in more of his writerly ethos, identity, and his own experiences to help clarify and amplify his purpose for writing.

He felt "neutral" about his conclusion's appeal to his audience. He stated that his conclusion "gives solutions to tutors and these solutions can be replicated in writing center sessions." To appeal to his audience more effectively, he considered "including more implications of the research in the conclusion. Implications are a required part of the paper and stated in the instructions, and I'm not sure if I fully included them." He returned to the assignment's overall purpose, implying that fulfilling assignment instructions may make him feel more confident about the paper's effectiveness.

DISCUSSION

Based on the narratives provided, utilizing metacognitive revision as a pedagogical tool allowed students to reflect on what they've done well in their writing thus far, what might need

to change, and what those changes might look like. My findings related metacognition to writing self-efficacy (Leggette et al.; Mitchell et al.; O'Sullivan-Sachar; Stewart et al.) with even greater nuance because my methodology implemented metacognition specifically at the revision stage. Because "external factors can be manipulated to change internal emotional states" (Stewart et al. 11), implementing metacognitive tasks, especially in the context of revision, can build the necessary foundations for writing self-efficacy to increase.

While the results do not *define* causal relationship between metacognitive revision and writing self-efficacy, the revision choices that Jack and Lily considered demonstrate that this pedagogical tool *is related to* fostering writing self-efficacy. As posited by Kim Mitchell and colleagues, "Success in improving writing and writing self-efficacy in students is contingent on revision" (20), emphasizing the need for pedagogical interventions such as metacognitive revision to foster productive and thoughtful writers.

While engaging in metacognitive revision, both Jack and Lily's experiences revealed that they considered: (1) how their identity is tied to their purpose for writing (writerly ethos) and (2) how appealing to their stated audience is tied to their purpose for writing.

IDENTITY AND PURPOSE: A "WRITERLY ETHOS"

While engaging in metacognitive reflection during revision, one of the most significant recurring themes from the participant narratives was the ways in which they realized their identity was tied to their overall purpose for writing. Both Jack and Lily had personal connections to their topics, and after identifying why those topics were important to them at the beginning of the questionnaire, those aspects of their identity recurred within their subsequent responses. Lily's passion to "[bring] awareness" to her experiences as a WGS major through her "position as a writer" and Jack's topic that "represents [his] experience as a creative writer in college" echo that "the capacity to create ourselves…is inseparable from consciousness or self-awareness" (May 100). Because the questionnaire asked participants to pause and determine what part of their identity makes this topic important to them, the revision process begins in a similar way to Stavenhagen and Daugherty's concept of kairotic composure; the participants "compose [themselves], the subject, and others in relationship with a given moment in a given place" (66). Identifying themselves as personal stakeholders in their purpose for writing constructs their own "writerly ethos," exemplified by Lily's intent to "impact readers and make a change in academia" and Jack's goal to "inform… and then offer some solutions based on research and [his] own experience," in their own words, respectively.

Jack exemplified this deep connection between his identity and his purpose for writing when pondering how he could revise his conclusion. He considered adding "more about how the topic impacted" him; because "being the author of the paper…an added presence in the conclusion may be helpful." Jack made a direct connection between his writerly ethos

and a potential revision choice through meta-cognition, demonstrating an awareness of his relationship to his own text (Consilio and Kennedy; Chaterdon; Leggette et al.; Stavenhagen and Daugherty; Yancey; Yancey et al.).

The metacognitive revision questions encouraged Jack and Lily to "articulate what learning has taken place, as embodied in various texts as well as in the processes used by the writer" (Yancey 6), directly linking their revision choices to their identities as writers. In their questionnaire responses, Jack and Lily engaged in internal conversations that asked questions about what they needed to do next (Chaterdon 60; Lindenman et al.). These "streams of consciousness" echo Yancey's arguments about reflection, where students are "agents of their own learning…in a process that is product becoming known" (5).

