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ABSTRACT

This dissertation reports findings from a microethnographic analysis of the academic literacy socialization of six multilingual PhD students in the field of education as they progressed through their first year of doctoral education. The main purpose of this study was to investigate the academic socialization processes that these multilingual students underwent while building academic knowledge and social relationships, and gaining an understanding of disciplinary knowledge and academic writing in a second language.

Drawing from the scholarship on sociolinguistic ethnography, language socialization, New Literacies and educational studies on intertextuality, this study was a one-year long ethnographic investigation of the doctoral students’ academic socialization both inside and outside of the classroom setting. The researcher followed six students in their theoretical and methodological courses, facilitated support group discussions they attended, and provided mentoring on various issues regarding life in academia. The sources of data include students’ written work, audio and video recordings of classroom discussions and student support group meetings, classroom observations, extensive field notes, and ethnographic interviews.

This study’s results suggest that socializing into the values of academic writing is a complex and multilayered process in which students collaboratively construct meaning and engage in interactive dialogs both inside and outside of their classrooms in
order to learn how to become legitimate participants in their academic disciplines. I argue that by acting and reacting (Erickson & Shultz, 1977) to each other as speakers and writers in an intercultural space, some adult multilingual students resist, challenge, and create hybrid forms of literacy practices, thus expanding the notion of textual world construction at doctoral level. The study demonstrates that the spaces created outside of academic classrooms can enhance students’ understanding of academic literacy practices, and empower the students to be engaging practitioners and members of their imagined academic communities.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The heart of the idea of enlightenment involves people coming into a sense of their own power, a new relationship with their own contexts (Fox, 1988, p. 2)

This study provides a multi-dimensional view of the academic literacy socialization of multilingual students in their first year of doctoral study in the U.S. In this investigation, I was particularly interested in looking at how students interact with text and talk in their first year of doctoral education while they are acculturating into their disciplinary fields. Fundamental to the academic socialization process and academic literacies of multilingual students in the early period of their doctoral study is the dynamic and complex relationship between different texts and actors, and the extent to which the peer conversations outside the classroom influence their academic literacy socialization. Therefore, this dissertation includes various types of micro-ethnographic analyses of both classroom and outside the classroom dialogues that focus on the dynamic relationship between spoken and written texts, social relationships and language use.

More specifically, building on theories of second language academic socialization, language socialization and a microethnographic approach to language use in the classroom, this study investigated the academic literacy socialization processes of six multilingual doctoral students. Underlining the material aspect of language (Voloshinov, 1933), the dialogic interactions that the students engaged during their first year at the doctoral level were assumed to be a key element in analyzing their academic
socialization experiences. These dialogs not only functioned as tools for understanding students’ academic literacy socialization processes, but they also served as a tool for emancipation and empowerment. It is these interactions and dialogues that I put at the heart of my research while investigating the academic literacy socialization of the multilingual doctoral students who participated in the study.

**Statement of the Problem**

In recent years, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of international graduate students who come to North American institutions of higher education\(^1\) to pursue a graduate degree. Upon graduation, while some of them stay in the United States with the intention of going into academic or business related professions, others return to their home countries to land professional jobs. Most of these students complete their first college degree in their home countries and are proficient users of the English language when they begin their post-graduate study in the United States. Furthermore, many international graduate students who pursue a doctoral degree come to the U.S with long years of work experiences in their home countries and thus bring with them a rich array of social and cultural experiences.

Due to the rapidly changing demographics in higher education at North American institutions, many scholars and educators have researched the dilemmas and struggles in academic studies when exploring the academic literacy experiences of student groups coming from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds (e.g. immigrants or 1.5

---

\(^1\) The number of international students enrolled in the US colleges and universities was recently reported as 564,766 according to the Open Doors, 2006 annual report on international education published by the Institute of International Education (IIE). IIE reports that almost the half of this population came to the United States to pursue their graduate degree.
generation students, ESL students). In these studies, topics such as academic socialization, disciplinary enculturation, acquisition of academic literacies, and the development of writing identity and voice among multilingual students have been explored by a number of scholars (e.g. Belcher, 1994, 1995; Belcher & Braine, 1995; Braine, 1995; Casanave, 1995, 2002; Connor & Kramer, 1995; Connor & Mayberry, 1995; Currie, 1993, 1998; Harklau, 1994; Ivanic, 1998; Leki, 1995, 1999, 2003; Leki & Carson, 1993, 1997; Prior, 1991, 1995, 1998; Shi, 2004; Spack, 1997a, 2004; 1997; Sternglass 1997, 2003; Zamel, 1993, 1995; Zamel & Spack, 1998; Zhu, 2001). Some of the overarching findings of these studies suggest that academic literacy socialization is a complex and lengthy process; academic practices are embedded in larger frameworks of social and institutional practices; and academic writing is not simply a cognitive or linguistic issue, but also a social and political one. The concepts of identity, practice, interaction, enculturation, socialization and texts (written, oral, electronic) are seen to be intertwined and lie at the heart of investigations of second language literacy learning and use in academic communities. These studies also suggest that academic communities in U.S. institutions are not homogeneous and static, leading scholars and teachers to reconceptualize the notion of second language (L2) academic literacy education while addressing the needs and expectations of a diverse student population.

Although there has been mounting research on the literacy practices of ESL students and 1.5 generation students (e.g. Harlaku, 2000; Roberge, 2002), relatively little is known about multilingual students who come to the U.S. to pursue graduate work, and more specifically to pursue a doctoral education. Yet doctoral education is a crucial network space for constructing knowledge and building and displaying expertise. In this
level of higher education, students are expected to engage intensely in the production of linguistically and intellectually sophisticated texts utilizing various speaking and writing “rhetorical moves” (Swales, 1990). Furthermore, students at the doctoral level are expected to be active participants in the academic communities within their disciplinary fields. Acculturating into the academic world at the doctoral student level becomes more complex when it involves students whose home language and culture are different than that of the mainstream within the university. Therefore, given the large number of foreign students in North American institutions, it is worthwhile to investigate how multilingual and multiliterate nonnative English speaking (NNES) students acquire, and socialize into, Western academic literacy practices and construct their own textual worlds on the way to becoming scholars in their chosen disciplinary realms.

More recently, several researchers in first and second language literacy education have begun to explore how, in the context of higher education, ‘novices’ or ‘newcomers’ acquire new sets of textual practices and socialize into their discourse communities (Belcher, 1994; Canagarajah, 2002; Casanave, 1995, 2002; Hirvela & Belcher 2001; Ivanic, 1998; Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Lea & Street, 1999; Prior 1995). These studies are valuable in the sense that they shed light on the types of literacy practices multilingual students need to adopt or the kinds of social processes they tend to experience during their academic socialization period. However, despite the highly interactive and collaborative nature of doctoral education in the US (i.e., writing papers, working on group projects, making presentations inside and outside the classroom, engaging in academic conversations and discussions), little research has been conducted regarding how multilingual doctoral students collectively socialize into academic communities as
they move through their doctoral experiences. Although it is assumed that such
collaboration takes place among them, the collaborative nature of their dialogs, the social
interaction within students’ peer groups and their impact on academic literacy
socialization has not been further researched.

Another important gap that needs to be addressed is the nature of first year
doctoral students’ academic socialization, particularly in the realm of literacy.
Investigating the academic literacy socialization of first year doctoral students is an
important enterprise, as the attrition rate during the first year of study is almost a third of
all doctoral student attrition (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992, Golde, 1998, 2000). This
statistical information is especially important when we consider the international students
studying in the U.S. graduate schools. In this context, the challenges that multilingual
students experience in their first year compared to the succeeding years of study could be
even greater, as they may lack certain cultural and linguistic capital that is necessary to
successfully function not only in their disciplines, but also the larger communities outside
of graduate school. Many doctoral students have indicated that their first year is the most
challenging and stressful year (Golde, 2000), but there is a lack of research on what
happens during that crucial first year. Therefore, this study aimed to examine several
multilingual students’ first year experiences in order to identify and better understand the
types of academic literacy socialization processes that occur both inside and outside
doctoral classrooms and how they impact on students’ enculturation into doctoral
education.
Significance of the Study

This study contributes to what is known about multilingual doctoral students’ socialization into academic disciples in three different ways. First of all, relatively little is known about the processes doctoral students engage in their first year as they seek to unravel what is expected from them as doctoral students. As explained earlier, this population has unique characteristics. Given the increasing number of doctoral students in the U.S., classrooms are becoming increasingly diverse. Therefore, there is a particular need to conduct longitudinal empirical studies exploring multilingual doctoral students’ academic socialization, focusing on the various processes they go through inside and outside the classroom.

A second area of significance of this study lies in its methodology. Earlier studies conducted on graduate students’ socialization were restricted to more conventional methodologies, such as surveys, interviews, and case studies. By adopting an ethnographic approach to inquiry, this study provides a thick description of doctoral students’ academic socialization processes both inside and outside the classroom. Drawing from the fields of sociolinguistic ethnography (e.g. Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, Shuart-Faris, 2005; Gee, 1996; Gumperz, 1993, 2001; Hymes, 1974) and the New Literacy Studies (e.g. Barton & Hamilton, 1994, 1998; Bloome et al, 2005; Gee, 1996, 2000; Street,1995), this dissertation brings an ethnographic and historical perspective to academic socialization. Using multiple ethnographic methods to gather and analyze data, this study sought to explore the micro interactions among students. These interactions have not been the focus of previous research, despite the window they provide into students’ socialization experiences. The rationale behind looking at such a micro level of
analysis is that “while the individual is the locus of learning, this learning does not take place in isolation” (Erickson, 1982, p. 150). Analyses of interaction make this possible. Similarly, the microethnographic analysis of doctoral students’ classroom interaction conducted in this study offers insight into the larger macroanalytical issues regarding second language academic literacy.

A number of researchers have explored the academic literacies of international undergraduate and graduate students in a wide range of disciplines by focusing on both the oral (i.e. presentations) and written literacy (e.g. academic papers) discourse socialization/acquisition of these students (e.g. Belcher, 1994, 1995; Belcher & Braine, 1995; Braine, 1995; Casanave, 1995, 2002; Connor & Kramer, 1995; Connor & Mayberry, 1995; Currie, 1993, 1998; Harklau, 1994; Ivanic, 1998; Leki, 1991, 1995, 2003; Leki & Carson, 1994, 1997; Prior, 1995, 1998; Shi, 2004; Spack, 1997, 2004; 1997; Zamel, 1993, 1995; Zamel & Spack, 1998; Sternglass 1997,2003 ; Zhu, 2001). These studies have been very useful in terms of illuminating the kinds of literacy struggles that the students experience and explicating the full range of social and cultural contexts influencing L2 academic literacies (predominantly L2 writing).

Most of these studies have looked at the linguistic, social and cultural struggles students face while socializing into the academic context and have identified, in particular, the kinds of literacy practices they adopt and the types of strategies they employ to produce an acceptable academic product. Adding to the findings of earlier studies on L2 academic literacies, this study focused on the processes and the kinds of intertextual links students engage both inside and outside of the classroom settings while interacting with one another. Looking at academic literacy socialization processes and
intertextual links students attempt to establish in this way can assist educators in helping students learn about academic conventions and the kinds of learning contexts they can create for students at different levels of education.

In summary, invoking an interdisciplinary framework as well as expanding the borders of research on second language literacy in general, this study contributes to the recently growing body of research on second language academic socialization.

Research Questions

The central research question I explored in this study is: What are some of the academic literacy socialization processes that multilingual students undergo as first year doctoral students?

More specifically, this study aimed to answer the following more narrowly focused research questions:

➢ What kinds of language practices do doctoral students display in their initial encounters with doctoral courses?

➢ What types of intertextual links and semiotic meanings do multilingual doctoral students collectively establish to make meaning from academic texts?

➢ How does social interaction (spoken, written and online) among doctoral students mediate students’ construction of academic writing and help them negotiate academic literacies?

Addressing these questions involved close sociolinguistic analysis that shed light on the literacy practices that these doctoral students engaged. Embedded in these questions was a less explored area of academic literacy socialization addressed by this
study: What goes on inside and outside of classrooms as multilingual students socialize into academic discourse?

By considering classrooms as social events where students use language not only to reflect realities but also to construct realities, academic socialization can be seen as a byproduct of students’ communicative interactions within classrooms (Bloome & Theodorou, 1988; Cazden, 1988; Hymes, 1974;). The belief guiding this study was that the complex socialization processes experienced by multilingual students could be explored within the framework of how they “act and react” (Erickson & Shultz, 1977) during communicative social interactions in the classrooms. Echoing Puro & Bloome (1987), this approach focuses on the “series of norms and standards for what counts as knowledge, what intellectual procedures are appropriate for solving problems, and what social configurations are appropriate for engaging learning process and the display of academic competence” (Puro & Bloome, 1987, p.28).

Definitions of Key Terms

Several terms were especially important in conducting this study. These are defined below.

1. Discourse: In this study, discourse was operationalized as stemming from a combination of various approaches, including Gee (1990) where he portrays discourse as an “identity kit” which instructs people in “how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular social role that others might recognize” (p.142). In another sociolinguistic perspective, discourse is defined as “social practices associated with a particular set of values, social believes and power relations” (Ivanic, 1998, p. 18). Employing a sociolinguistic point of view, this study also views academic discourse as a set of values
and beliefs that occur in academic discourse (i.e., L2 academic writing) that the participants of this study encountered in their first year of doctoral education.

2. Intertextuality: In its simplest definition, intertextuality means the juxtaposition of texts. According to the Bakhtinian understanding of language and dialogue, our utterances are responses to previous or anticipated future utterances. That is, they exist in relation to other voices and other texts. However, these intertextual relations “are not simply given in the text itself, but rather are constructed by people in interaction with each other” (Bloome & Clark, 2006, p. 229). Intertextuality is also defined as a process of “a potential for making meaning located in language itself” (Bloome & Egar-Robertson, 1999). Following these views, in the context of this study, intertextuality is perceived as location of knowledge that is recognized and shared by the participants of this study.

3. Academic literacy: Academic literacy, in this study, is perceived as multiple and situated (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996, 2000). The term is also used in its plural form (i.e. academic literacies) by researchers who conceptualize academic literacy as including a wide range of communicative practices (Lea & Street, 2000). In this study, the term academic literacy is seen as an important component of the process of academic socialization that involves more than the acquisition of an independently existing set of skills related to reading and writing. Academic literacy, in this study, also includes the social interactions where academic reading and writing became an important topic of discussion.

4. Academic socialization: Building on Lea and Street’s (1999) academic literacies model cited above, academic socialization, in this study, was operationalized as students’ negotiation of different literacy practices and as construction of new meanings and social
identities. Learning of academic literacy practices in this study is seen as an important part of academic socialization. Thus, in this study the term academic socialization is interchangeably used with academic literacy socialization to indicate students’ evolving literacy practices. Academic literacy socialization in this study will be discussed as it occurs in multiple spaces.

5. Literacy Practices: In this study, the notion of literacy practices refers to what people do with literacy. They include “general ways of utilizing written language which people draw upon in their lives” (Barton & Hamilton, 1998, p.5). Students in this study were involved in a wide range of literacy practices such as collective writing experience, academic classroom presentations and writing academic papers.

6. Literacy Events: Drawing from Heath (1983), literacy events are everyday activities that include spoken or written text. In this study, I borrow from Heath (1982)’s definition of literacy event as “any occasion in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of the participants’ interactions and their interpretive processes” (p.3). Similar to the ideas developed by sociolinguists, literacy events, in this study, are also perceived as a “social event of verbal interaction rather than formal linguistic properties of texts in isolation” (Barton & Hamilton, 1998, p.9). As will be described in detail later in the dissertation, literacy events in this study took place in various spaces.

7. Communities of Practice: Drawing from social accounts of learning, the idea behind the notion of communities of practice is that learning is a process of social participation where members of a group engage in similar sets of practices. In this framework, meaning exists in the process of negotiation, and negotiation includes participation in communities of practice (Wenger, 1998). This study acknowledges the theoretical
underpinnings about learning being associated with participation, yet the critiques toward communities of practice are also considered in this study\(^2\). In this study, multiple communities of practice are experienced and negotiated among the first year doctoral students due to the students’ interactions within and across different communities in their first year. Examples of this will be seen in the analysis chapter.

8. **Discourse Communities:** In this study, discourse community is defined as a group of people held together by their common characteristics of talking, believing, acting, interpreting, and using the written language (Swales, 1990). The doctoral students in this study were members of several overlapping and shifting discourse communities. While the students seemed to identity themselves with international student communities, at times, they also detached themselves from these communities.

9. **Nonnative English Speaking Students (NNES) /International students/Multilingual Students:** Although numerous terms have been used to refer to students whose first language and culture is other than English, in this study I used the term “multilingual” to capture the belief that students’ literacy abilities in languages other than the target language (in this case, English) are an important part of their identities as novice researchers and writers. The participants in this study were already fluent writers in their native language, at least, when they began their doctoral education, and that fact was important to bear in mind while exploring their encounters with academic English. These terms are used interchangeably in later chapters when referring to students whose

\(^2\) Communities of practice, as it is described by Wegner (1998), is criticized as the theory does not consider the role of language and other forms of semiotic systems within a social interaction. The use of language is at the center of this study, thus the Communities of Practice framework that I invoke in this study includes the expanded definition that is described in Barton & Tustig (2005) which considers the language processes and power relationships as important aspects of the communities of practices.
native language is not English and who are multiliterate and fluent in more than one language.

10. **Interaction:** Given the focus on the spoken text, interaction is a significant concept in this study. By interaction, I mean the verbal or nonverbal exchanges between the participants of this study. These include spoken, written, and electronic communication among the students. The students used language and interaction to construct spaces, and to build relationships and social positions in their immediate academic communities.

11. ** Appropriation:** Appropriation is a key concept for this study, and there appeared different kinds of appropriations in students’ first year experience. Through the acts of appropriation, the participants of this study changed the literacy practices and concepts they were learning in their first year of doctoral study. As will be described in more detail later in the dissertation, while moving into a new community and learning how to perform doctoral lessons or how to be a doctoral student, the students were appropriating certain practices and concepts to fit their own ideas and beliefs.

12. **ESL:** English as a second language

**Theoretical Assumptions**

Below is a list of the theoretical and methodological assumptions that guided this study.