When reflecting on one way of making her evidential analysis more clearly aligned with her writing purpose (Lily's revision item #1), Lily demonstrated such an internal conversation as she tangentially followed the thread of her thoughts to think more deeply about what else could be done to address this part of her writing. She started by broadly stating she could explain her evidence more so that her audience has a better understanding of what color-blind racism is, but eventually narrowed her focus to explain a specific source more. She then narrowed the focus even further by thinking about how the organization and structure of her explanation could also make the purpose clearer. As she was writing this response, Lily was creating revision plans that could better appeal to her audience, which is a form of both goal-setting and autonomous motivation (Camacho et al.; Campbell and Batista; Cui et al.; Jahin; Mitchell et al.) These revision plans, along with her "stream of consciousness" of "product becoming known" (Yancey 5), can begin to foster self-efficacy through the relationship between her identity and her purpose for writing (Leggette et al.; Mitchell et al.; Stewart et al.). This aspect of metacognitive revision reinforced her commitment to speaking about her own "experiences as a WGS major in the WGS department in order to persuade them that the department has work to do in countering racism and effectively teaching students about race and racism."

Jack demonstrated similar "streams of consciousness" in his responses, also incorporating his writerly ethos into the process of revision. As he pondered why he felt "neutral" about his thesis statement and the potential revisions he could make (his revision item #1), Jack engaged in an internal conversation about the scope of the assignment, pondering whether he should revise his thesis to be more specific or keep it general (Chaterdon). Jack's reflection on his thesis demonstrated a "meta-awareness" of "author and audience" (Chaterdon 50). While he didn't decide on a definitive revision choice for his thesis, he eventually concluded that he would seek the advice of his fellow students and professor, a self-regulatory behavior deeply tied to writing self-efficacy (Camacho et al.; Campbell and Batista; Cui et al; Jahin; Jones; Mitchell et al.; Stewart et al.). Seeking advice from others also positions his writerly ethos alongside "the subject and others in relationship with a given moment and a given place" (Stavenhagen and Daugherty 66).

Metacognitive revision also promotes students' ownership of their work as they reflect their writing from the role of a learner (Riddell). Jack and Lily examined the ways in which their writing was effective through "awareness of how that performance came to be" (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 75). Because the practice of metacognitive revision maintains the intimate connection between a writer's identity to the nature of their reflection (Chaterdon; Consilio and Kennedy; Stavehagen and Daugherty), writers' revision choices and the power to enact those choices are fueled purely by their own agency.

In addition to reinforcing students' writerly ethos, metacognitive revision also helps students reflect from the lens of a teacher (Riddell). The metacognitive revision questions in this study asked participants to identify what they had done well and what they could do differently, giving themselves feedback in the way an instructor would (Chaterdon; Riddell). Jack assumed this teacher role when he summarized the revisions he had already made and created a revision plan throughout his peer review and questionnaire responses. This example demonstrates that metacognitive revision may help students avoid treating "teacher commentary…like a checklist" (Lindenman et al. 601); rather, this "reflective revision" encourages the same positive effects as increased feedback loops (Riddell) but with a greater emphasis on student agency. Encouraging student reflection throughout their entire writing process may have positive implications on self-regulatory behaviors and overall writing self-efficacy (Camacho et al.; Campbell and Batista; Cui et al.; Jahin; Leggette et al.; Mitchell et al.; Stewart et al.).

The ways Jack and Lily discussed their writerly identities in relation to their topics constitute the same set of social, emotional, and environmental experiences responsible for self-efficacy construction (Bandura). Because Jack and Lily rely on their personal relationships to the topic throughout the questionnaire rather than the skills or capabilities they perceived they had, a metacognitive revision tool such as this has implications for developing writing self-efficacy.