1. Meaning is multiple and contested through particular genres and discourses in higher education.

2. People act and react each to each other in social interactions.

3. Classrooms are social environments where students negotiate meaning.
4. Literacies are multiple and situated, and include a wide range of modes of meanings and communication.

5. Second language academic literacy socialization is a complex, slow-paced and multilayered process.

6. Academic literacies are contextual, multiple, situated and ideological.

7. Language constitutes an integral part of socialization practices.

**Outline of the Dissertation**

This dissertation consists of 6 chapters. The chapter following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2, explores the theoretical underpinnings that guided the investigation concerning the academic literacy socialization of multilingual doctoral students. The primary theoretical frameworks that I draw on in this chapter are: academic socialization, academic literacies, language socialization, and microethnographic analysis of classroom events. Chapter 2 also reviews other studies of academic socialization and the use of academic literacies. Chapter 3 presents the methodological framework of this study. As the primary methodology used to investigate academic socialization is microethnographic research, special attention is given to explaining the main underpinnings of micro analysis. Utilizing various charts and figures to depict the study’s ethnographic data collection procedures, Chapter 3 also provides a detailed discussion of the study’s data analysis methods, research design, and issues revolving around ethical concerns in qualitative research.

Chapter 4 explicates the study’s contextual background. This chapter includes descriptions of the participants and features some of their narratives about the doctoral program and the type of difficulties they experienced in their first year. This chapter also
describes the environments in which the students interacted as they were experiencing academic socialization.

Chapter 5, which is the findings chapter, features micro-analyses of students’ classroom and peer group interactions while addressing the study’s research questions. Through the analysis of representative samples of classroom dialogues, and some interview accounts, this chapter presents the central findings of the year long ethnographic research on the academic literacy socialization of multilingual doctoral students.

Finally, Chapter 6 presents a recapitulation of key findings, accompanied by a focus on their theoretical and methodological contributions to the field of second language literacy and to our understanding of academic literacy socialization, in particular. This discussion chapter concludes with suggestions for future research as well as some concluding remarks regarding academic literacy socialization.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Given the increasing number of international students in North American institutions of higher learning, there is now a growing body of research that investigates the academic literacies and academic discourse socialization experiences of these students. These researchers are taking into consideration the cultural and linguistic hybridity this diverse student population brings to their encounters with academic literacy in English (e.g. Duff, 2003, Casanave, 2002; Connor, 2004,2005; Kope &Kalantzis, 2000; Kubota, 2004), leading to the widely-held notion of these students as multilingual writers and readers. In these studies of the academic socialization and academic literacies of second language speakers and multilingual writers, researchers have dealt with a wide range of issues, such as the rhetorical and linguistic ‘move’ structures that adult L2 learners need to acquire in academic writing in English (e.g. Brett, 1994; Swales, 1990), the voice and identity issues they face (e.g. Hirvela and Belcher, 2001; Ivanic & Camps 2001), the critical relationships that exist between students’ vernacular communities and the academic communities they seek to enter (e.g. Belcher, 1999; Canagarajah, 2002), and the academic discourse socialization processes and experiences of these L2 learners, with a focus on their oral discourse (e.g. Duff, 2003; Kobayashi, 2003; Morita, 2002; Seloni, 2008; Zappa-Hollman, 2007) and a more recent focus on written discourse.
(e.g., Belcher, 1995; Casanave, 1995, 2002; Prior, 1992; Spack, 1997; Zamel, 1998, 2000). Some of the overarching concerns of these studies are: How do newcomers learn conventions and rules of the new academic discourse? What are the informal and formal processes that facilitate these students’ academic socialization and learning of academic literacies? Or how do these students become legitimate participants of academic communities of practice? These are some of the questions that the second language literacy scholars have typically explored in order to shed light on a wide range of processes that these multilingual students undergo to succeed academically and socially in the new academic communities they enter.

This chapter will describe the findings of these studies on second language socialization, academic literacies, and academic socialization. The theoretical background provided in this chapter is embedded in how this study’s research questions were shaped and how the findings of this study will be presented in later chapters. In what follows, I will first provide an overview of previous research and the theoretical foundations of second language socialization, which collectively serve as a theoretical framework that is frequently used to generate a deeper understanding of the academic socialization and academic literacies of multilingual writers and speakers. Next, I will describe theories and research on second language academic literacies specifically focusing on the university setting, since that was the setting in which this study took place. In that section, I will include research conducted both in U.S. and non-U.S. contexts that examines the academic discourse socialization (both oral and written) of different student populations. Finally, I will present studies conducted specifically on doctoral students’
second language academic literacy development and academic socialization, since this study focused on such students.

**Research and Theory on Second Language Socialization and Academic Socialization**

Second language (L2) socialization research shares similar principles and underpinnings as first language socialization studies, which have been influenced by fields such as linguistic anthropology (e.g., Hymes, 1977; Heath, 1993; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Watson-Greco, 2004), cultural psychology (e.g., Rogoff, 1990), sociolinguistic ethnography (e.g., Gee, 1996, 1999; Gumperz, 1981, 2001) and sociocultural theories (e.g., Vygotsky, 1978). The language socialization framework, which was originally developed by linguistic anthropologists Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin (1986) with their ground-breaking study in Western Samoa, deals with people interacting in their social contexts. In their seminal study, Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) studied the everyday oral language routines of adults and children, including praising, shaming, teasing and greeting. In this framework, the locus of learning has been perceived, in their words, as “socialization through language and socialization to use language” (p.2), in which “children and other novices in society acquire tacit knowledge of principles of social order and systems of belief through exposure to and participation in language-mediated interaction” (p. 2-3). Although language socialization starts from the beginning of childhood, it is also viewed as a life-long process which involves “the process by which novices and newcomers in a community or culture gain communicative competence, membership, and legitimacy in the group” (Duff, 2007, p. 37).

Researchers inspired by the language socialization framework have looked at literacy socialization in a wide range of settings. For instance, Heath’s (1987) influential
study, *Ways with Words*, examined children’s use of language and narrative at home and in school. In this study, Heath bridges the theories of language socialization with the field of literacy education and shows how the different patterns of interaction (oral and written) at home and in school can impact children’s literacy education, where children may need to “reformulate their home habits of handling knowledge and ways of talking about knowledge” (p.355). A number of other educationally oriented studies, like Heath’s, aimed to address possible cultural gaps between the discourse practices at home, in communities, and in school.

Although theories and research on language socialization have mostly dealt with children and adults who socialize into a specific context or community through the use of their first language, these theories about language and learning have also informed research on how second language users socialize into new contexts. Given the increasing size of the immigrant student population in the U.S., many second language researchers have turned their attention to the theories of language socialization, which aim to explain “how persons become competent members of social groups” (Schiefflin & Ochs, 1996a, p. 167). It was also around the same time, the 1980s and 90s, when the “social turn” began to take place in the second language field and researchers began to stress the imbalance between cognitive and social orientations to language learning (Firth & Wegner, 1997; Kasper, 1997; Hall, 1997; Lantof, 1996, 2000 among others) through the influence of language socialization, which has its roots in linguistic anthropology (e.g., Hymes, 1977) and sociocultural theories (e.g., Lantof, 1996, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978).
The cognitive view of second language learning was replaced by a sociocultural view of second language learning, which underscores that learners use language in naturally occurring settings to “use interactively, in a variety of contexts for myriad practical purposes” (Firth & Wegner, 1997, p. 297). In this view, language is not only perceived as a set of codes, but also as ways of speaking. Therefore, language learning is not composed of learning the structure of language by focusing only on its grammar, but learning a wide range of speech acts in multiple speech events (Hymes, 1977). As Hymes states, when a child learns his native language, he acquires “the knowledge of sentences, not only as grammatical, but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner” (cited in Johnson, 2004, p.87). This view of language occurring in a context, which is defined as “communicative competence,” has been a major influence on how the L2 field conceptualizes language learners and language learning. As the learners’ mental L2 knowledge is not available to investigate, researchers began to explore the actual utterances that learners produce both in writing and speaking. Hymes, for instance, studied the ability to participate appropriately in relevant speech events, an ability that requires more than grammatical knowledge. In this view, learners must also acquire knowledge of what the speakers of the target language expect, linguistically and culturally, within interactions. The linguistic anthropologists’ view of language coupled with educational ethnographers has led many second language scholars to turn their attention to ethnographic studies in which they examine L2 learners’ linguistic and cultural practices within naturally occurring social interactions (e.g., Lantof & Pavlenko, 2000; Pierce, 1995) within a language socialization framework.
Although first language and second language socialization share many
commonalities (e.g., Duff, 2003, Watson-Greco 2003, 2004), second language
socialization includes another complex layer of socialization, in that children and adults
already possess linguistic and cultural knowledge of their first language and successfully
function in various communities in which they are affiliated. The complexity appears
when second language speakers experience difficulty in gaining access and acceptance in
a second or target language setting. This results in second language speakers’ resisting or
opposing the target community’s values and belief systems and attempting to negotiate
their identities or vernacular literacy practices, which might lead to the newcomers not
being fully invested in socializing into the new community (e.g. Kanno, 2003; Kramsch,
2000; Norton & Toohey, 2001; Pavlenko & Lantof, 2000; Pierce, 1995). The studies
which have focused on the disjunction between the learners’ home language and culture
and that of the school setting have typically investigated the L2 students’ acculturation
into new oral and written discourses within various academic contexts and their
socialization into various contexts such as post-secondary programs and workplaces (e.g.,
Kanno, 2003; Norton & Toohey, 2001; Pierce, 1995).

Second language speakers’ socialization into the new English speaking
communities is successfully illustrated by Pavlenko & Lantof (2000). In this study,
Pavlenko & Lantof analyze first-person narratives of several immigrant authors with
Eastern European background. Following Sfard’s (1998) distinction between the
acquisition metaphor and the participation metaphor, the authors claim that the L2 field
has been dominated by the acquisition metaphor, which stresses the idea that language
learning entails only linguistic knowledge. Similar to Sfard’s acquisition metaphor, the
cognitive orientation of the field is usually associated with information processor metaphors separating individuals’ mind and their environment. The participation metaphor, on the other hand, views language learning as “a process of becoming a member of a certain community” (Sfrad, 1998, cited in Pavlenko & Lantof, 2000, p.155). The narratives of bilingual adults examined in this study illustrate the importance of the active participation of bilingual adults in their target community and their day-to-day challenges and internal conflicts in the process of moving into a new set of discursive practices. Pavlenko & Lantof (2000) explain this process in separate phases. The first phase is the phase of loss, which is segmented into five stages: 1) loss of one’s linguistic identity; 2) loss of all subjectivities, 3) loss of the frame of reference and the link between the signer and the signified, 4) loss of the inner voice, and 5) first language attrition. The second phase is called the phase of recovery and includes 1) appropriating of others’ voices; 2) emergence of one’s new voice, often in writing first, 3) translation therapy, resulting in the reconstruction of one’s past; and 4) continuous growth ‘into’ new positions and subjectivities (Pavlenko & Lantof, 2000). The East European participants in Pavelenko & Lantof’s study explain how they experienced losing their voice in their native language, and then gaining a new voice in English through participation in the discursive practices of the target language community. The inner conflicts depicted in their narratives are explained as resembling the inner speech mentioned in Vygotsky’s work and private dialog in Bakthin’s work. For both perspectives, as the authors put, “inner speech functions to organize and makes sense of a person’s experiences of the world” (p.165).
Studies on second language socialization have also examined various student populations (i.e., elementary, secondary, post-secondary) socialization in a wide range of settings (i.e., U.S, Canada). The studies could also be identified as studies of academic socialization. While some of these studies focused on code-switching in bilingual and multilingual contexts in the U.S. (e.g., Schecter & Bayley, 1997), others focused on the communication difficulties of immigrants in elementary, secondary and post-secondary classrooms in the American and Canadian contexts (Duff, 2002; Harklau, 2003; Kobayashi, 2003; Norton, 1995, 1997, 2000; Norton & Toohey, 2001; Morita, 2000, 2004; Toohey, 1998). This line of research has illustrated the importance of oral discourse, scaffolding and peer feedback in academic discourse and the type of writing strategies second language speakers employ while operating in a new system.

To explain the socialization processes of diverse student populations, scholars have also drawn from the notion of Communities of Practice (Lave and Wenger, 1990), in which learning is viewed as a situated activity. In an attempt to offer a detailed analysis of the social theory of learning, Wenger (1998) emphasizes the idea that learning as participation in the social world “takes place though our engagement in actions and interactions, but it embeds this engagement in culture and history” (p.13). Wenger (1998) views the social theory of learning as branching in four directions. According to his argument, social theory is located at the intersections of the theories of practice, theories of social structure, theories of identity, and theories of situated experience. The social theory of learning basically argues that learning “involves the whole person” (Lave and Wenger, 1991). It involves not only the relationship of individuals with specific activities, but also interpersonal relationships where people are engaged in different
activities and gain new understandings in the process of becoming full members of a social community. In this view, the concepts of “identity, knowing and social membership entail one another” (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p.53), and participation is defined as an important action that will lead to identity construction. As Wenger (1998) argues, individuals’ relation to communities of practice involves both participation and non-participation, and their identities are shaped by the combination of both. From the framework of Communities of Practice, competence and identity are seen as situated and constructed through participation. This socially oriented view of learning is primarily concerned with learners’ interacting and socializing with each other and participating in multiple communities of practice.

Although the theory of Communities of Practice has been adopted by several first and second language scholars to analyze the academic socialization of newcomers, its shortcomings have also been identified through attempts to apply the framework to multilingual students’ socialization experiences (e.g. Gee, 2005; Haneda, 2006; Morita, 2004). Many scholars point out that newcomers’ participation in new communities is not a seamless process and that the concept of Communities of Practice is “slippery and elusive” (Barton & Turstig, 2005). As shown in Morita’s case study of six Japanese graduate students studying in a Canadian university, the students’ participation in the classroom discourse did not depend only on their active involvement, but was also heavily influenced by how they were positioned by their classmates and course instructors. Grounded on Lave and Wenger’s Communities of Practice theoretical

3 The Communities of Practice framework has been critiqued by several scholars as the framework has not been capturing the conflicting participation stories of diverse populations.
framework, Morita’s study focused on how international graduate students negotiate participation, identity and membership in their classrooms. Employing a multiple case study approach, Morita interviewed six female first-year Japanese students in three different academic departments. Morita’s analysis of the classroom discourse of those six Japanese students suggests that the students were struggling to be recognized as legitimate members of their classroom community while negotiating discourses, competence, identities and power relations. According to Morita (2004), these negotiations varied according to individual students’ sociocultural backgrounds, histories and goals. One common identity that emerged from Morita’s participants’ comments was that of being less competent than the other students in the class. Students constructed these “incompetent” selves based on their struggles in not fully understanding the classroom readings, or not actively contributing to class discussions. Some of the main reasons for their nonparticipation and silence in their classes derived from the learners’ belief that their English was not good enough to express their ideas and their knowledge of North American popular culture. Morita asserted that their silence meant different things in different courses. When the students struggled to participate, it was at least in part because they had developed the identity of being less competent member of their classroom communities. Behind their silence, there were not only issues related to language but also power relations, classroom pedagogy, culture and identity. While some instructors associated them with certain identities, which were difficult to overcome since they were imposed by the instructors as the recognized experts of the new communities, other instructors assisted them in taking on an empowered role in the classroom. Morita’s study demonstrates that the construction of learners’ agency is not a “peaceful,
collaborative process, but is often a struggle involving a web or power relations and competing agendas” (p.597). Morita’s study is especially important and urgent, as there are few studies conducted on classroom participation and interaction of non-Anglo students at the graduate level. Studies such as Morita’s assert that it is not only the newcomers’ responsibility to gain access the community’s practices; instructors should also question what sort of roles and status are given to students in their classrooms. Moreover, Morita notes that in an academic context, native speaking students and teachers are not the dominant group or the norm; in fact, they are also peripheral participants who need to be socialized into international student communities (Morita, 2004). This is a significant insight within the framework of this dissertation, as the participants of this study interacted with a wide range of members of academic discourse communities who were also in the process of socialization into their communities, which included language practices that were new to even native English speaking students.

Another study which drew on the Communities of Practice and language socialization framework is the one that Toohey (1998) conducted in an elementary school ESL classroom. Although conducted at a different level of education than Morita’s, this study also carries considerable commonality with the graduate level socialization study that Morita (2004) conducted. Toohey (1998), in her longitudinal ethnographic study, followed and observed a group of ESL students from kindergarten to Grade 2. In her study, she closely investigated some common classroom practices, such as children’s seating arrangements, their borrowing and lending practices, and their oral and written copying from each other. The teacher of the class from kindergarten through grade 2 made the seating arrangements in such a way that children from the same L1 background
were not seated next to each other; children who needed more attention were seated close
to the teacher’s desk; some Anglophone children were seated beside or among the ESL
children, while other Anglophone children, who were believed to have no difficulties in
class, were seated at the back. With this seating arrangement, the teacher aimed to restrict
the children’s extraneous speech and to control classroom behaviors more easily. Another
aspect Toohey looked at included the sharing of classroom materials. Borrowing and
lending practices among the students in the class reflected the social relations existing
among the children. Although the teacher constantly reminded the children to use their
own materials, borrowing and lending practices prevailed as a reflection of social
interaction between the children. Likewise, the teacher discouraged children from
copying each other’s work or orally repeating each other’s answers. They were
encouraged to use their own words and ideas. Also, some ESL students’ social interaction
with their peers was curtailed since they were seated close to the teachers’ desk. As
Toohey asserts, these classroom practices contributed to students’ understanding of
individuality, which led to a process of stratification in the classroom community.

Another study that illustrates second language socialization from the
Communities of Practice framework was conducted by Norton (2001), who examined
two immigrant language learners (Katarina and Felicia) in Canada whose subjectivity led
them to nonparticipation in their university level ESL classes. Norton looked at these
two immigrants’ affiliation with learning by exploring their *imagined communities* which
in turn affected their learning trajectories and explained their acts of resistance in the new
community. Norton’s work was inspired by Wegner (1998), who refers to three modes of
belonging in communities: engagement, imagination and alignment. The second mode of
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Wegner’s hypothesis, which is imagination, is central to Norton’s understanding of Katerina’s and Felicia’s nonparticipation. Inspired by Benedict Anderson’s notion of “imagined community,” Wegner (1998) uses the concept of imagination to refer to “a process of expanding our self by transcending our time and space and creating new images of the world and ourselves” (p.176). In this understanding of imagination, individuals generate realities, shared understandings, and identities through directly or indirectly relating themselves to like-minded people and extrapolating from their experiences. The assumption is that it is through a process of imaging realities and identities that people hope to eventually belong to the community in which they are participating.