AUDIENCE AND PURPOSE: A DEEPER AWARENESS

The other significant theme throughout participants' narratives was the ways they considered how appealing to their stated audience was tied to their purpose for writing. At the beginning of the questionnaire, after identifying their purpose for writing and why the topic was important to them, Jack and Lily were asked to identify who their audience(s) were for this assignment. This established the interconnectedness of the rhetorical situation (Stavenhagen and Daugherty) and a "meta-awareness" of "author and audience" (Chaterdon 60) right from the beginning.

The metacognitive revision questions then asked Jack and Lily to elaborate on how aspects of their writing appealed to their stated audience. It is interesting to note that in all of the questions regarding appealing to the audience, both Jack and Lily made mention of their overall purpose for writing, illustrating that these metacognitive revision questions encouraged

them to reflect on how readers might perceive their purpose for writing. For instance, Lily chose to revise her use of evidential analysis for clarity. She acknowledged her audience's familiarity with the topic of the discourse but reminded herself of her purpose for writing to them: to inform, persuade, and inspire a call to action. She identified that clearly explaining her evidence and her personal examples will "direct them to [her] purpose…and see themselves in my call to action." In a similar way, fueled by consideration of her audience's reception of her writing, her decision to streamline her introduction and eliminate wordiness avoided "[getting the essay] off to a rocky start" and helped the audience "[gain] trust of [her] voice." These responses demonstrated her connection between her purpose for writing, her audience, and her writerly ethos, together echoing the reflective pedagogies of Jennifer Consilio and Sheila Kennedy, Stavenhagen and Daugherty, and Chaterdon that facilitated positive student writing outcomes.

Jack also referred to his purpose for writing when considering his audience, especially when reflecting on his conclusion paragraph. He considered "adding more implications of the research" not only to appeal to his audience more effectively but also because doing so might better address his overall purpose in adhering to the assignment's instructions. He realizes that "implications are a required part of the paper…and [he's] not sure if [he] fully included them." Here, pondering how his writing appeals to his audience reinforced the ways his writing responded to the purpose stated in the writing assignment's instructions,

demonstrating the effectiveness of "reflective revision" (Lindenman et al.) in making thoughtful changes (Adler-Kassner and Wardle; Bardolph; Chaterdon; Downs and Wardle; Leggette et al.; O'Sullivan-Sacahar; Riddell; Yancey; Yancey et al.).

LIMITATIONS

Research investigating metacognitive revision and writing self-efficacy should be replicated across a diversity of institutions and student experiences to further define their relationship with each other. Future research into this relationship may also consider employing an empirical, qualitative component. Additionally, future replications or reiterations of this research should require participants to upload a copy of their draft before and after taking the questionnaire instead of making this component of participation optional. Because neither participant chose to upload copies of their drafts, I could not conclusively argue that metacognitive revision produced more effective writing without seeing evidence of any changes.

Another significant limitation of this study's findings is the inability to pinpoint where Lily and Jack get their ideas about what needs to be revised. Like writing skills, the language and execution of revision are not innate and are learned over time. For instance, Lily explains that her introduction is "wordy." Does Lily truly think that her writing is "wordy," or is this something that has been told to her by professors or peers before and simply assumes of her writing? This raises even more interesting questions about writing processes: to what

extent are our revision choices our own? To what extent are they products of our experiences, such as prior feedback, genre conventions, or discourse community values? While these are questions my findings certainly cannot answer, this particular limitation opens the door for more research about the nature of cognition, writing processes, and identities.[1]

One advantage to the narrative ethnographic approach is the ability to compare individual stories and the different ways identities are shaped. Writing is a complex social and rhetorical activity (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 17), with each writer necessitating their own processes and approaches. Thus, evaluating the effectiveness of pedagogical tools such as metacognitive revision at an individual level can provide greater insight into how these tools may be applied holistically in writing classrooms.

CONCLUSION

Changing how students perceive the revision process also means changing how they perceive themselves as writers. This transformation, while emotional and belaboring, can be fostered through a deeper implementation of metacognition strategies. As scholars in the field of rhetoric and composition, we have the theoretical knowledge and methods of inquiry needed to definitively explore how students can benefit from metacognitive interventions in the classroom. The metacognitive revision questions from this study could easily be adapted into revision activities or assignments for students to complete online, and the formats and modalities that metacognitive revision activities could take are endless.

Metacognitive revision activities may be key in fostering confidence in student writers. Increased writing self-efficacy helps students in their writing courses but also impacts how students see themselves in relationship to their thoughts, ideas, and created products. This confidence in their abilities is continually revisited and transformed as students enter future contexts, such as relationships, academic endeavors, and careers. It is of utmost importance that the work we do in writing classrooms aims to impart this kind of confidence to students because it can translate into other aspects of their lives—past, present, and future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

1. Though unrelated to the study's methodology, a significant limitation to this study was the loss of my mentor for this project, Dr. Elizabeth G. Allan. She passed away suddenly in November 2022, shortly after I received IRB approval and began data collection. Dr. Allan was an incredibly wise, supportive, and encouraging mentor to me and taught me so much about ethnography and research design. I am very proud to have known her. Consequently, I'd like to acknowledge Dr. James Nugent for stepping in as my mentor while I wrote up this research for my capstone course in the Winter 2023 semester.

WORKS CITED

Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Elizabeth Wardle, editors. *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies.* Utah State UP, 2016.

Ballenger Bruce, and Kelly Myers. "The Emotional Work of Revision." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 70, no. 4 2019, pp 590–614,

Bandura, Albert. "Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning." *Educational Psychologist*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1993, pp. 117-148, http://doi.org/10.1207/sl5326985ep280.

Bardolph, Megan J. "Modifying Classroom Routines to Provide Reflective Space." *Teaching English in the Two Year College,* vol. 46, no. 2, 2018, pp. 137-146, https://doi.org/10.58680/tetyc201829949

Camacho, Ann, et al. "Relations Among Motivation, Behavior, and Performance in Writing: A Multiple-Group Structural Equation Modeling Study." *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* vol. 91, 2021, pp. 1456-1480, http://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12430.

Camfield, Eileen Kogl. "Mediated-Efficacy: Hope for "Hopeless" Writers." *Journal of Developmental Education,* vol. 39, no. 3, 2016, pp. 2-6, 8-11. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44987414.

Campbell, Colin William, and Barney Batista (2023). "To Peer or Not To Peer: A Controlled Peer-Editing Intervention Measuring Writing Self-Efficacy in South Korean Higher Education. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, vol. 4, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100218.

Chaterdon, Kate. "Writing Into Awareness." *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing,* vol. 16, no. 1, 2019, pp. 50-65, https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2019.16.1.05.

Consilio, Jennifer, and Sheila M. Kennedy. "Using Mindfulness as a Heuristic for Writing Evaluation: Transforming Pedagogy and Quality of Experience." *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing,* vol.16, no. 1, 2019, pp. 1-22, https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2019.16.1.04.

Cui, Ying, et al. "Effects of Trained Peer vs. Teacher Feedback on EFL Students' Writing Performance, Self-Efficacy, and Internalization of Motivation." *Frontiers in Psychology,* vol. 12, 2021, http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.788474.

Downs, Doug, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching About Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)envisioning 'First Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication,* vol, 58, no. 4, 2007, pp. 552-584.

Hetthong, Rapassak, and Adisa Teo. "Does Writing Self-Efficacy Correlate With and Predict Writing Performance?" *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature,* vol. 2, no. 1, 2013, pp. 157-167, https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.2n.1p.157.

Jahin, Jamal Hamed. "The Effect of Peer Reviewing on Writing Apprehension and Essay Writing Ability of Prospective EFL Teachers." *Australian Journal of Teacher Education,* vol. 37, no. 11, 2012, http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol37/iss11/4.

Leggette, Holli R., et al. "Through Reflective Lenses: Enhancing Students' Perceptions of Their Media Writing Skills." *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator,* vol. 75, no. 1, 2020, pp. 81-97. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077695819852256.