Building on the notion of imagination, Norton’s (2000) study describes two immigrant adult language learners who resisted participation in their ESL class. One of the participants of this study, Katrina, seemed to be influenced by her teachers’ comment that her English was not good enough to attend a computer class. Feeling insulted, Katerina dropped out of the program. On the other hand, Felicia, the second participant of this study also did not participate much in the classroom discussions and eventually dropped out of the class. Felicia later explained that her dropping out was influenced by her teachers’ failure to mention her native country, Peru, while she was presenting the native country of each ESL student in the class. Although Norton states that at first the students’ reactions seemed extreme, when one considers these adults’ imagined communities, their reactions became an important unit of analysis. Before they came to Canada, both Katerina and Felicia belonged to respected professional communities. They both wished to retain the same level of recognition from the members of their imagined
community (their class) in Canada. However, their teacher, who both Katerina and Felica perceived as an old-timer in their imagined community, did not validate these students’ identities as professionals. As a result, in Norton’s analysis the students’ nonparticipation in the ESL class “resulted from a disjuncture between their imagined community and the teachers’ educational vision” (p.243). Another important point that Norton argues is that different learners have different imagined communities, and they are best understood if teachers consider each learner’s unique investment in the target language. Investment is a notion that Norton also mentions elsewhere to refer to the “socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and practice” (Norton, 1997, p.411). Both Katrina and Felicia passionately invested in the target language and both believed that they were legitimate members of their imagined communities. Finally, through their diverse encounters with old timers, they understood that they were not perceived as legitimate members of their imagined communities. Having resisted being perceived as newcomers or ‘immigrants’, they withdrew from their ESL classroom.

In summary, second language socialization studies drawing from the framework of language socialization have focused on diverse students’ participation in various academic communities. The overarching finding of these studies is that although these students seemingly had access to the target community’s discourses, they had difficulty in socializing due to various issues such as lack of involvement in the target community’s culture or the disjunction between students’ vernacular cultures and school culture, which eventually influenced their school achievement. It is also important to note that although the literature review presented in this section specifically focused on immigrants’
socialization into academic communities, researchers also focused on various bilingual and multilingual immigrants’ socialization in various communities in the US and non-US contexts. Bayley & Schecter (2003) offer a useful summary of studies reporting on a wide range of learning contexts and age groups.

Research on second language socialization into academic discourse, which has its roots in language socialization studies and Communities of Practice, also coincides with research on second language academic literacies, which is the focus of the second part of this literature review. Foregrounding linguistic, cultural and social interactions in a wide range of contexts, research on second language socialization mostly documents how immigrants or international students who temporarily come to North America to pursue further education shuttle between different language codes and cultural meanings. The above-mentioned studies analyzed the hybrid identities and social practices that L2 communities reproduce as a result of negotiating their own and the target community’s values and practices. Likewise, the present study illustrates the types of negotiations and socialization processes that multilingual doctoral students undergo inside and outside the classroom context.

While this dissertation research draws from second language socialization and Communities of Practice framework as components of its theoretical framework, it also combines the theories and research conducted on first and second language academic literacies. The participants of this study also went through a complex set of socialization processes which included a wide range of literacy practices that they needed to learn to become legitimate participants of their academic communities. The theories of Communities of Practice and language socialization provided valuable insight into the
microethnographic analysis conducted to understand students’ academic literacy socialization. The next section will present a social view of literacy, particularly focusing on different uses of literacy, and the type of work done in both L1 and L2 literacy fields through the use of ethnography and other anthropological oriented methodologies.

**Research and Theory from a Social View of Literacies**

Another line of research that I used as a theoretical lens to understand the academic literacy socialization of multilingual doctoral students is the notion of academic literacies as *situated* and *multiple* (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Barton et. al, 2000; Hull & Schultz, 2000; Street, 1984, 1995, 1998; Lea & Street, 1999, 2000), which are some of the major underpinnings of the approach called the New Literacy Studies. In the L1 literacy field, Street (1984, 1993, 1995), one of the leading scholars of the New Literacy Studies, defines two models of literacy: the “autonomous and the “ideological”. While the autonomous model of literacy conceptualizes literacy as a set of isolated skills, independent of social context (product oriented), the ideological model of literacy portrays literacy as a set of culturally and politically involved practices, in which literacy activities must be seen within the larger context in which they occur (process oriented). More specifically, in the ideological model, literacy is perceived as “inextricably linked to cultural and power structures in society” and recognizes “the variety of cultural practices associated with reading and writing in different contexts” (Street, 1993, p.7). Adopting an ethnographic perspective to literacy, Street (1984) analyzes various literacy practices. In his view, the concept of literacy practices involves not only individual’s knowledge of reading and writing, but also “behavior and conceptualizations related to the use of reading and writing” (p.12). In his seminal work on Iranian villagers’ reading
and writing practices, Street (1984) reveals the ideological aspect of literacy practices. His ethnographic work on Iranian villagers’ literacy activities in Koranic schools raises many thought-provoking questions, such as what counts as literacy and illiteracy in different educational and non-educational contexts. The series of investigations Street conducted in various places around the globe showed that there is a dominant discourse in the mainstream schooling about what literacy is and how it is used. This mainstream understanding of literacy does not always recognize various local literacy practices performed by local people. The local people in Street’s research used reading and writing in various contexts, but not in the way teachers valued literacy,

A similar observation was made by Heath in her influential book *Ways with Words* (1983) when she investigated a wide range of literacies at home and school communities in a U.S. context. Heath was the first scholar who defined literacy as a social event. Heath’s definition of literacy captures the multiple and situated nature of literacy. As she put it: “the concept of literacy covers a multiplicity of meanings, and definitions of literacy carry implicit but generally unrecognized views of its functions (what literacy can do for individuals) and its uses (what individuals can do with literacy)” (Heath, 1980, p.3). This view of literacy has also been supported by other important scholars such as Barton (1994) and Barton & Hamilton (1998), who have made major contributions to the development of the social view of literacies.

For instance, Barton’s ecological view of literacy underscores the strong connection between individuals and their social environment and the emphasis on “the social and mental embeddeness of human activities in a way which allows change”
Emphasizing literacy’s embeddedness in social life, Barton (1994) describes his ecological views on literacy as follows:

Instead of studying the separate skills which underlie reading and writing, it involves a shift to studying *literacy*, a set of social practices associated with particular symbol systems and their related technologies. To be literate is to be active; it is to be confident within these practices (p. 32).

This ecology metaphor of literacy contributes to the current understanding of the social view of literacy. Building on Street’s and Heath’s social view of literacy, Barton and Hamilton (2000) define literacy practices as “the link between the activities of reading and writing and the social structures in which they are embedded and which they help shape” (Barton & Hamilton, 2000 p. 7), and literacy events as “activities where literacy has a role” (p.8) and is used as a “part of a range of semiotic systems” (p. 9). In this social view of literacy, literacy is situated in broader social processes and perceived as part of everyday life (Barton et al., 2000). More specifically, literacies of everyday life are “positioned in relation to the social institutions and power relations which sustain them” (Barton et. al 2000, p.1). Building on this view, the word literacy has been used in its plural form by many scholars, as it applies to a wide range of knowledge and competencies, such as computer literacy, visual literacy, political literacy, cultural literacy and academic literacy. This broader social understanding of literacy is extended to be used to mean “competent and knowledgeable in specialized areas” (Barton, 1994, p.19). In this multiple view of literacies, individual can possess and navigate in more than one type of literacy, so the plural term literacies is used rather than the singular term literacy to broaden the notion of an individual’s connections with literacy.
The research and theory on both L1 and L2 literacy has moved a long way from the view of literacy as a set of autonomous skills to acquire. Because the traditional view of literacy has not fully captured the multiple and conflicting literacy experiences of diverse student populations both in U.S. and non-U.S. contexts, many scholars have turned their attention to more ethnographic investigations focusing on the social, cultural and political processes that students from multiple linguistic and cultural backgrounds undergo.

*Academic literacies, academic socialization and study skills*

Lea & Street (2000) have identified three oft-cited models in higher education research: *study skills, academic socialization* and *academic literacies*. According to them, the study skills model coincides with the previously cited autonomous view of literacy that puts the emphasis on a set of writing skills and knowledge that exist apart from any specific context, while both the academic socialization and academic literacies models are perceived as embedded in deeper epistemological and institutional contexts. More specifically, the study skills approach emphasizes the mechanical aspect of language such as grammar and spelling and the importance of teaching such skills outside any particular context. This skill-based model, when applied to classroom pedagogy, encourages students to write by focusing on the technical aspects of writing. A key criticism of this model is that it has not addressed the needs and expectations of a diverse student population and the contexts they bring to learning how to read and write, leading some researchers to explore the view that the learning of academic writing is a process of academic socialization that involves more than the acquisition of an independently existing set of skills. In the academic socialization model, the focus is placed on the
negotiation of meaning and students’ enculturation into new discourses and discourse practices, so that literacy acquisition is viewed within the particular context in which it occurs. However, according to Lea & Street (2000), the academic socialization approach tends to treat the academy as a “homogenous culture whose norms and practices have simply be learnt to provide access to the whole institution” (p.35). Given the increasingly diverse students population in American higher education today, this model is thus deemed by some to be problematic and insufficient to address the diverse nature of students and academia itself. In their studies of academic literacies, Lea and Street (2000) found that students who enter the world of higher education often face conflicts and struggles while attempting to accommodate the various discourse needs of academic institutions and discourse communities. In their view, it is not only the English language learners or “non-traditional” students who have difficulties in acquiring the literacy skills of academia; rather, all students face difficulties when they enter university and begin to learn new sets of literacy practices. Thus, the academic literacies model, as Street (2005) emphasizes, “targets the institutions themselves and the professional development of tutors as well as the students’ ‘needs’ for academic support, and it stresses the need for unpacking and making explicit what is taking for granted in terms of literacy requirement”(p.6). In this way, it takes a broader view of students’ academic enculturation than does the academic socialization model. While academic socialization is more related to students’ assimilation into the school practices, academic literacies is related to taking up and adapting the literacy practices.

In this section, I have discussed the social view of literacy, particularly focusing on the research and theory produced under the umbrella of the ‘New Literacy Studies’. In
it, I have presented the major underpinnings of a social view of literacy: literacy as process, situated literacies and academic literacies, which serve important reference points for this dissertation. I built this study on the research conducted under the aegis of the New Literacy Studies and located it within the social view of literacy, as this approach is mainly concerned with diverse individuals and how they socialize into the mainstream communities through the use of literacy. The next section of this literature review will focus specifically on second language (L2) academic literacies. Given the increasing number of international students in North American schools, exploring the academic writing difficulties of international students has become an important area of research. Thus, the next section of this literature review will focus on research and theory concerning how L2 students at different levels of education become literate users of the disciplinary discourses of their chosen academic communities.

Second Language Academic Literacies

Along with the previously cited language socialization studies of immigrants, researchers have also explored the academic literacies of international undergraduate and graduate students in a wide range of disciplines, focusing on both the oral (i.e. presentations) and written literacy (e.g. academic papers) discourse socialization/acquisition of these students (e.g. Belcher, 1994, 1995; Belcher & Braine, 1995; Braine, 1995; Casanave, 1995, 2002; Connor & Kramer, 1995; Connor & Mayberry, 1995; Currie, 1993, 1998; Harklau, 1994; Ivanic, 1998; Leki, 1999, 2003; Leki & Carson, 1993, 1997; Prior, 1995, 1998; Shi, 2004; Spack, 1997, 2004; 1997; Sternglass 1997, 2003; Zamel, 1993, 1995; Zamel & Spack, 1998; Zhu, 2001). These studies on academic literacies have revealed that becoming literate within second or
target language academic communities is a complex and a slow-paced process involving a wide range of cognitive, linguistic, cultural and social struggles. Most of these studies agree that academic writing in a second language moves beyond what Street (1995) calls the “autonomous model of literacy” (i.e., literacy as a set of generic and decontextualized skills) and appears instead as a situated practice that is more than merely learning about certain rhetorical moves.

Most of the research in second language academic literacies has employed in-depth qualitative research methodologies, which have contributed significantly to our understanding of the academic literacy learning and socialization of Nonnative English Speaking (NNES) students in different disciplines. The methodologies used in these studies have included case studies and multiple case studies (e.g. Casanave, 1995, 2002; Leki, 2003; Spack, 1997, 2004; Zamel, 1995, 2004). For example, Spack’s (1997/2004) longitudinal case study of a NNES student’s academic development shed light on the cultural and linguistic factors that impacted her acquisition of L2 academic literacy. In this longitudinal study, Spack investigated a Japanese student’s (Yuko) academic literacy development over a period of three years. Spack’s study revealed that Yuko developed various reading strategies for different reading purposes by showing the evolving strategies she used over the course of three years. In terms of writing, Spack found that Yuko attributed her writing struggles to the influence of writing habits in her first language, Japanese, and the kind of education that she received in Japan. Yuko’s interview accounts illustrate that she “could not cross over comfortably to the American style of writing and thinking” (p.21), and she was struggling to be critical and independent in her thinking. This struggle of “crossing over” that Spack mentions
prevented Yuko from becoming a part of the classroom culture she entered. The following quote captures what Yuko faced while not only learning how to be literate in a second language but also learning how to be a legitimate participant within an academic classroom:

There is a big cultural difference between the U.S and Japan, in the way of communication: in Japan you don’t have to say everything you think or feel because certain things are “understood” or even “to be observed.” If you express your thoughts all the time, it could be seen as selfish or insistent. But then here in the States no thoughts or feelings exist unless you express them. Being reserved is not something respectable. And I had hard time making myself speak up, and sometimes I feel that I am being too superficial to say everything I feel or think. (p. 21)

In addition to the cultural differences in communication that she encountered, Yuko’s lack of background knowledge was revealed as another important barrier that affected her academic literacy development. Over time, Yuko overcame various fears that she harbored about reading and writing in her chosen disciplinary field.

Overall, this study adds richness to what we know about multilingual students’ literacy experiences. Spack’s study reminds us that academic literacy learning for NNES involves multiple layers of linguistic and cultural concerns and that academic writing in English is not readily available to newcomers like Yuko. This study also contributes to the contrastive rhetoric field, which explores similarities and differences across languages and cultures, as it also adds important insights to how cross-cultural differences in writing could be perceived in academic settings (e.g., Connor, 1996; Kaplan 1966). Related to the notion of culture and second language writing, Spack problematizes the traditional view of culture as “a set of rules and patterns shared by a given community” (Connor, 1996, p.101). Instead, she claims that students like Yuko need to be viewed “not as products of
culture but creators of culture” (p.102). The main point that Spack makes in this study is that rather than creating cultural dichotomies between English writing and students’ culture, it is important to move beyond them and see how students are accepting or resisting certain discourse practices.

With the respect to the last point about culture, second language scholars have long been investigating cross-cultural writing in various contexts and with various genres under the name of contrastive rhetoric, which is also known as Critical Contrastive Rhetoric (Kubota & Lehner, 2004) or Intercultural rhetoric (Connor, 2004, 2005). In a nutshell, contrastive rhetoric is a field of inquiry that “identifies problems in composition encountered by second language writers and, by referring to the rhetorical strategies of the first language, attempts to explain them” (Connor, 1996, p.5). In its early years of development, the research paradigms employed primarily focused on the decontextualized analysis of students’ L1 and L2 writing (e.g. Connor, 1987; Hinds, 1987; Kaplan, 1966, 1987). Such textual analysis looked at the linguistic features of students’ L1 and L2 texts such as cohesion, coherence, discourse organization, and distribution of responsibility in writing. Through examining the differences between students’ essays written in their native language and essays written in second language, teachers and researchers could identify the rhetorical variations and similarities in students’ essays as well as the absence of English rhetorical features. Pedagogically, Leki (1991) notes that contrastive rhetoric contributes to teachers’ deeper understanding of their students’ English essays. Moreover, when explained to students, contrastive rhetoric makes students aware of their native languages’ rhetorical conventions and how they might impact on learning how to write in their L2. Leki (1991) maintains that “students who are
having trouble writing in English and who are made aware of cultural differences in rhetoric, suddenly view themselves, not as suffering from individual inadequacies, but as coming from a particular rhetorical tradition” (p.138). Students’ knowledge of the rhetorical conventions of the target language will raise their awareness of what native speaking audiences expect from a text in that language. Referring to Fan Shen’s (1989) oft-cited article on a Chinese student’s identity struggles while writing in English, Leki (1991) argues that the awareness of differing rhetorical conventions between students’ first language and English will help students develop an English “self”, which could potentially help them become competent writers in English.

Although the field of contrastive rhetoric has long informed the teaching of L2 writing and the field of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in the university context, it has been criticized by many scholars who, like Spack’s study, have found that writing differences should not only be attributed to contrasting textual practices in different cultures, but also to students’ lack of training in L1 and L2 writing, educational background, or differences across the genres of writing they are accustomed to use in their first language and are learning in the second language (e.g. Atkinson, 2002, 2004; Block & Chi, 1995; Hinds, 1987; Kubota, 1992, 1997; Kubota & Lehner, 2004; Matsuda, 1997; Pennycook, 1996, 2000; Scollon, 1997, Spack, 1997, Tardy, 2006; Zamel, 1997). The overarching criticism that these scholars made was that generalizing about L2 writing according to students’ cultural groups leads to stereotyping and the danger of creating an ethnocentric approach to NNES students’ writing. Therefore, these researchers called for devoting more attention to the plurality and complexity of rhetorical conventions within one language as well as across different languages and
cultures. Pedagogically, as Canagarajah (2002b) asserts in his critique of classical contrastive rhetoric, “teachers must keep in mind that no one needs to be held hostage by language and culture; students can be taught to negotiate conflicting rhetorical structures to their advantage” (p.68). This pedagogical insight is replete in many studies on multilingual students’ academic literacy development.

For instance, another longitudinal study of second language academic literacies, similar to Spack’s longitudinal study, was conducted by Sternglass (1997), a strong advocate of educational access for students from diverse backgrounds. Sternglass (1997) researched a student from the Dominican Republic (Delores) who could not initially pass a standardized test, but was able to complete her undergraduate and graduate degrees in a North American university. In her longitudinal study, Sternglass makes the point that becoming proficient in English academic literacies is a long process involving various linguistic and sociocultural factors, particularly for L2 writers. Delores, at the end of her sixth year of academic study (undergraduate and graduate), felt much more confident not only in her writing abilities but also as an active professional in her field. Although the fact that Dolores was a second language user was still noticeable in her writing, she had improved as a writer and had become a better researcher in her discipline. She came to the realization that writing was a means of learning how to “help remember facts, to delve more deeply into ideas and theories from an analytical perspective so that she could apply these theories, and to develop new insights that led her to original research projects.” (p. 57).

Another longitudinal case study was conducted by Leki (2003) on a Chinese undergraduate nursing student’s (Yang) literacy development at an American university.
Leki, in this study, investigated the writing development of Yang over five semesters. Yang, who was knowledgeable and well-educated in the medical field in her home country, China, came to the U.S. to pursue a nursing major. Although she was exempted from the university’s ESL courses due to her high TOEFL score, she encountered various struggles while trying to communicate orally, which significantly interfered in her understanding of what she was told to do in her clinical work. In addition to these oral difficulties, Yang also faced various difficulties in her writing. While Yang was succeeding in writing traditional academic papers for English and History courses, she was struggling to write comprehensive Nursing Care Plans (NCP), which required her to describe the needed information succinctly, effectively and clearly while relying heavily on the vocabulary of her field. Yang perceived these assignments as very time consuming which, according to her, wasted valuable time and took her away from her actual learning of the medical material. In addition to the discipline specific writing difficulties, Yang’s limited social and cultural knowledge also negatively affected her academic literacy development. In summary, Leki’s longitudinal case study reveals the complexity of second language academic literacy experiences for a NNES student who was already knowledgeable and accomplished in her disciplinary field.

Along the same lines, Casanave (2002a) also raised some important questions about the complexity of academic literacy and emphasizes that academic writing is a sociopolitical process that includes “extralinguistic complexities of students’ lives” (p.33) and the sociopolitical contexts in which they perform their academic writing, just like we have seen with the experiences of multilingual students like Yuko, Yang, and Delores. One of the commonalities of these three longitudinal studies is that the students’
learning of academic literacies transcended the issues of grammar, mechanics and spelling (i.e., the autonomous model of literacy) and includes a painstaking process that involves the complexities of writing as a sociopolitical act. Another important insight arising from these three longitudinal studies is that second language academic literacies can best be understood when students’ academic literacy experiences are traced over a long period of time, which was one of the main objectives of this dissertation as well. Although the present study was not longitudinal, in that it did not focus on the changes students experienced, this study followed several adult students during a long period of time to gain a deeper sense of their academic literacy socialization.

**Second Language Academic Literacies at the Graduate Level**

Recently there has been an increasing interest in investigating the academic writing of multilingual graduate students. Multilingual students engaging academic discourse at the graduate level constitute a unique population, as they need to “adapt smoothly to the linguistic and social milieu of their host environment and to the culture of their academic departments and institutions” (Braine, 2002, p. 60) while they shuttle between their home language and culture and the standard academic language and culture they are expected to use as graduate students. The research on graduate students’ educational and disciplinary academic socialization has explored such issues as acquisition of genre (e.g., Belcher & Hirvela, 2005; Swales, 1990; Tardy 2006, Ventola & Mauranen, 1991), voice and identity in L2 writing (e.g., Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Ivanić, 1998; Ivanić & Camps, 2001), and interactions with experts and mentors (e.g., Belcher, 1994; Casanave, 1995; Connor & Mayberry, 1996; Hirvela & Li, 2008; Leki, 1995; Li & Flowerdew, 2008; Prior, 1998; Schneider & Fujishima, 1995).
Several of these studies have emphasized the importance of interaction between peers and mentors, which is considered a significant aspect of academic socialization at the graduate level. For instance, Belcher (1994), adopting Lave and Wenger’s framework of Communities of Practice, investigated the role that the graduate student-advisor relationship plays in multilingual students’ participation in research communities while writing their dissertations. In this study, Belcher focuses on the academic relationships between three students and their mentors from the fields of Chinese literature, applied mathematics, and human nutrition. Two (Li and Kuo) of the three students’ relationships with their advisors ended up being troubled due to a mismatch between the students’ and their advisers’ views of academic community, the goal of research writing, and the expectations of readers. On the other hand, the Korean (Keoungmee) student’s interaction with her mentor was relatively successful due to their collaborative relationship. As Belcher notes, “the collaborative relationship such as Keoungmee’s with her advisor offers a means of helping students become risk takers by giving them an insiders’ appreciation of both the reasons and the rewards for writing up research” (p.32).

Another study that echoes Belcher’s (19994) results about the collaborative relationships in graduate school was conducted by Li (2005). Although Li’s study on disciplinary enculturation took place in a non-Anglophone context, the results of this study closely coincide with the ones conducted in the U.S. setting. In her study, Li (2005) investigated the disciplinary enculturation of a Chinese doctoral student (Fei) in the field of physics at a Chinese university. Drawing from the communities of practice framework, Li conducted a case study on Fei’s experiences with publishing, more specifically how he learned how to display rhetorical structures that eventually led him to
successfully enculturate into his discipline. Yi’s study found that Fei’s relationship with his mentor played an important role in his success.

Unlike Fei in Li’s (2005) study, who willingly accepted the role of a student and recognized the superiority of his mentor, Virgina, a 22 year old Puerto Rican bilingual featured in Casanave’s (1992,2002) research had difficulty in adapting to the institutional culture of her doctoral program in the sociology department of an American university as well as . As Casanave points out, Virginia experienced a “clash of cultures” with her program and with her mentors which led her to eventually drop out of the doctoral program. The reasons for her leaving the program included language concerns, her “increasing discomfort at imaging herself playing a contributing role” (p.169), her environment outside academia, and her dislike in aligning herself with the academics. Casanave’s study revealed that Virgina’s socialization into her academic community was partial. She was uncomfortable with her identity as a doctoral student. Virgina’s nonparticipation in the academic activities of her disciplinary field and the disconnection between her interests and the academia led her leave her doctoral program. On the other hand, her decision to drop out of the program and her new profession showed her increasing sense of agency. As Casanave points out, in her new profession as a family counselo, Virgina seemed to be confident and “very good at this new and serious game and to have finally found a professional home” (p.173).

Another investigation that shows the ways in which graduate students learn to participate in new academic communities through peer and mentor interactions and outlines the difficulties of graduate students’ enculturation period was conducted by Connor and Mayberry (1996). In this study, Connor and Mayberry explore how Timo, a
male Finnish graduate student in the field of agricultural economics in a North American University, negotiated writing tasks with his professor. Unlike, Virginia in Casanave’s investigation, Timo successfully produced an acceptable written text after he received comments from his caring professor. For his writing assignments, Timo sought assistance from his native English speaking friends as well as his native English speaking professors. The study shows how spoken and written interaction led to success in academic writing.

Casanave (1995) also emphasizes the importance of oral interaction in multilingual students’ experiences of academic socialization. In this study, which was an off-shoot of her 2002 study cited earlier, Casanave investigated the disciplinary socialization of doctoral students in the department of sociology at an American university. The results of her study illustrate how the students and professors influenced each other in a number of ways (e.g., students resisting certain writing tasks of the professors and professors changing their courses and writing tasks in response to students’ resistance). She concluded that interactions among the doctoral students positively affected their academic socialization. Stressing the importance of “peopled environments” on the socialization period of doctoral students, Casanave asserts:

It was the people with whom the students came into regular contact who shaped the socialization experiences from the first day. These people, whether professors, other members of the cohort or upper-year students, contributed in very real ways to the students’ developing sense of what the field was like and of their own place in it. Students were pushed and pulled, confused and questioned, challenged and supported by those around them. It was in this peopled environment that they undertook their writing assignments.(p.96)

Both in her 1995 study and in her later research, Casanave builds on the metaphor of “writing games,” which she draws from feminist anthropologist Shelly Ortner’s work. In
her work, Ortner emphasizes that social life is composed of serious games which consist of “webs of relationship and interaction between multiple, shiftingly interrelated subject positions in which none are autonomous agents” (cited in Casanave, 2002, p. 17).

Conceiving academic writing as a game-like structure, Casanave conceptualizes texts and writing as socially situated practice (see also Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic, 2000). In a similar vein, an early awareness of the situatedness of writing and acquiring these game-like strategies in learning to write in graduate school will help graduate students in their textual construction and empower them to participate professionally in the academic communities of their disciplinary fields. Characterizing doctoral students’ academic socialization through the image of “writing games” is a valuable contribution to our understanding of doctoral students’ academic experiences. Yet, as is seen in this dissertation, in order to play these “writing games,” students may need to generate their own “academic culture of collaboration” where they draw upon links between speaking and writing while “textualizing” (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993) their experiences in academic writing. In addition to the concept of writing games, the concept of “peopled environments” is an important part of this dissertation. First of all, the classroom discourse analysis conducted in this study illustrates that the doctoral program’s wide range of spaces that could be called “peopled environments” also include a wide range of literacy practices. Building on Casanave’s concept of peopled environments, the present study (as will be seen in Chapter 5 and 6) suggests that looking at students’ verbal and

---

4 This is a framework that this research was built on. The notion of academic culture of collaboration will be further explained in the next chapters. In a nutshell, this framework sees academic literacy socialization as a social process that involves communicative actions and reactions, in which students not only resist but also assist to one another in order to unpack the tacit rules of “writing games” or simply in order to understand the ways of thinking, writing, valuing and being at the graduate level.
non-verbal interactions and how they acted and reacted to each other in these peopled environments becomes a crucial part of their academic literacy socialization.

Some studies have taken a different approach by exploring graduate students’ academic literacies with respect to the issues of voice and identity (e.g., Casanave, 1992, 1995; Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Hyland, 2002; Ivanic, 1998; Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Kubota, 2003). These studies have examined the role of identity in a larger framework as it plays out in acquiring second language writing skills in academic research communities. For example, Hirvela & Belcher (2001) conducted three case studies (Fernando, Jacinta and Carmen) to explore the role of voice in L2 writing and the identity related issues multilingual graduate students experience with English academic writing at the doctoral level. The participants in this study were three Latin American graduate students who were already established writers in their professions, and in their native languages, when they entered the academic community in the U.S. setting. The study found that two of the participants resisted certain academic writing requirements in English because they clashed with their L1 writing experiences but eventually created hybrid voices and identities as they continued through their doctoral study.

Similar issues were also brought up in various oft-cited literacy autobiographies such as Fan Shen’s (1989) and Min-Chan Lu’s (1987) where they talk about struggles between representing or negotiating their multiple selves in cross-cultural writing at the undergraduate level. For instance, while making the transition from his Chinese self to what Shen calls to his “English identity”, he was always “wrestling with different ideological systems” (p.127). As he eloquently states in his biographical account, “I
realize that he process of learning to write in English is in fact a process of creating and defining a new identity and balancing it with the old” (p. 128)

Finally, a series of important and recent research studies which specifically investigate the experiences of graduate student’s academic literacy practices and academic socialization are collected in Casanave and Li’s (2008) *Learning the literacy practices of Graduate School: Insiders’ reflections on academic enculturation*. Drawing on the theoretical underpinnings of Communities of Practice (e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1994), genre studies (e.g., Swales, 1990) and identity (e.g., Ivanic, 1998), this book features invaluable research that sheds light on a wide range of issues regarding multilingual students’ academic literacy development and disciplinary enculturation in the context of graduate school. Some of the issues discussed in these books involve issues such as mentors and mentee’s relationships (e.g., Simpson & Matsuda, 2008; Hirvela & Yi, 2008; Li & Flowerdew, 2008), active participation in academic communities (Casanave, 2002; 2008; Hedgcock, 2008; Fujikoa, 2008) and situated learning experiences in graduate school (Kuwahara, 2008; Prior & Min, 2008, Okada, 2008). One common finding of these studies is that successful academic socialization necessitates proactive participation in various academic communities, negotiation of literacy practices, and active interactions with peers, mentors and professors. The studies reveal that multilingual students, as they socialize into academic communities in graduate school, “transform the communities by critically and consciously resisting and changing the existing ways of doing things, and more often, by simply being who they are, by bringing their ways of living and coping into the mix” (Casanave & Li, 2008, p. 6). Another point of convergence is that in order for multilingual students to integrate themselves into their discipline, they
need to successfully navigate the cultural, linguistic and political practices of English-
dominant graduate schools in the U.S. This multidimensional understanding of academic
socialization has also shaped the research questions and the analysis of this study, as will
be presented in next chapters of this dissertation.

Chapter Summary

The review of literature on various theories of socialization (e.g. L1 and L2
socialization, academic socialization) and academic literacies of second language
speakers illustrates the complex and multidimensional nature of the academic literacy
socialization experiences of students from diverse backgrounds. As will be described in
the next chapter, the research methodology employed in this dissertation also informed its
theoretical framework (Bloome et. al.2005). Previous studies on academic socialization
of L2 adult students are mostly restricted to surveys, interviews, and case studies.
However, to fully understand the academic literacy socialization processes of
multilingual students and how they resist or adapt to new academic environments
requires an understanding of their social interactions, as much of their activity at the
doctoral level occurs in connection with others, not in isolation. Likewise, it is important
for researchers to look at the everyday life of these students both inside and outside of the
classroom and investigate the dialogues they engage about their own academic
socialization, as their engagement with doctoral level education is not confined to what
takes places in their classrooms. Therefore, focusing on classroom discourse through the
analytic tools of discourse analysis, as will be explained in the next chapter, provides a
deeper understanding of multilingual students’ academic literacy socialization during
their first year academic socialization. The theoretical underpinnings employed in this
study, coupled with the methodological approach discussed in detail in the next chapter (i.e. micro ethnographic discourse analysis), guided the steps followed in the data analysis and interpretation of the results.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of ethnography is to come to a deeper understanding of how individuals view and participate in their own social and cultural worlds. (Harklau, 2005, p. 179)

Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to provide a detailed picture of the methodological decisions that I made in order to conduct a deep analysis of the academic literacy socialization of six multilingual doctoral students in their first year of doctoral education. As explained in Chapter 2, academic literacy socialization for nonnative English speakers is a lengthy and slow-paced process, in which participants engage a wide range of literacy activities that are distributed over a wide span of time. Many scholars who have investigated academic socialization conducted longitudinal case studies in order to better understand the complex nature of academic socialization in a second language (L2). In this study, I adopted the academic socialization model as described in the work of Brain Street and Mary Lea. The very nature of the research topic and the research questions guiding this study called for a detailed analysis of students’ everyday lives. Given the centrality of language and interaction in education, particularly at the graduate level, the methodology adopted was grounded in ethnographic and microethnographic discourse analytic approaches to the researching of academic socialization.
Utilizing microethnographic discourse analysis, the overarching question that this study asked was: What are some of the academic literacy socialization processes that multilingual students undergo as first year doctoral students? To shed light into this larger question, I attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What kinds of language practices do doctoral students’ display in their initial encounters with doctoral courses?

2. What types of intertextual links and semiotic meanings do multilingual doctoral students collectively establish to make meaning from academic texts?

3. How does social interaction (spoken, written and online) among doctoral students mediate students’ construction of academic knowledge (academic socialization) and help them negotiate academic literacies?

As briefly illustrated in Table 3.1, the research questions of this study are closely aligned with the methodology and data analysis procedures, which will be explored in greater detail later in the chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Data Corpus</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What kinds of language practices do doctoral students’ display in their initial encounters with doctoral courses?</td>
<td>Spoken text acquired by two video-recordings of two courses, observations, student interviews</td>
<td>Classroom observations, participant observation, audio and video recording, taking field notes</td>
<td>Message by message analysis of classroom discourse. Microanalysis of social interaction focusing on contextual cues and linguistic evidence. Exploring the reoccurring themes and patterns from transcripts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Research questions and methodology

Continued
Table 3.1: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kinds of intertextual links and semiotic meanings do multilingual doctoral students collectively establish to make meaning from academic texts?</th>
<th>interviews, classroom observations</th>
<th>recording, field notes. Interviews, informal conversations outside the class</th>
<th>of support group dialogues. Looking for intertextual and intercontextual links through microanalysis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. How does social interaction (spoken, written and online) among doctoral students mediate students’ construction of academic knowledge (academic socialization) and help them negotiate academic literacies?</td>
<td>Student narratives in the support group, students’ collaborative written work in the support groups. Student interview accounts</td>
<td>Participant observation. Audio recording of group discussions. The use of online interaction</td>
<td>Message by message analysis of support group interaction, looking at linguistic and nonlinguistic cues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chapter is organized in two main parts. Part One focuses on the research approach adopted and its ethical considerations, while Part Two describes the microethnographic analysis approach to classroom discourse. It is important to note that the methodological discussions outlined in the following pages will also underline the theoretical constructs that foreground the analysis of multilingual first year doctoral students’ academic literacy practices and their participation in academic communities. As Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto & Farris (2005) aptly state, “methodological discussion does not stand distinct from theoretical discussion about the nature of the phenomena being analyzed and described” (p.51). Thus, the discussion that follows is not only about the data collection methods employed in this research, but also about how the researcher of this study views
knowledge, language, culture, interaction and discourse, which are some of the central components of ethnographic logics of inquiry.