Lindenman, Heather, et al. "Revision and Reflection: (Dis)connections Between Writing Knowledge and Writing Practice." *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 69, no. 4, 2018, pp. 581-611.

Martinez, Christy Teranishi, et al. "Pain and Pleasure in Short Essay Writing: Factors Predicting University Students' Writing Anxiety and Writing Self-Efficacy." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,* vol. 54, no. 5, 2011, pp. 351-360. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41038868

May, Rollo. *The Courage to Create.* W.W. Norton Company, 1975.

Mitchell, Kim M., et al. "An Exploration of Writing Self Efficacy and Writing Self-Regulatory Behaviors in Undergraduate Writing." *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* vol. 10, no. 2, 2019, art. 8. https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2019.2.8175.

Oliver, Lucy. "'Nothing Too Major': How Poor Revision of Writing May Be an Adaptive Response to School Tasks." *Language and Education*, vol.33, no. 4, 2019, pp. 363-378, https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1511728.

O'Sullivan-Sachar, Cassandra. "Revising With Metacognition to Promote Writing Achievement: A Case Study." *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* vol. 20, no. 3, 2020, pp. 49-63, http://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v20i3.28675.

Riddell, Jessica. "Performance, Feedback, and Revision: Metacognitive Approaches to Undergraduate Essay Writing." *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching,* vol. 8, 2015, pp. 79-96. https://doi.org/10.22329/celt.v8i0.4256.

Stavenhagen, Kurt, and Timothy R. Daugherty. "Contemplation as 'Kairotic' Composure." *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing,* vol. 16, no. 1, 2019, pp. 66-78, https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2019.16.1.06

Stewart, Graeme, et al. "Anxiety and Self-Efficacy's Relationship with Undergraduate Students' Perceptions of the Use of Metacognitive Writing Strategies." *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* vol. 6, no. 1, 2015, https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2015.1.4.

Wacholz, Patricia B., and Carol Plata Etheridge. "Writing Self-Efficacy Beliefs of High- and Low-Apprehensive Writers." *Journal of Developmental Education,* vol. 19, no. 3, 1996, pp. 16-18, 20, 22, 24, https://www.jstor.org/stable/42775606

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "On Reflection." *Reflection in the Writing Classroom,* Utah State UP, 1998, pp. 1-22.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake, et al. "Teaching For Transfer (TFT) and the Role of Content in Composition." *Writing Across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing,* Utah State UP, 2014, pp. 60-102.

APPENDIX: METACOGNITIVE REVISION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How confident do you feel that your draft achieves the stated purpose and goal of the assignment from your instructor's assignment instructions?
   a. Very confident, confident, neutral, unconfident, very unconfident

2. How confident do you feel that revising will allow your draft to achieve the stated purpose and goal of the assignment from your instructor's assignment instructions?
   a. Very confident, confident, neutral, unconfident, very unconfident

3. Rate how much you agree with the following statements (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree):
   a. The main reason for writing an essay or paper is to get a good grade on it.
   b. I plan out my writing and stick to the plan.
   c. My first draft is often my finished product.
   d. Revision is a one-time process at the end.
   e. I think about how I come across in my writing.
   f. I imagine the reaction that my readers might have to my paper. [IL1]
   g. I identify the purpose for my paper in the pre-writing stage.
   h. I identify the purpose for my paper while I am in the drafting stage.
   i. I identify the purpose for my paper when I am in the revision stage.

4. Consider the following statements and select which stage of the writing process they apply to you. (Pre-writing, drafting, revision, proofreading, does not apply to my writing process)
   a. I consider why I am writing about this topic.
   b. I consider why this topic is important.
   c. When thinking about my own identity, I consider why this topic is important to me.
   d. I consider others who might think this topic is important.
   e. I consider why others might think this topic is important.
   f. I decide what I want to say about this topic.
   g. After I decide what I want to say about this topic, I decide why I want to say it.
   h. After I decide what I want to say about this topic, I decide how I want to say it.
   i. After I decide what I want to say about this topic and why I want to say it, I decide how I want to say it.