Part I

**Research Paradigm**

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) state that paradigms are “the net that contains the researchers’ epistemological, ontological, and methodological premises” (p. 9). Each paradigm in the social sciences and humanities reveals particular sets of assumptions about the nature of reality (ontology), the nature of relationship between the knower and the known (epistemology), and the use of methodology. These ‘basic belief systems’ (Guba 1990, p.18), namely paradigms, are adopted by researchers from different research traditions. In Schwandt’s (1997) words, paradigm refers to “a type of cognitive framework- an ‘exemplar’ or set of shared solutions to substantive problems used by a very well-defined specific community of scientists both to generate and to solve puzzles in their fields”(p.109). On the other hand, Lincoln and Guba (1994) define the notion of paradigm as

\[ \text{...a set of basic beliefs (or metaphysic) that deal with ultimate or first principles. It represents a worldview that defines, for its holders, the nature of the ‘world,’ the individual place in it, and the range of possible relationships to that world and its parts, as, for example, cosmologies and theologies do. (p. 105)} \]

This study is grounded in a social constructivist research paradigm, which is based on the assumption that there is not a single reality outside of discourse and that “we enter a world of discourses- a tradition, a way of life, and a set of value preferences” (Gregen, 2000, p. 19) which is not a reflection of what is out there, but “a set of social artifacts, a reflection of what we make of what is there” (p.20). Within this socially constructed
world of discourses, knowledge and reality are not seen as static entities that are packed in, for instance, isolated units and measured as a set of skills; instead, knowledge is perceived as an “outgrowth of communal relationships” (p. 180). Problemitizing the value of individual mind, social constructivists stress that truth resides in the community and that people, through their collective and reflexive actions and interchanges, explore alternative understandings to truth as it is viewed by the mainstream. Moreover, in this approach, reality (truth), and knowledge are human construction (Guba, 1990, p.15), which is a consequence of human activities, and community and dialogue are central notions in understanding the relationships between and creative communications among people.

This methodological understanding is also central to the theoretical framework of this study. Subscribing to the social constructivist epistemology, the research process, i.e. data collection and analysis, of this study was not linear or static. Instead, the research process was socially constructed by the participants of the study as they engaged in collaborative relationships about what it means to write academically in a second language or what it means to be a first year doctoral student from a different culture than that of an Anglophone university. In this study, the researched and the researcher worked together in the “process of co-construction” (Hatch 2002, p.15) this study. Similarly, the analysis of the data was ongoing and cyclical. I went back and forth recursively while reading the transcriptions of video recordings of classroom discussions and audio recordings of interview accounts. The multiple collections of data allowed me to look at multiple layers of students’ academic socialization experiences.
Role of a researcher: Prolonged engagement, reflexivity, participant observation

The first instance of gaining entry into the culture of six multilingual first year doctoral students was in November, 2006 when I was soliciting participants in a doctoral course that the students were taking in their first academic quarter. As a researcher, I was not granted group membership immediately after I was in the field, even though I was also a multilingual doctoral student. Although it took some time to acquire group membership, my subjectivity as a multilingual doctoral candidate seemed to help me to build rapport and gain access to the students’ interactions both inside and outside their classrooms in the very early days of my field work. In qualitative research, it is essential for the researcher to be aware of his or her own subjectivity, assumptions, beliefs and values and systematically reflect on them (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2001). Therefore, reflexivity, “examining one’s own subjectivity” (p.27) as they describe it, and how it influences the research process, became an important part of the data collection and analysis procedures. Subjectivity is unavoidable in qualitative research, and it was important to be aware of my own subject positioning and my assumptions about socialization, learning, and interaction. Auerbach & Silverstein (2001) state that “subjectivity and values are necessary parts of human interaction and therefore cannot be eliminated or controlled” (p.27). Therefore, as a researcher, I constantly tried to reflect on my own subjectivity before, during and after the data collection period through dialoguing with colleagues, consulting with them about the methodological decisions I was making, and through keeping a research journal in which I recorded my daily experiences with the research participants. Although the participants of the study and myself shared similar traits (e.g. studying in a foreign country, being a nonnative speaker.
of English, being a doctoral student), my subjectivity as a 28 year old Turkish-Jewish woman naturally had an influence on my relationships with the participants as well as my own positioning and understanding of socialization in each step of the data collection and data analysis processes.

Another variable that influenced my role as a researcher and my relationships with the participants was prolonged engagement. Prolonged engagement with the research participants during the data collection period was a necessary strategy to ensure an in-depth understanding of the participants’ worldviews. Merriam (2002) stresses the point “that emerging findings must feel saturated” (p.26) and that researchers begin to see and hear the same things over and over again. While looking for information, it is often noted that variation in understanding needs to be sought in the data being gathered. In addition to prolonged engagement, participant observation was an important process and an integral part of my field work that granted me natural access to the participants’ daily practices in their first year of doctoral study.

According to Wolcott (1988), there are various ways of conducting participant observations. Regarding field work, he distinguishes between having the opportunity to be a participant observant, a privileged observer, or a limited observer. In this study, I played multiple roles depending on the nature of the course being observed and its participants. It is important to note that the six participants of this study gave me the privilege to become a more active participant, rather than a passive one, granting me access to the interactions they had both in and beyond the classroom settings. Glesne (1999) also asserts that during participant observation a paradox might develop where the researcher becomes more of a participant and less of an observer. I also experienced this
dilemma while in the field and collecting data, communicating with the students over a wide range of issues, observing their classes, video recording their interactions, or tutoring them on their writing assignments. I found myself developing multiple roles in different contexts. These roles included being a researcher, observer, participant observer, mentor, writing tutor, colleague and friend. These roles were neither assumed as static nor decided by me, yet they were constructed through the interactions I had with different participants of this study.

Spradley (1980) asserts that “personal gains become exploitative when the informant gains nothing” (p.24). As an educational ethnographer, I also bear the responsibility to contribute to my participants’ lives as I gain insights from them. Therefore, this study also aimed to benefit the students who agreed to participate. The students generously opened their worlds to me, allowing me hear their stories about the joys, frustrations, disappointments that they were facing as first year doctoral students. The close relationships, that is, the bonding power between the students and myself and even among the students themselves (separate from me) made this an especially active learning experience and a continuous intellectual dialogue that continued even after the data collection period ended. For instance, in one of the courses on research methodology, the students mentioned that through their involvement with this study they were able to understand some important steps in educational ethnography, such as participant selection, prolonged engagement, interviews and so on. Additionally, hoping to compensate them somewhat for the invaluable insights that they shared, I offered my help as a writing tutor and mentor during the first year of their doctoral work.
Sampling and Participants

Hatch (2002) asserts that determining the participants for a study should be based on the units of analysis and the context of the study. Decisions about who to include in this study were framed by my research questions. Since I was exploring how multilingual students socialize into the academic communities within their discipline in their first year of doctoral study, I needed to choose my participants among the international students within the larger group of first year doctoral students. Before soliciting participants for this study, I went through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to obtain permission to conduct this study. Having received the IRB permission, I began introducing my study first to one of the professors of the school where I was conducting my study in order to solicit participants in his class. I was given the permission to introduce my study to the class participants in one of the very first courses the students took in their first year.

In alignment with the main principles of qualitative research, I conducted purposeful and homogenous sampling (Patton, 1994, 2000). That is, the participants I worked with shared important characteristics, such as being a first year doctoral student in the field of Education. Due to the nature of the study and the research questions I was asking, the study needed to include participants from a variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, the sampling procedure was in harmony with the purpose of this study. There existed a set of criteria in order to select participants. These were (1) the participants had some experience with teaching (2) the participants were first year doctoral students, (3) they came from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds and used English as their second, third or fourth language. For the selection of participants for
this study, I presented my research in one of the professors’ classes and asked whether students would volunteer to be a part of this study. I also spoke with them outside of the class and informed them about the study.

At the end of the solicitation period, ten students had agreed to participate in my study. However, I needed to eliminate some students due to the selection criteria that I reported above. In addition, focusing on a small sample would give me an opportunity to pay close attention to each participant and provide an in-depth look at the academic socialization of six multilingual students. All of the participants in this study were informed (orally and in writing) about the goals and format of this research as well as any ways in which the data they provide will be used. The participants agreed to be a part of this research by signing a letter of consent that I gave them introducing the primary aims of this research and the data collection procedures to be employed (see Appendix A). The following table provides an overview of the participants in this study.

**Table 3.2:** Overview of the focal participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Fang</th>
<th>Jewel</th>
<th>Mike</th>
<th>Rice</th>
<th>Misa</th>
<th>Carol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>Chinese, English</td>
<td>Greek, Italian, English, French</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Chinese, English, Taiwanese</td>
<td>Japanese, English</td>
<td>Chinese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Drama Education</td>
<td>Global Education</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous degrees</td>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Spanish Literature</td>
<td>Educational Psychology Chinese Lit</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic experience</td>
<td>MA in TESL, worked as an English teacher in China</td>
<td>M.A. in Teaching, Worked as an Italian teacher.</td>
<td>M.A. in Spanish literature, Taught ESL</td>
<td>M.A. in Educational Psychology, Worked as an English tutor</td>
<td>M.A in Internatioonal Relations, Worked in Peace Ship</td>
<td>M.A. in TESL, Worked as a translator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Site

This study was conducted in an Education doctoral program at a Midwestern University hosting approximately 53,000 students, of whom between 4,000 and 5,000 were international students. The university is a large Research One institute which values the construction of academic knowledge and quality teaching and mentoring. In the doctoral program where I conducted this research study, students are required to complete a minimum of 90 graduate credit hours beyond their Master's degree. More specifically, students in this program need to take at least four research courses (qualitative or quantitative), several program-specific required courses, a handful of core courses required by the larger unit that the program belongs to, and elective courses, some of which could contribute to the two minors or specializations students were then expected to complete before taking the candidacy examination that precedes the dissertation phase of the program.

Although an initial objective of data collection was to observe all the courses that the students took in their first year (which comprised three quarters), due to issues such as permission or coordination (i.e. not all participants taking the courses simultaneously), the observation of classroom discourse varied from quarter to quarter. As a result, I was able to actively and systematically observe six core courses during the study. From these six courses, I was able to video record certain class sessions of three courses and audio record portions of the other three. Table 3.3 below summarizes information about the courses that I observed and recorded over three quarters. More detailed analysis of the context of the study, including the participants, appears in the next chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Main literacy Activities</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Research activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Language and literacy</td>
<td>Conceptual Paper, classroom discussions, presentations, research paper</td>
<td>Misa, Rice, Carol, Fang, Mike, Jewel</td>
<td>Observed (three sessions), kept field notes, collected student artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues in education</td>
<td>Presentations, classroom discussions, reflection papers</td>
<td>Mike, Fang Carol, Jewel</td>
<td>Observed (all sessions), Video recorded three sessions, participant observer, took field notes, collected student artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Literacy autobiography, reflection papers, online interactions</td>
<td>Mike, Fang Carol, Jewel</td>
<td>Collected student artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Presentations, classroom discussions, literature review, Research paper</td>
<td>Mike, Carol, Fang, Jewel</td>
<td>Video recorded (four sessions), observed, collected student artifacts, took field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral English Proficiency</td>
<td>Mock teaching, classroom discussions, reflection papers, online interactions</td>
<td>Misa, Carol, Mike, Fang, Jewel</td>
<td>Audio-recorded (four sessions), collected student artifacts, took field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Support Group (met six times)</td>
<td>Informal discussions about doctoral education</td>
<td>Carol, Mike, Fang, Jewel, Diana, Song, Alexis</td>
<td>Audio-recorded (all sessions), collected student artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Dewey</td>
<td>Presentations, final paper about Dewey</td>
<td>Misa, Rice</td>
<td>Audio recorded (all sessions), collected student artifacts, took field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Learning Theories</td>
<td>Critical Response papers, classroom discussions, research paper, presentations</td>
<td>Carol, Fang, Rice, Mike, Jewel</td>
<td>Video recorded (one session) Took field notes, observed, collected student artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research methods</td>
<td>Critical response papers, presentations, class</td>
<td>Carol, Fang, Mike, Jewel</td>
<td>Audio-recorded (six sessions), collected student artifact,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The names of the original courses have been changed due to confidentiality reasons.


Table 3.3: Summary of courses, literacy activities and data resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>discussions</th>
<th>observed, took field notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Group (met twice)</td>
<td>Informal discussions, working on manuscript</td>
<td>Carol, Fang, Mike Jewel, Song, Diana, Alexis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Timeline

The data collection for this ethnographic study took place between September 2006 and June 2007. The data collection was separated into four different phases. The table below illustrates the timeline of the data collection and the type of research activities that I conducted. Phase one included soliciting participants as well as building rapport with them. I was also able to observe one classroom and had permission to video record several sessions of the course. Phase one also included the first interviews with the participants. The first set of interview questions included questions regarding their educational background and reasons to go to PhD. The interview questions can be seen in Appendix B. Discussion of students’ backgrounds and more information about their context will be given in Chapter 4. The second phase of the research included participant observations, interviews with each of the participants, as well as video recording of certain course sessions. During the third phase of the data collection, I was able to observe one class, but not able to audio-record it due to permission reasons. Phase four included the analysis of collected data, as well as member checking with the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall quarter</td>
<td>Winter Quarter</td>
<td>Spring Quarter</td>
<td>August, 2007-April, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20 – December 7 2006</td>
<td>January 3- March 15, 2007</td>
<td>March 27-June 7, 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering the first year doctoral community</td>
<td>Focusing on literacy events in and beyond</td>
<td>Focusing on literacy events in and beyond</td>
<td>Data Analysis and Interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I collected the data from multiple sources and triangulated the findings. Over this nine-month period, my role as a researcher included being a participant observant or an outside observer (or as some students called me, “the big mama” of the program), depending on the nature of the social interaction I was observing.

The research methods included many data gathering procedures, including conducting ethnographic interviews, keeping a researcher diary, collecting student artifacts, audio recording classroom discussions as well as our informal support group meetings, and video recording some classroom discussions. The central data analysis methodology used was microanalysis of audio recorded and video recorded data; these data were complemented by in-depth interviews and classroom observations as well as tutoring sessions I offered for some students’ writing of papers for courses.

Triangulation is one of the best-known strategies applied by qualitative researchers to ensure internal validity. The two primary data collection methods were video recording of classroom interaction and ethnographic interviews conducted with individual students. At the request of the students, at the beginning of the winter quarter (January 12th), the participants and I established a “Doctoral Support Group” which lasted about 4 months. The main objective of the group was to exchange information, share
stories, and engage in academic activities. Several themes or topics of discussion were identified during our first meeting. Some of these included conference proposal writing, information exchanges about awards and scholarships, publishing, the experiences of women in academia, and the emotional struggles related to studying in a doctoral program. The discussions in this support group were also used as a data collection resource. The following table provides a summary of the data collection methods employed in this study. The data corpus indicated in the table will be explained below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Corpus</th>
<th>Data collection sources</th>
<th>Time length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Interviews</td>
<td>One on one interviews, Support Group</td>
<td>Average of 60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>Class time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>First year doctoral courses</td>
<td>Two-three days a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recording</td>
<td>Classroom discussions</td>
<td>Class time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal conversations outside the class</td>
<td>Support group, email interaction</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Classroom papers, course syllabus</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: Data Corpus and Data Collection Methods

Data Corpus

Ethnographic Interviews

I conducted two interviews every quarter with each of the participants. By the end of the year, I had conducted 36 formal interviews (October, 206-June 2007). In addition, I
conducted one interview each with two of the professors who were willing to be interviewed. In addition, the professors shared with me some additional information regarding their perceptions of students’ academic socialization experiences in response to some of my questions sent via electronic email. As the aim of this dissertation was not to look at professors’ perceptions or experiences with the first year multilingual students, those interviews were only used to provide more detailed contextual or background information. The interviews with the participants took place in various places, such as classrooms, cafes, in my apartment, or in the participant’s apartment. The interviews lasted an average of one hour. Each interview was also digitally audio recorded and transcribed to identify emerging themes. Transcribing each interview before the next one helped me to revise and generate new interview questions. Although the particular focus of the interviews was the academic socialization and academic literacies of the students, I allowed the participants to deviate from the interview questions when they were inclined to do so. Thus, the interviews were semi-structured in nature. Being flexible with the interview also helped me to access sometimes richer sources of data which included various unexpected narratives of the research participants. The main purpose of these interviews was to gain a deeper understanding of the students’ academic socialization processes as well as the frustrations and joys that they experienced in their first year.

*Classroom observations*

During one year, I attended different core and elective courses that the participants of this study took. At each visit to the classes, I announced my identity as a doctoral candidate who was conducting an ethnographic study to understand the academic socialization of multilingual doctoral students and gave details about this study.
Although I had the IRB permission for the focal participants of this study, I asked the other class members’ as well as the professors’ permission to observe the classroom sessions and video record without being intrusive. Yet, some teachers did not agree to be video recorded and audio recorded. Although I was not able to record all the course sessions, I was able to collect 22 hours of video recorded data and 72 hours of audio recorded data from classroom observations. In addition to the recording activity, I took extensive field notes regarding the discussions and social interactions occurring in the classes that I observed.

**Field notes**

Field notes, in this study, were collected during the course of data collection. As I was entering various classes in each quarter, it was important that I systematically kept records of what was discussed in the classrooms. I also spent time with students outside of the classrooms. Because it seemed intrusive to record notes during an unplanned conversation, I took notes only if the discussion revolved around topics relevant to my dissertation questions. This was immediately after the conversations ended. My field notes included different categories. While one category was devoted to the time, date and main topic of the discussion, another category was the descriptive and interpretive notes regarding what was going on in the field. Furthermore, I also included more personal notes such as my feelings, ideas, or dilemmas as a researcher in the field. These sections helped me to identify the major themes in the whole data set. Most of the time, I typed up the handwritten notes and saved them in my personal laptop, which is protected by a password.
Video Recording

Each quarter I observed all the sessions of at least one doctoral level course. The courses that I video recorded are listed in table 3.3. Depending on the permission received by the instructors and by other class participants, I video recorded and audio recorded the classroom discussions. The video recorded data was also digitized through the use of Media Player. I selected critical events which were the most revealing and representative events in the video recorded data through viewing and reviewing the recordings various times. The choice of video segments for in-depth microanalysis will be described in greater detail later in the chapter.

Transcription

It is also important to share a few words about transcription. Although a transcription is a text which represents an event, it is not an event itself. Transcribing is an interpretive and representational process. Elinor Och’s (1979) points out that the technical choices in transcription are reflective of the theoretical assumptions of a research study, and “selectivity is encouraged” (p.44), although it should not be random. Likewise, in this study, transcriptions were the major representation of the study’s data. Decisions about the significance of the segment of a discussion or an interaction or a speech event were made based on the critical moments that appeared throughout the text, as will be explained in greater detail below. It was also based on the researcher’s assumptions about language both priori or in situ.

Drawing from the methodological tools that Green & Wallat (1981) and Bloome et al (2005) developed, the transcriptions included both verbal and non-verbal messages. The nonverbal messages included cues such as gestures and intonation; these are
identified within the transcripts. Therefore, the narrative description of a transcription represents both the researchers’ and the participants’ voices. In this study, the use of transcription was an important analytical tool that was socially constructed to investigate how the first year doctoral students made meaning and negotiated their understanding of academic literacies. The transcription key used for this study can be seen in Appendix C.

Classroom Materials

With the permission of the students, I collected a wide range of classroom materials during the data gathering period. These materials included the original copies of research papers, response papers, and literacy autobiographies they wrote for their courses (mostly with the instructors’ feedback on them), class syllabi, and other materials distributed or created by the students in classroom events (i.e. presentation handouts, written materials produced in group work in response to a class prompt). Although the focus of this study was not on exploring the writing practices of the students per se, looking at their writing helped me to understand the kinds of references they were making to their second language writing experiences.

Utilizing a wide range of data sources, micro-level discourse analysis was conducted focusing on the social interaction within various segments of discussions. For the purpose of in-depth micro analysis, I chose to analyze selected student interviews, three courses, and four peer group discussions outside the classroom. More information regarding the use of microethnographic analysis will be provided in greater detail later in the chapter.
Part II

Ethnography and Microethnographic Discourse Analysis

The central methodology used in this dissertation is a microethnographic approach to discourse analysis of language use, which primarily focuses on what people do with language, and who is doing what for what purposes. Before moving to a detailed discussion of how a microethnographic approach to academic socialization was utilized in this study, it is important to unpack how ethnography as a research process works.

Ethnography, in general terms, is described as sociocultural interpretation of human society and culture (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998, 2002). Gall, Gall & Borg (1999) state that “Ethnographers can make the familiar strange either by immersing themselves in a culture far different from their own, by studying a subculture in their own community with which they are unfamiliar, or by investing a subculture with which they are familiar, but looking at it from the perspective of the subculture members’ rather than from their own perspective” (p.330). Ethnographic research includes a wide range of approaches incorporating sociolinguistics and interactional sociolinguistics, and includes the ethnography of communication and critical ethnography. As Atkinson (1990) puts it, “ethnography is not a static genre” (p.5). Although both sociolinguistics and ethnography have their own traditions of inquiry, many researchers view them as complementary (Egan-Robertson & Willet, 1998). It is important to make the distinction between the ethnography and ethnographic approaches in qualitative study. While ethnography is the usually described as a naturalistic inquiry that particularly focuses on the study of a cultural behavior of a community, ethnographic research includes the methodological and theoretical features of ethnography. This study embraces the ethnographic research to
classroom culture. Ethnographic research to understand classroom culture includes “an interpretation of the comments by a teacher or a student or speculate on the meaning of a particular activity or organizational structure without understanding the full social, cultural, and educational context” (Egan-Robertson & Willet, 1998, p. 5).

Congruent with the main tenants of qualitative research, ethnographic research studies have three important characteristics (Egan-Robertson & Willet, 1998). First, ethnographic research is holistic and contextual. An ethnographer “attempts to describe as much as possible about a cultural system or social group” (Creswell, 1998, p.60), including people’s history, religion, politics and environment. Geertz (1973), in his seminal work “Interpretation of Cultures,” emphasizes that human behaviors make sense if they are described as a part of the whole picture with the help of ‘thick description’ that can enable us understand the context and what a certain human behavior means in that larger context. In turn, the whole picture should be viewed through the examination of its parts. Second, ethnographic research is systematic and uses recursive methodologies. In other words, an ethnographer uses multiple methods of data collection as he or she systematically looks at the data corpus. Third, as Egan-Robertson & Willet (1998) explain, ethnography “elicits the group member view of reality” (p.5). In other words, one of the key features of ethnographic research is to capture and describe the ‘emic’ perspective of the participants and compare it with an ‘etic’ perspective. The categories of emic and etic perspectives derive from cognitive anthropology. While emic refers to “specific language and culture” (Schwandt, 1997, p.35) used by the indigenous that is used by the members of a specific group of people, whereas the etic perspective refers to
the scientific language used by the social scientists (p.36)” to describe the phenomenon or concept that he or she observes.

On the other hand, the use of microethnographic approaches is different from traditional ethnography. A researcher who conducts traditional ethnography often immerses himself or herself with the community for an extended period, engaging in participant observations and seeking to understand the ways in which things are done in that community in order to capture an emic perspective of the participants. By contrast, microethnographic research includes some microanalysis of specific interaction (verbal or nonverbal) segments in an activity (e.g. classroom, community events, and literacy practices). With respect to this study, I chose to utilize ethnographic inquiry to gain long term insight into what goes on in the first year doctoral program of this study in terms of students’ socialization experiences. The ethnographic techniques used in this study come from 1) the emphasis on exploring a certain social phenomena (i.e. academic literacy socialization), 2) the attempt to work form an unstructured data corpus, 3) investigation of small segment of one case (literacy events in classroom and beyond classroom settings), and 3) analysis and interpretation of meanings (Atkinson & Hammersley 1994). On the other hand, I chose to utilize a microethnographic approach to gain a deeper sense on what goes on at the level of interaction and language in and beyond the classroom settings. Therefore, the main object of the study was not the individual students’ accounts, as in a case study; instead it was the interactions involving more than one actor acting in their natural settings.

Following the work of Bloome et al. (2005) and Green &Wallet (1981), the methodology employed in this study was both ethnographic and microanalytic in nature.
Microethnographic research includes some microanalysis of specific interaction (i.e., verbal or nonverbal) segments in an activity (e.g., classroom, community events, literacy practices) and focuses on small units of interaction with a context. Microanalysts usually look at how individuals produce and interpret texts in their conversations. This approach is often concerned with exhaustive examination of a small segment of an organization, group or a culture (Schwandt, 2001). Many researchers have conducted microanalyses of classroom life to describe and understand evolving social, cultural and literacy related events occurring between students and the teacher (e.g., Bloome et al, 2005; Green & Wallet 1981; Phillips, 1971). One of the objectives of microanalytic approaches is “to document and to describe how larger societal constraints are operationalized at the level of face to face interaction” (Bloome & Golden, 1989, p. 209). Microanalytic studies are based on two overarching assumptions:

1) that smaller units of context are embedded in larger units of context—i.e., show-and-tell time is embedded in a classroom, which is embedded in a school, which is embedded in a community/ideological context—and (2) that such smaller units of context can be ‘pulled out’ of the larger contexts in which they are embedded without a loss of integrity. (Bloome and Golden, 1989 p. 208-209)

Although both ethnographic and microethnographic studies examine social phenomena as they occur in a natural setting, microethnography includes some fine-grained processes to better understand these social phenomena. As Phillips (1993) asserts, microethnographic research often includes

the tape recording or videotaping of the naturally occurring activity in focused gathering 2) the representation of that activity in a transcription which minimally includes the speech of the participants in the activity, but may also include information about their nonverbal behavior; and 3) the close scrutiny of the transcripts with the goal of saying something about the nature of the human activity documented (p.xiii)
Similarly, in the present study, close analysis of multilingual graduate students’ academic literacy practices through microethnographic approaches was selected in order to understand the students’ ways of constructing meaning, and to explore ways in which they socialized into the academic community both inside and outside the classroom.

Different research methods serve different purposes both in the qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. One of the distinctive reasons for applying a microethnographic approach to understanding the academic socialization experiences of the first year students was the premise that language constitutes an important part of academic socialization, and in order to understand the processes students experience through social interaction, it is important to look at “discourse-in-use” (Bloome & Clark, 2006). Looking closely at the classroom and beyond classroom interaction showed, as will be seen in Chapter 5, the kinds of social and cultural practices that are ingrained in academic contexts in the Anglophone University setting of this study. As Bloome & Clark (2006) aptly express, teachers and students in educational settings “step into a given chronotope ad a set of given social and cultural practices defined as education that are materially manifest” (p. 235). These given practices are deeply rooted in social and cultural interactions. Similar to other qualitative research methods, in a microethnographic study the data does not speak for itself, but it is the researcher’s contextual information and interpretive framework that gives meaning to a strip of event or language exchange. Thus, in order to understand these interactions and production of meaning, I had to interpret and explain the conditions students were in both inside and beyond the classroom.
Since the term “discourse” is at the heart of the approaches to microethnographic research on classroom events as described by Bloome et al. (2000), it is also important to articulate the notion of discourse and the uses of discourse analysis that I drew from in this study. The most basic definition of the term discourse is the one that refers to spoken and written language above the level of the sentence (Cameron, 2001). Wodak and Kroger (2000) describe the term discourse not just as an object but as a way of treating language. In their words, “language is taken to be not simply a tool for description and a medium of communication, but as social practice” (p.4). Similarly, Gee perceives discourses as ways of being in the world, which includes “forms of life which integrate words, acts, values and beliefs, attitudes, and social identities as well as gestures, glances, body positions, and clothes” (p.7). Viewing language in a social plane as a discursive activity composed of various texts instead of merely viewing it as a “system of signs that express ideas” (Sassure, 1959, cited in Pierce, 1989, p. 404) is a central perspective in discourse analysis. According to Volosinov (1929), “language is a system of signs constituted between two socially organized persons, and in the absence of a real addressee, an addressee is presupposed in the representative of the social group to which the speaker belongs” (Volosinov, 1929 p. 5). That is, language is no longer viewed as a system of neutral signs, but rather an ideological phenomenon which is shaped among people and situated in people’s actions. Looking at language from a discursive perspective also means that our utterances have some important implications, such as their locutionary or referential meaning (what they are about), their illocutionary force (what the speaker does with them) and perlocutionary force (their effects on the hearer) (Wodak & Kroger, 2000). Such functions of spoken and written language are important in
discourse analysis, because discourse analysts usually look at language as a discursive act. In other words, they examine what people are doing with language, rather than focusing on language as a linguistic object.

Hammersly (2003) explicates two important features of discourse analysis which are also central to understanding the methodology of this study:

1. A refusal to attribute to particular categories of actor distinctive, substantive psychosocial features – ones that are relatively stable across time and/or social context – as a basis for explaining their behavior.
2. A refusal to treat what the people studied say about the social world as a source of information about it. (p. 752)

What sets discourse analysis apart from other qualitative research methods, as Hammersly points out, is that the focus of inquiry is the discursive construction of social practices. In this approach, people are more than certain individual characteristics or attributes. They should be treated as active participants “employing cultural resources that are publicly available, and doing so in contextually variable ways” (p.752).

There exist several approaches to discourse analysis. The one that I mainly employed in this study is built on sociolinguistic ethnography (Gumperz, 1986; Hymes, 1974), New Literacy Studies (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic, 2000; Bloome, 1993; Gee, 1996; Heath, 1983; Street, 1995) as well as the literary theorists such as Bakthin (1935/1981) and Volosinov (1929/1973). The microethnographic approach to language in this study is primarily influenced by Bloome et al’s (2005) approach which, as they describe in the introductory chapter to their book, 

---

6 Different approaches to analyzing discourse and talk include interaction analysis, conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis which derive from various fields such as anthropology, ethnography of communication, ethnomethodology and interactional sociolinguistics. This rich research area is carefully analyzed and explained by Deborah Cameron’s (2001) book titled Working with Spoken Discourse.

7 Related terms to sociolinguistic ethnography is ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1961, Gumperz and Hymes, 1972) and interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 2001).
adopts a “social linguistic or social interactional approach” (p. xv) in which they “combine attention to how people use language and other communication in constructing language and literacy events in classrooms with attention to social, cultural, and political processes” (p. xv).

Moreover, given the complex nature of classroom discourses, educational researchers usually apply ethnographic and discourse analysis approaches to understand what counts as learning, what counts as literacy, schooling and so forth in local settings (Gee & Green, 1998). In this study, therefore, using discourse analysis guided by microethnographic approaches, I aimed to understand how students resist, oppose or acknowledge dominant academic literacy practices occurring in their first year of doctoral study and how all these actions impacted on the ways in which they made meaning out of their classroom and support group discussions, readings, writing, and other interaction in their disciplines. According to Gee and Green (1998), the task of discourse analysis is “to construct representations of cultural models by studying people’s action across time and events” (p.125). By closely observing six multilingual students’ communication patterns inside courses as well as observing their academic literacy socialization processes outside courses, this study sought to closely investigate how these multilingual students constructed knowledge, socialized into academic discourse, negotiated academic literacies, and created social relationships through the use of language in their day-to-day lives.

Given this explanation, the ethnographic and microethnographic approaches to exploring academic socialization of first year doctoral students seemed to be the most suitable approach for the research questions I was investigating in this study. Adopting a
microethnographic approach to literacy events enabled me to answer the research questions of this study. For example, utilizing a case study approach, although it would enable me gain a different set of insights about academic literacy socialization, would not be able to achieve the primary objects of this study. In other words, the primary object of this study was not the cases of individuals, but the groups of individuals in interaction. Although this study carried some features of a case study (i.e. giving the insiders’ perspective, studying the contextual information), it was more concerned with the talk and social interaction in a group of students and with their collective academic socialization experiences.

**Theoretical tools for microethnographic analysis**

Bloome et al (2005) selected five theoretical tools for their microethnographic analysis of classroom discourse and literacy events. These are a) contextualization cues, b) boundary making, c) turn taking, d) negotiating thematic coherence, and e) intertextuality. The use of contextualization cues, boundary making and intertextuality were of particular value to me in understanding the academic socialization processes of my participants. Contextualization cues refer to verbal, nonverbal and prosodic signals. Identifying the contextualization cues in students’ conversations signaled their understanding or acknowledgement of or resistance to certain classroom events or literacy practices. Referring to Gumperz (1986), Bloome et. al (2005) state that the use of contextualization cues is often just beyond the level of consciousness. Contextualization cues, according to Gumperz (1986), are verbal, nonverbal or prosodic signs that speakers signal during the conversation. As Gumperz points out “Roughly speaking, a
contextualization cue is any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signaling of contextual presuppositions. Such cues may have a number of such linguistic realizations depending on the historically given linguistic repertoire of the participants” (p.131). In other words, people in conversation might not necessarily be aware of these subtle signals or cues as they communicate. Identifying the contextualization cues in this study also helped me to see students’ understanding and engagement with the academic literacy, with the course materials, assignments, project and so on.

Intertextuality is another framework that I brought to this microethnographic study. In brief, intertextuality means the juxtaposition of texts. My use of intertextuality in this analysis was built on social semiotics and discourse analytic understanding of intertextuality (e.g., Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Ivanic, 2005). In this view, people in interaction constantly draw from various texts, constructing intertextual relationships by acting and reacting to each other (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993). According to this social constructivist view of intertextuality, Bloome and Egan-Robertson (1993) argue that for an intertextual relationship to be socially significant, it should be proposed, recognized, and acknowledged.

Investigating the intertextual links in students’ dialogues can further our understanding of the academic literacy socialization of international students, and so I felt it was essential to incorporate intertextuality into my methodology. As will be seen in the analysis chapters (Chapter 4 and 5), every time the students were engaged in a classroom dialogue (i.e reading a text, interacting with each other, writing papers), they employed their previous experiences with other texts in different ways. In literary studies, intertextuality refers to the juxtaposition of texts. In classroom interaction, however,
Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1993) emphasize that this juxtaposition of different texts should also be recognized, acknowledged and assigned social significance. This view of educational intertextuality is based on the view of how “people act and react to each other” and evolves from the work of scholars such as Michael Bakthin, Valentine Volosinov, John Gumperz and Dell Hymes. According to this view, events and meanings in a social interaction are situated not only in people’s minds, but also in the events and interactions in which they participated. This socially constructed view of intertextuality gives interaction a material basis. That is, each interaction has a physical existence in the world. As Bloome and Egan-Robertson (1993) assert:

In a view in which language and interaction are seen as having a material basis, transformation of events and of the people located in those events involves a transformation of the material nature of the events; and the study of how people change or fail to change the material nature of the events and circumstances in which they live. (p. 310)

Following Bloome and Egan-Robertson, the intertextual analysis I utilized in this study included five processes to identify the patterns of students’ perspectives on their preferred pedagogies: “1) describing individual messages, 2) identifying the boundaries of interactional units, 3) locating proposal, recognition, and acknowledgement of intertextuality, 4) describing the social consequences of intertextuality, and 5) locating uses and references to written language” (p.314). Following similar procedures, I was able to identify and locate the academic literacy socialization experiences of six multilingual students across different contexts.

Contextualization

The microethnographic framework of this study was rooted in its detailed and intensive focus on everyday events and social interactions within doctoral level
classrooms and the effort to provide and analyze representative examples of the interactions that took place in them. As Agar (1996) states, “an ethnographer learns the contexts and meanings that shape local lives” (p.27). He goes on to say that the material for an ethnographer lies in the daily activities of people, and that the only way to access these activities is to “establish relationships with people, participate with them in what they do, and observe what is going on” (p.31). It is usually expected that problems or misunderstandings will appear during the ethnographer’s contact with the community he or she is studying. Agar (1996) names such problems in understanding as “rich points”.

To quote Agar, “when a rich point occurs, an ethnographer learns that his or her assumptions about how the world works, usually implicit and out of awareness, are inadequate to understand something that had happened” (p.30). Agar sees these breakdowns as the “raw material of ethnography” (p.31). The ethnographer needs to identify the rich points as he or she submerges into the culture of that group under study through the use of participant observation. Similarly, the participant observations I conducted as well as the video and audio recordings of the dialogues provided me with abundant opportunities to identify situations wherein rich points appeared. In addition to identifying these revealing moments, I conducted a microethnographic analysis to closely examine the language processes the students went through in and beyond the classroom settings. The steps of the data analysis procedures will be explained later in the chapter.