5. In the following questions, you will be asked to provide a short-answer response regarding the initial draft of your assignment.
   a. What is my purpose for writing this assignment?
   b. Why is this my purpose?
   c. Why do I think this topic is important? What about my identity makes

this topic important to me?

d. Who/what group of people thinks this topic is important?

e. What does my audience already think about this topic?

f. While talking to my audience about this topic, what is my goal? (to persuade, to inform, etc?)

6. Select all that apply: What parts of your draft do you feel confident about?
   a. Thesis statement
   b. Introduction
   c. Conclusion
   d. Use of evidential support
   e. Analysis of evidential support
   f. Organization of ideas
   g. Structure of argument/analysis
   h. Synthesis between sources of evidential support
   i. Effectiveness of writing to support thesis statement/purpose
   j. Language
   k. Style
   l. Tone
   m. None, I am unconfident about my draft as a whole

7. Choose an item from the following list that you would like to incorporate into your revision process for this assignment. **This item will be referred to as Item #1.**
   a. Thesis statement
   b. Introduction
   c. Conclusion
   d. Use of evidential support
   e. Analysis of evidential support
   f. Organization of ideas
   g. Structure of argument/analysis

h. Synthesis between sources of evidential support
i. Effectiveness of writing to support thesis statement/purpose
j. Language
k. Style
l. Tone

8. How confident do you feel about **Item #1's** effectiveness in your writing right now?
   a. Very confident, confident, neutral, unconfident, very unconfident

For the following questions, refer to your answers for Question #5.

9. How confident do you feel that your writing choices regarding **Item #1** effectively convey your purpose about this topic?
   a. Very confident, confident, neutral, unconfident, very unconfident
   b. Explain your choice.

10. How do your writing choices regarding **Item #1** convey your purpose?

11. What about your writing choices regarding **Item #1** can be revised to make the purpose of your writing clearer? Provide a justification for your revision(s).

12. How confident do you feel that your writing choices regarding **Item #1** are tailored to your audience?
    a. Very confident, confident, neutral, unconfident, very unconfident
    b. Explain your choice.

13. How do your writing choices regarding **Item #1** appeal to your audience?

14. What about your writing choices regarding **Item #1** can be revised to appeal to

your audience even more? Provide a justification for your revision(s).

15. Choose another item from the following list that you would like to incorporate into your revision process for this assignment. **This item will be referred to as Item #2.**
    a. Thesis statement
    b. Introduction
    c. Conclusion
    d. Use of evidential support
    e. Analysis of evidential support
    f. Organization of ideas
    g. Structure of argument/analysis
    h. Synthesis between sources of evidential support
    i. Effectiveness of writing to support thesis statement/purpose
    j. Language
    k. Style
    l. Tone

16. Regarding **Choice #2,** how confident do you feel about that item's effectiveness in your writing right now?
    a. Very confident, confident, neutral, unconfident, very unconfident

For the following questions, refer to your answers for Question #5.

1. How confident do you feel that your writing choices regarding **Item #2** effectively convey your purpose about this topic?
    a. Very confident, confident, neutral, unconfident, very unconfident
    b. Explain your choice.

2. How do your writing choices regarding **Item #2** convey your purpose?

3. What about your writing choices regarding **Item #2** can be revised to make the purpose of your writing clearer? Provide a justification for your revision(s).

4. How confident do you feel that your writing choices regarding **Item #2** are tailored to your audience?
    a. Very confident, confident, neutral, unconfident, very unconfident
    b. Explain your choice.

5. How do your writing choices regarding **Item #2** appeal to your audience?

6. What about your writing choices regarding **Item #2** can be revised to appeal to your audience even more? Provide a justification for your revision(s).