Another important concept of Agar’s that is worth mentioning is the term “strip.” Agar uses the term “strip” to refer to the any type of ethnographic data—in my study, it could have been a transcript that was derived from an interview, or an account of an experience garnered from students’ group discussions. According to Agar, rich points
occur as the ethnographer reviews the experience strips. It is through ongoing modification of the ethnographer’s framework that he or she reaches a holistic point of view. This, to Agar, shows the emergent nature of ethnography, and it was this aspect of ethnographic research that was especially appealing to me, though in my case I adjusted this approach to fit within my microethnographic framework. Holistic perspective and contextualization are important characteristics of ethnographic research. Ethnography portrays the events in their naturally occurring contexts from the point of view of the actors or participants in the events taking place (Erickson, 1984). One of the ethnographer’s tasks, according to Erickson, is to examine the obvious, and what is taken-for-granted by an insider that is not visible to them. This could be done through the help of “thick description” (Geertz, 1973) of a specific culture the researcher is attempting to understand. As Geertz (1973) points out “Culture is not a power, something to which social events, behaviors, institutions, or processes can be casually attributed, it is a context, something within which they can be intelligibly –that is thickly described” (p.14). It was this kind of “thick description” that I was seeking to construct through my microethnographic methodology that permitted me to identify and closely examine specific discoursal moments in the events I was observing. While the conventional ethnographic approach enabled me to focus my investigation on everyday events, such as class sessions, occurring in the lives of the first year doctoral students, it was the more intensive focus of the microethnographic approach that allowed me to probe deeply into representative stretches of interaction within those events. The issue in this microethnographic analysis of students’ social interaction is not to understand what one individual means or how she or he interprets an event or a social phenomena, but to
explore “the shared interpretation” among students, thus it is crucial that “this type of analysis places so much stress on contextualization process” (Gumperz, 2001, p.223) and everyday communicative interactions within a group of people.

**Focusing on and Selecting Events as Representative Findings**

In educational discourse analysis research, one of the central instruments of the researcher is the notion of *event*. ‘Event’ as it is used in this study is built on Gumperz (2001) and Bloome et al’s (2005) definition of the term event. In this definition, an event (or a social event) is perceived as a theoretical construct and an observed “empirical manifestation…from which cultural and social and cultural practices are inferred” (Bloome et. al, 2005 p.5). More specifically, this empirical understanding of events, or “temporally organized units”(Gumperz, 2001 p.223), focuses on how people act and react to each other, how they adopt, adapt and appropriate the social and cultural practices around them (Bloome et. al, 2005). The occurrence of such events was observed in various instances in the academic socialization experiences of the six research participants of this study. Research on L2 academic socialization utilizing the notion of event in this study involved focusing on the use of language, gestures, proximics and other kinds of semiotic systems that the students displayed. The guiding belief in this research was that carefully selecting and analyzing representative examples of important events would help produce the themes that emerged in the study. Thus, a key aspect of the microethnographic methodology of this study was built around the notion of ‘events’ and language use (through interaction) taking place within the events. Therefore, it was essential to identify and discuss a relatively small number of representative stretches of
discourse rather than a wide array of them. This is the essence of microethnographic research used in this study.

In educational discourse analysis, it is also important to explain how data is selected for use in the development of the study’s key themes, which in this research was the notion of second language academic literacy socialization. In this study, selection of representative events occurred both during the data collection and data analysis phases of the research. While each event was being audio or video recorded, I took extensive field notes and indexed the typical and atypical moments appearing in the recordings. Here, it is also important to note that, consistent with this type of research, video recording was not conducted for the purpose of producing a frequency count of students’ academic socialization processes or the intertextual links they established during their conversations. That kind of counting, while useful for different research purposes, is inconsistent with the purposes and values accompanying the type of microethnographic research that this study utilized as well as the kinds of questions that it attempted to answer. Rather, the recordings were intended to capture the “rich points” (Agar, 1996) or “critical events” (Woods, 1993) in order to explore “who is using language and other semiotic tools to do what, with whom, to what consequence, when and where” (Bloome & Clark, 2006, p.238). Likewise, as the main researcher of this study, I needed to make some decisions as to what video and audio segments to choose in order to reveal how the students used language and other semiotic tools to access and understand academic speech communities that they were about to enter. The basis for this selection was not only theory-driven, but also context-driven, that is, centered in the participant observer
insights that I developed during three academic quarters of being in the field and interacting with the students.

For example, the videotaped session that will be analyzed in Chapter 5 will “provide the context for, and final check of, description and interpretation” (Green & Wallet, 1981 p.163) and thus provide deeper insight into the kinds of interaction that took place among the participants.

Emphasizing the significance of microanalysis, Green & Wallet (1981) point out that “in order to explore the broad questions of socialization and context definition, some form of microanalysis and structural representation is necessary” (p. 163). This view of research was central to the aims and processes that guided this study. Having selected several illustrative events for microanalysis, a deeper analysis of them was conducted from June 2007 to April 2008. Through micro-level analysis of the research participants’ language use, I carefully reexamined the indexed events, focusing on the interactions the students had both inside and outside of the classroom. After examining the video recordings, I chose illustrative events to conduct a detailed micro-analysis of students’ language use (one course from each quarter). It is also important to note that although the type of analysis performed was at the micro level, the events were situated in a broader institutional context as well as in the students’ everyday lives and individual voices. The rich access to the field that I gained through such procedures as the prolonged engagement, the ethnographic interviews, the field notes, and the participant observations helped me in choosing and focusing the specific events to conduct a micro-analysis (Bloome et. al. 2005). The decisions for selecting data to transcribe (i.e. the procedures of
selecting critical events) and to analyze will be described in greater detail in the data analysis section.

**Data Analysis**

With a longitudinal study of such magnitude, the data analysis was an ongoing endeavor. In order to understand how the students negotiated new academic literacies and created alternative discourses (new spaces) in academia, I triangulated the data via various means of data collection. Another important point to mention is that during the data analysis period, there were a series of decision making processes involved. As mentioned previously, there were three main data sources that I carefully analyzed throughout this study. These included the ethnographic interviews (student narratives), classroom discourse (transcripts of audio and video recorded classrooms), and students’ narratives on their academic writing experiences during their first year. Some of the microanalysis came from students’ classroom dialogues, while other analyses came from their informal dialogues in their support group.

Data analysis occurred mostly at the micro level. The micro level of analysis occurred through the message-by-message analysis of social interactions, i.e. specific literacy events and included some macro level of analysis, i.e. making interpretations about the data analyzed. The rationale behind looking at the social interactions at the micro level is underscored in Erickson (1982), who states that “while the individual is the locus of learning, this learning does not take place in isolation. Learning by individuals occurs as reflectively adaptive transactions between the immediate environment and the individual, in which each stimulates change in the other.” (p. 10). As researchers who deal with classroom discourse from a microethnographic viewpoint indicate, the basic
unit of analysis in such research is not the individual, but the group of people they operate within. In the present study, the main purpose of microanalysis was to create a fine-grained analysis of six multilingual doctoral students’ classroom interaction over a period of one year. By fine-grained, I mean a close look at the linguistic and non-linguistic cues derived from students’ social interactions. Looking at the small bits of interactions enabled me to establish a direct relationship between the social interaction and academic literacy socialization of multilingual students.

The data selection and analysis period went hand in hand during the data collection period. Inspired by the work of scholars such as Frederick Erickson, Judith Green, Cynthia Wallet, Ann Egan-Robertson, David Bloome from the field of educational linguists who utilized microethnographic approaches to understand classroom interaction and scholars such as Harvey Sacks, Paul Haves, from conversation analysis to understand ordinary conversation, I followed the steps portrayed below. (Figure 3.1)

**Figure 3.1:** Data analysis and selection process
The data analysis and selection process took place in three overlapping stages which aimed to provide insights on students’ academic socialization experiences in their first year.

*Phase I*

Phase I included the videorecording and audiorecording of the data. This occurred during one academic year, depending on the permission I received from the participants and the classroom teachers. The video recording and audio recording was done during the events such as classroom discussions or students’ peer group discussions. After the recording was complete, I scanned all the recorded material and converted the video files to a viewable format in my laptop. This was done with the help of a technician who assisted in converting the video tapes into a DVD format. On the other hand, the audio recording was done with a help of SONY digital audio recording device. The audio recorded materials were also transferred to my personal laptop and organized according to their date of appearance and location of recording. These audio recorded files were listened to and certain parts of them were transcribed for a close analysis.

*Phase II*

Phase II of the data collection included an *unmotivated look* to the video and audio recorded data. Although the eventual aim was to review all the materials before discovering the strip of revealing and most illustrative events, it was important to look at the data “giving consideration to whatever can be found in any particular conversation, subjecting to investigation in any direction that can be produced” (Sacks, 1984, p. 27). The unmotivated look was described by Schegloff (1996). He points out:
Virtually all of these results emerge from an ‘unmotivated’ examination of naturally occurring interactional materials—that is, an examination not prompted by prespecific analytic goals [...] but by ‘noticing’ initially unremarkable features of talk and of other conduct. The trajectory of such analysis may begin with a noticing of the action being done and be pursued by specifying what about the talk or other conduct— in its context—serves as the practice of accomplishing that action. Or it may begin [...] with the noticing of some feature of the talk and be pursued by asking what— if anything— such a practice of talking has as its outcome. (Schegloff, 1996, cited in ten Have, 1999, p.103)

As ten Have states, this unmotivated look at the data is naturally influenced by the theory. Consequently, this phase was also influenced by my knowledge of literature on academic socialization, discourse analysis and social interaction. Examining the data without a specific goal was followed by indexing of naturally occurring events. These initial notes appear as an “index to the whole event” (Erickson, 2006, p.185). The indexing of events enabled me to go back and forth in the data and eventually decide what to transcribe.

*Phase III*

Having completed the unmotivated look at the data and indexed the recorded events in the field, I selected certain segments from the data which were the most representative of events that impacted students’ academic socialization experiences. The selection of segments was influenced by the theory and research questions guiding this study. The primary criteria for selection included 1) events that were most revealing in terms of what students said and for what purposes 2) events that were highly communicative, collaborative and interactive, and finally 3) events that had important consequences for students’ academic socialization.

In this study, as will be seen in Chapter 5, I wished to propose a notion of *academic culture of collaboration* referring to students’ collaborative interactions that constituted an important part of students’ academic socialization processes. Certain units
in the video and audio recorded data suggested that students co-construct what counts as knowledge and socialization through these collaborative units in the classrooms and beyond the classroom setting. These collaborative units, as will be seen in the results, are seen as students engage in a wide range of language processes such as collaborative, contesting talk, questioning, arguing or negotiating and appropriate certain tasks and understandings of academic writing in their first year of doctoral studies.

The messages that are analyzed in Chapter 5 were context-bound and were “constructed by students and teachers as they engage[d] in social interactions of the classroom to achieve specific instructional goals” (Green and Wallet 1981, p.176). Thus, my purpose in focusing on a small but representative sampling of these interactions was to reveal the purposes of students’ social interaction inside and beyond the classroom context.

**Ethical Considerations**

In general, qualitative research is famous for its ‘messiness’, yet to ensure a credible and robust qualitative study, it needs to be conducted in a systemic, rigorous and ethical way. Likewise, in this study I followed a deliberate process to gather data and make meaning out of the data. For a study to be trustworthy, it must be valid, reliable and ethical (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). In this study, to ensure confidentiality and anonymity, I used pseudonyms. Any identification parts that could reveal the participants identities were taken out from the transcriptions or the descriptions of the participants.

Ethical dilemmas usually emerge in the data collection phase and the dissemination of findings (Merriam, 2000) in a qualitative study. Some of the methodological procedures that I employed to establish trustworthiness in this study included: thick description, prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation,
peer debriefing, and member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These procedures are discussed in more detail below.

While presenting the data, it is important that the researcher present a thick description (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Merriam, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to ensure quality in research and to allow other researchers to judge the study’s applicability. Since the assumptions underlining qualitative researcher reject the idea of trying to arrive at universal laws and generalizable results like quantitative researchers do, a qualitative researcher needs to provide thick description that includes all of the details that a reader needs to know in order to fully understand the findings. Providing thick description, as Lincoln & Guba (2000) explain, “will enable someone interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility” (p.316). The term generalizibility is therefore replaced by transferability in qualitative research. The judgments of transferability depend on providing sufficient information about and knowledge of the setting that will permit another researcher to do a comparison with his or her own research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Therefore, in this ethnographic study I provided a thick description of the contexts in which the participants were engaged in various literacy activities both inside and outside of the classroom settings.

Triangulation is another strategy that is applied by qualitative researchers to ensure internal validity. In triangulation, a researcher deploys a combination of methods such as observations, interviews, and document analysis in order to validate the findings (Johnson, 2002, Merriam, 2000) As Rossman & Rallis (2003) assert, using a variety of methods ensures that the researcher has not studied only a fraction of the complexity of the situation being researched. To ensure validity and credibility, I collected data via
multiple data gathering procedures such as interview accounts, field notes, classroom discussions, and student artifacts. By employing various methods to unravel each participant’s understanding of a phenomenon being studied not only extended the amount of information I, as a researcher, attempted to elicit, but it also provided alternative perspectives on what I was investigating.

While the term triangulation is used to bring validity to qualitative research, in a postmodernist view of mixed-genre texts, the metaphor of “crystallization” is suggested as an alternative to triangulation. The ‘crystal’ metaphor is used by Richardson (2000) to define a “deepened, complex, thoroughly partial understanding of the topic” (p.934). Richardson (2000) uses this metaphor to deconstruct the notion of validity and to extend the meaning of triangulation in qualitative research. The image of crystal, for Richardson, refers to “symmetry and substance with an indefinite variety of shapes, substances, transmutations, multidimensionalities, and angles of approaches” (p.934). In postmodernist mixed genre texts there is no fixed point that can be triangulated. So in postmodern research, we do not triangulate; we crystallize. We recognize that there are far more than three sides from which to approach the world” (p. 934). As Richardson (2004) explains, “paradoxically we know more and doubt what we know. Indigenously, there is always more to know” (p.934). The image of crystallization successfully recognizes the multiple angles of participants’ voices and legitimates the use of mixed genres for analysis. However, from an interpretive/constructivist point of view, triangulation remains an important strategy that ensures validity and reliability (Merriam, 2000) Likewise, the data collected in my microethnographic analysis of students’ social interactions were triangulated with various other first-hand sources such as the interview
accounts, field notes, researcher journal, member checking, and peer debriefing, which are other important elements that added credibility to this study.

Another common strategy that ensures validity and reliability in qualitative research is member checking. In this study, as I analyzed the data, I usually took the tentative findings back to the participants to cross check if the interpretations were representative of participants’ views. This helped me to better capture the participants’ points of view on their literacy activities. In Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) words, “the member check, whereby data, analytic categories, interpretations and conclusions are tested with members of those stakeholding groups from whom the data is originally collected, is the most crucial technique for establishing credibility” (p. 314). In qualitative research, member checks are an important step for verifying the researcher’s findings. Johnson (2002) quotes a very meaningful line from a Toni Morrison novel to reflect on how she “safeguards the individual stories and diverse perceptions” (p. 469) in her study:

She is a friend of my mind. She gathers me…the pieces, I am, she gather them and give them back to me all in the right order. It’s good you know when you got a woman who is a friend of the mind (p. 272, cited in Johnson, 2002)

Similar to Morrison’s quote, my transcriptions of the audio and video-recorded data were shared with the participants to confirm the accuracy and appropriate representation of the participants’ words.

Peer review is another strategy that brought trustworthiness to this research. It is also known as “peer debriefer” or “using a critical friend” (Rossman & Rallis, 2003 p.69). Peer review is used by researchers to share the decisions on the process of doing research (e.g., decisions about research design, data analysis categories) with a
colleague(s). As Rossman and Rallis (2003) assert, this person or persons who look at the research in progress serves as an “intellectual watch dog” (p.36) for the researchers. To strengthen the validity of the research findings, in addition to my two co-advisors, three peer reviewers were invited to assist in this study. One of them currently works as an assistant professor on the Early Childhood field at a university in Turkey, and was a doctoral candidate at the time of the data collection and analysis. One of the other two peer reviewers is a doctoral candidate in Foreign Language education, and the other peer reviewer is a doctoral candidate in Political Science department.

*Prolonged engagement* with the participants during the data collection period is a strategy necessary to ensure an in-depth understanding of participants’ worldviews. Merriam (2002) emphasizes “that emerging findings must feel saturated”(p.26), and in this way researchers begin to see and hear the same things over and over again, thus allowing them to identify patterns or themes emerging from the data. While looking for information, it is often noted that variation in understanding needs to be sought while studying data. Researchers purposefully look for disconfirming data that will challenge their findings- this strategy is called negative case analysis. Through triangulation and member checking methods, I was able to access such disconfirming data.

Some of the ethnical dilemmas that a qualitative researcher encounters are associated with issues such as the need for confidentiality. It is essential that a qualitative researcher provides a written consent form in which the researcher informs the participants about the nature of the study and assures them that their responses will be kept confidential. Through informed consent, researchers provide confidentiality and anonymity. Furthermore, written consent will eliminate the “unobtrusive field
observations and informal conversations” (Glesne, 1999, p.117) that can interfere with the research process. The participants of this study were handed written consent forms which they signed and returned to me. Copies of these were given to the participants for their own records. Preparation of the consent form used took place while I sought permission from the university’s Institutional Research Board (IRB) to conduct this study.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter focused on the following: the general research approach adopted in this study, the researcher’s role, the study’s research design, the nature of microethnographic analysis, data collection, and data analysis, and the treatment of ethical dilemmas. Based on the qualitative research paradigm I selected, the central methodology of this study was microethnographic analysis, which focuses on social interactions within a small segment of a group dialogue. To increase trustworthiness, I triangulated the data with various other data sources such as interviews, transcripts of class discussions, students’ written artifacts, and some course materials as needed. In the next chapter, I will provide a more detailed description of the participants as well as the context in which their academic socialization took place.
CHAPTER 4

CONTEXTUAL DATA

Introduction

This chapter contextualizes six first year doctoral students’ academic socialization experiences by describing their relevant physical environment as well as their course work during the one year period examined in this study. This information serves as an important background to the findings presented in Chapter Five.

The contextual data presented in this chapter consists of two parts. The first part is a case by case portrait of the participants as revealed mainly through interview accounts which illustrate the key personal experiences of the research participants as novice researchers and writers in a Research One institution. The second part describes the overall institutional environment, various physical spaces, and the kinds of activities that the students encountered during the study. As mentioned in Chapter 3, four of the research participants (Fang, Mike, Jewel, and Carol) are the focal participants representing one area of Education (the foreign language education program), while the other two (Rice and Misa) are from different branches of Education (drama and global education, respectively). It should be noted that the four members of the foreign language group took several program specific and research courses together. There were also several marginal participants who were involved in this study at different times during the data collection period and whose names and comments appear occasionally in
the transcripts. The following table provides relevant background information about the participants in this study and thus creates a foundation for the rest of the chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Fang</th>
<th>Mike</th>
<th>Rice</th>
<th>Carol</th>
<th>Jewel</th>
<th>Misa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Foreign Language Education</td>
<td>Foreign Language Education</td>
<td>Drama Education</td>
<td>Foreign Language Education</td>
<td>Foreign Language Education</td>
<td>Global Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous MA Degree</td>
<td>English Teaching</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Education Psychology</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay in North America</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued the second year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1: Background Information of Research Participants**

**PART I**

**Portraits of Six First Year Doctoral Students**

**Fang:** “*The support group glues us together*”

Fang, who was in her late thirties, was one of the most articulate students in the group. Originally from China, Fang immigrated to North America to pursue her M.A degree in 2003. Upon completing her M.A degree in another university, she decided to pursue her doctoral degree in education in her current university. She had extensive experience in the teaching as well as non-teaching professions, such as business. Being the oldest student in the group, she had several areas of interest besides education. During the year of the study, she not only completed her course work, but also took various courses in the Chinese Department focusing on the language, on Chinese pedagogy, and

---

8 The length of stay indicated here is prior to the beginning of the study.
on calligraphy. Fang seemed to enjoy our conversations about graduate school, writing and other social networks and relationships she was engaged in during her “busy” graduate life. When I asked her about the reason why she wanted to pursue a doctoral degree, she mentioned her need to “upgrade her skills” and gain more knowledge about her field. She gave me the following account:

Because of my experiences in the university and in business, I developed this view of looking at education from social, political and economical view (laughs). I know that English education is such a huge business in my country and at the same time it has such an important social significance for people, for their life. I feel like this is the area which I can make most contribution and also I can get most things from it. So I want to go back and develop my career there. But in order to do that well I need first to get a degree from the West because that is in my culture that is valued...in order to do, in order to REALLY show who you are and show your ability you first should show I have this knowledge and prestige. Prestige, yeah…and also people listen to you more willingly... If you don’t have anything, people will not listen to you/// yeah, you need to have a degree, education background and of course your living experience there [in the U.S]. (Interview, 12/04/2006)

As the above account delineates, Fang seemed to have a serious outlook and strong drive to pursue her doctoral degree. Fang was also one of the most attentive and outspoken students of the first year group as well as the support group the students initiated in the early period of their doctoral education. This support group for her was “a strong emotional help,” and, as she put it, through her involvement in the group she “gained knowledge, and more importantly, the power to face challenges in my academic study.” (Support Group Discussion, 4/10/2007). Fang and I established a strong rapport, and she appreciated the support group and my mentorship, as both encouraged her to consistently connect with other students in her “cohort.” As she claimed in one of our informal chats: “We need somebody in the department who generously offers mentorship, this support group and your mentorship glues us together.” (After the support...
group meeting, 4/10/2007). The other participants often enjoyed listening to her comments and advice not only about academia but also about life in general because of her vast teaching and non-teaching related experiences in national and international contexts.

Based on our conversations and my observations of her learning behaviors both inside and outside of the classroom, it was apparent from early on that Fang attempted to take ownership of her writing, which I will focus on in the second part of this chapter. For instance, she usually questioned certain assignments, asked intriguing questions in class, and had various research plans that she would like to pursue in the future. By the third quarter of the study, she brought a more critical lens to the graduate program she was in. Unlike the other students, she constantly evaluated the program in relation to her academic goals. Measuring the strengths and weaknesses of the program and the field of Education in general, Fang had developed various insights about professors’ teaching styles and the department she was in, and about educational research methods and theories that the courses covered early in her program.

**Jewel:** “*I feel like I need to adapt new ways of writing and thinking*”

Born and educated in Cyprus, Jewel is a 28 year old woman. She received her M.A degree in the U.K, and came to the U.S in 2006 to pursue her doctoral degree. At the time of the study, Jewel was also teaching Greek, her first language, in the same university as she is pursuing her doctoral degree, and like Fang, she was also an active member of the support group. During our conversations, she always seemed to have various instrumental motivations to earn a doctoral degree in education. She repeatedly
said that earning a doctoral degree, especially in her country, would “upgrade her economic status,” as she could then find a better teaching position. She also placed value on and appreciated the experiences she was gaining beyond academics, such as living in a new country and meeting people from various backgrounds. As she put it:

I first want to have this for my own experience and gain some learning experience, traveling, meeting people while I am in the U.S. Also, for me it [learning a doctoral degree] means a better position in my work. Well, also, the situation in Cyprus is different because everybody have a BA degree and then probably 80 percent of the teachers own an MA degree, and now I was amazed in Christmas when I was in Cyprus, to see how many students are proceeding to Ph.D. Because I am young in my field and I have many years to come in terms of you know getting a job and promotions, so now I know that I will definitely need Ph.D. (Interview, 12/14/2006)

Besides these motivational factors, she also mentioned that her fiancée was pursuing his doctoral degree in another department and that this was an important motivational factor for her because she was able to “discuss the educational issues with somebody from another field” (Interview, 12/14/2006). Many times in classroom discussions she referred to her dialogs with her fiancée, and stated that these helped her to discuss the key concepts and theories she was learning from her course readings.

Jewel took every assignment very seriously, and she came across as studious and hard working. Moreover, she regularly visited me at the Writing Center to improve her writing. As much as she seemed to enjoy her courses and the new concepts she was learning, several times in our interviews, she showed her reluctance about staying in academia. As she stated, “I plan to go back to my home country. My dream job would be to work in the university level in Europe or to get into the government in the ministry of education as a mentor would be a dream position after my Ph. D, so maybe I can
suggest some methodologies in education, being in the council of educators.” (Interview, 11/19/2006) Due to her interests in pedagogy and teaching issues, she enjoyed the courses which had direct implications for teaching and learning (i.e., useful for pedagogical purposes), but had a difficult time in courses that were heavy in theory and research.

Jewel was also very eager and passionate about forming a student-driven support group, and she indicated her need to gain some guidance and mentorship during the first year of her doctoral study. She expressed her thoughts about the support group as follows: “I felt free to express my thoughts, ideas, feelings, and also to exchange suggestions when I am in the group.” (Interview, 4/8/2007)

Jewel and I also established a strong relationship as a result of her numerous visits to the Writing Center, as well as our email exchanges and face-to-face interactions. She kept in touch with me long after I finished the data collection. Also, after she received her grades or feedback from the professors, she always attempted to express her appreciation about the writing center tutorials we had. One day after one of her major papers was returned, she asked me to go outside of the classroom with her, as she did not want to reveal her grade to the other students. Being a compassionate person who likes to express her thoughts and feelings, she hugged me and said, “You are my lucky charm!” Her expressive style was also reflected in her writing assignments. By the end of winter quarter, she increasingly felt comfortable with her writing and became more confident about it. As she happily told me one day, “As you can see Lisya, I began to less frequently visit you in the writing center, now I think about you when I do my writing.” (Final interview, 4/22/2007) She made this comment in one of our final interviews.
regarding her evolution in her first year in the doctoral program. Jewel felt increasingly comfortable with academic writing in English. She also told me that she played our conversations over in her mind while writing for her classes.

Professors also recognized the improvement in her writing and made note of it in their written feedback on her papers. Some of the written comments that she received from professors are as follows:

- “I think this paper is much stronger than your first paper--This is nice progress over a short period of time” (Comments on an auto-ethnographic literacy, later in the Autumn Quarter).
- “The comprehensibility of your paper has improved” (Comments on a reflection paper, Winter Quarter).
- “Your review is well-organized and has a nice flow from section to section” (comments on her literature review, later in the Winter Quarter).

Feeling more motivated every time she wrote a new paper, Jewel took these comments very seriously and frequently made mention of her progress in her writing.

Carol: “I like academic writing. You put things together in one nice piece”

Carol was born and educated in Hong Kong and moved to the U.S. in 2006 to pursue her doctoral degree. Most of Carol’s schooling has been in Hong Kong. After receiving a B.A. at a university in Hong Kong (double majoring in linguistics and translation), she worked as a research assistant: taking part in research projects, helping professors organize conferences, and working on some translation projects.
Carol was the youngest of the participants, and she came across as one of the most ambitious and career-oriented members of the support group and of the participants in this study. In my numerous conversations with Carol, she always asked me important questions about finding a job in academia, or about becoming professionally active. Unlike the other participants of the study, from the very early days of her doctoral study, she expressed her strong desire to publish and to present at academic conferences. In our conversations, she stressed that her main goal was to progress in the program as quickly as possible. Doctoral experience for her revolved around, as she passionately said in one of our interviews, “the research experience, theoretical background, data collections, and going to conferences” (Interview, 12/2/2006). While many students expressed frustration at times about academic writing, she seemed to enjoy the complicated process of writing. As she explained:

I like writing something that is in MY head. Especially, like after reading a while, I can have some concepts//And, I LOVE putting down those KEY concepts in words///I mean I am an organizational person. And I love to put CHAOTIC things together///and put them in ONE piece/// a REALLY nice piece/// that’s why I think I like academic writing. (Interview, 11/18/2006)

Despite her ambition and concrete academic goals, many times she indicated her discomfort at being a nonnative English speaker and the possible discrimination she might face during her job search upon completion of her degree. Because of her fears and worries about being a nonnative English speaking researcher and teacher, she constantly indicated her interest in teaching Chinese pedagogy, an area she thinks she has more authority in, and therefore feels confident about. In the first support group meeting, Carol made an interesting statement about her fears and worries concerning finding a job as a
non-native speaking professional in language education: “I feel like I will never ever have a chance to work in the U.S. because of how I look. I am Asian, and if there is any other applicant like I don’t know like for example, Diana, who is from Albania, and who looks a little bit more like American///I think that they will just hire that person, not me” (Support Group meeting, 2/4/2007). These worries had a major impact on the decisions she made during the first year of her doctoral education. Although she enjoyed classes that required linguistic analysis or discourse analysis, she repeatedly said that she would have less of a chance at finding a job in the U.S if she pursued a research interest in applied linguistics or sociolinguistics. Therefore, Carol began to take various courses where she could learn more about Chinese pedagogy and decided to declare this as one of her minor areas of study.

Carol also enjoyed being a part of a supportive group of international students and frequently attended the support group meetings. In our interviews and informal group meetings, she noted that she appreciated “the kind of multicultural environment that a student can emerge in such groups” (Support Group Meeting, 1/4/2007). Besides the support group relationships, she was very close to Fang and other Asian students in her cohort, e.g., always sitting together with them and working together on different projects. Additionally, Carol sought and valued the advice and mentorship that I gave in response to her request regarding various issues related to doctoral education. We kept in touch long after the data collection period ended.
Mike: “Sometimes, you need to fake it ‘till you make it”

Mike, in his early thirties, was the only male participant of the study. Mike was born and raised in Colombia and immigrated to the U.S. six years earlier to pursue his graduate work. He had previously pursued an M.A. degree in Spanish literature in the U.S. When I asked his reasons to pursue a doctoral degree, he said:

When I finished my M.A. degree, I realized that first of all it wasn’t the field I was interested in and second, most of the people who helped me to apply for the M.A. degree told me that don’t stay there. M.A. is just to keep you going and when you start learning you realize that you need more. I could not basically stop there (Interview, 2/7/2007).

Upon completing his M.A. degree, Mike worked with Mexican Hispanic seasonal workers. Before he began his graduate work, he was hired to be a liaison between Hispanic and American employees for a construction company. In one of our earlier interviews, he said “What struck me was that even though these employees and I shared the same mother language, our different backgrounds made the initial adaptation process difficult.” (Interview, 3/20/2007) His research interests in Hispanics’ language socialization mainly derived from his experiences with the construction company. Mike was always open and articulate in his remarks, both in our interviews and in the support group meetings. For example, in the first support group meeting where students were discussing the advantages and disadvantages of being a nonnative English speaking professional in the U.S, he said:

My advantage is that the vast majority of immigrants in the U.S. is Hispanic, so I can either teach Spanish or ESL to immigrants, or go home and teach EFL. So I am working on that goal. I don’t want to only stick to ESL because it will pretty much TIE my hands (Support Group Meeting, 1/29/2007)
Being an active participant of the support group, Mike seemed to value the discussions he and his classmates had. Especially, he said, the existence of the support group in his life made the “burden of graduate studies less heavy” (Support Group manuscript, 4/2/2007). Overall, Mike seemed to remain calm despite the pressure and demands of the doctoral program. As he told me one day while walking to the bus stop, sometimes “you need to fake it until you make it”. This statement struck me as interesting and reminded me that the pretending that Mike was thinking he was doing was actually a conscious act in which he was modeling and imitating certain academic moves to become a part of the academic community he was envisioning. Mike generally participated in most of the classroom discussions. Similar to other first-year doctoral research participants of this study, the courses that he was most active in were the ones in which he could contribute to the class discussions from his own educational and cultural background. Although he established close knit relationships with his peers by the end of the first year, he expressed a sense of occasional alienation from his group earlier in the year:

I have seen most of the students form my cohort adapting what they are seeing and interpreting the differences into their culture and into what they are learning in the US//I am trying to do that but my situation is different than my cohort. I am a double minority. I am THE ONLY Hispanic, and I am the only MALE in my cohort. And most of the classes I am taking is/// to build up my OWN identity and my OWN context and be able to identify with what I am learning///but it is taking TIME and I am working on it. (Interview, 2/9/2007)

As mentioned in Chapter 3, these four students discussed thus far were following a foreign and second language track within the College of Education. Mike, Fang, Carol and Jewel took the core courses together, therefore ending up forming a closer bond than did Misa and Rice, the other two participants of this study. By the time the second quarter
of the study started, these four students had established a strong bond with each other and
decided to create a support group, while Misa and Rice strengthened their relationship
with classmates from their own fields. Misa and Rice also volunteered to be participants
in this study and sought my advice and mentorship on writing and other general issues
about doctoral course work. Due to time conflicts, however, they were unable to join the
social network (i.e. support group) that was created by Mike, Jewel, Fang and Carol.

Misa: “Hopefully, easy writing will get some respect. If people don’t understand you,
what is the point of writing?”

Misa showed her willingness to participate in the study the first time I described it
to her. When I first met Misa in a class that she was taking, I was soliciting participants.
After the class, she quietly came to me and indicated her strong interest in the study.
Born in Japan, Misa was the member of the group who had spent the greatest amount of
time studying and living in the U.S. She first came to the United States as an exchange
student. As she put, “Between years 1996 and 1997, I stayed with American family with
their 3 young daughters in Houston Texas. It was a great experience for me.” (Interview,
11/15/2006). In Texas, Misa attended a local public high school where she took ESL
classes as well as regular classes. However, as she said, “since the school year would not
be counted as academic year in the high school I was enrolled in Japan, I rather focused
on my daily-life English rather than academic English.” (Interview, 11/15/2006). When
she returned to Japan, she “intensely” studied for TOEFL by “attending after school
TOEFL program.” (Interview, 11/15/2006). Then, Misa moved to the U.S and started her
undergraduate study in San Antonio, Texas majoring in International Relations. Upon
completing her B.A., she enrolled in an M.A. program in International Education in Washington, D. C. Passionate about global issues, Misa took some time off from school and “worked as academic and communication translator on educational cruise ship called Peace Boat.” (Interview, 11/15/2006). After that experience, she decided that her passion lay strongly in the field of global education and decided to pursue her doctoral degree in that discipline.

Misa indicated that she felt content and happy with her current program by constantly comparing it to her previous institution where she pursued her M.A. degree. One of the reasons for this, as she said, was the “diverse environment” that the classrooms offered. Misa had some negative experiences in her M.A. program and frequently talked about her experiences in her doctoral education in relation to her previous institution:

For example, in that program if you cannot make sense out of what you are saying or what you are writing you’d better not say it [laughs]/// but here just say it and they [classmates and professors] will help you to make sense of it. I think it is because of the environment, the fact that there are a lot of international student. I enjoy being myself here. (Interview, 2/4/2007)

Also, in another account, she made mention of her being more comfortable because of the fact that there were many international students in her doctoral program environment. She also made close friends with American classmates in her program. Her native speaking American classmates usually helped her to express her ideas both in the written and spoken medium. As she explained:

In my previous school, there were only two international students in my program and even if there are international students, they don’t treat you any different. Everything was more formal, and people used a lot of big vocabulary and presentations. If you could not do that, it wasn’t good, you might be ashamed.
think for international students formal ways of talking and writing is very difficult (Interview, 2/4/2007).

Misa’s diligent personality and her strong interest in global education served her well as a doctoral student. During my one year of contact with her, I was able to observe her in three different classrooms. She expressed her discomfort with the courses in which she could not make a lot of contributions. Usually, these were the courses she considered as having “more linguistic orientations”. On the other hand, in the courses focusing on global education, she felt more comfortable to participate in classroom discussions:

There are many things that we can contribute to such classes because we are international student, and as for the global education, we have many resources to contribute to the class, but for a class like a more linguistic oriented, we don’t have any particular advantage to contribute to the class, that’s why the first theory class on discourse analysis was a bit difficult (Interview, 2/4/2007).

Rice: “Here [in the U.S.], before I come to a conclusion in my writing, I need to elaborate and give evidence all the time. It is so different form what I got used to in Taiwan”.

Another participant in the study was Rice. Inquisitive and calm, Rice, from Taiwan, came to the U.S in September 2006 to pursue her doctoral degree. Most of Rice’s schooling, like Carol’s, has been in her home country. Compared to the other participants, Rice was quite self-conscious about her oral and written English skills. Therefore, as she constantly told me in our one-on-one interactions, one of the top priorities during her doctoral study was not only to learn about “literature discussion group,” which was her research interest, but also “to improve my grammar in written English” (Interview, 2/20/2007). When I asked about her reasons for studying drama education, she offered the following explanation:
Because my interest is in literature discussion group, I came to the U.S. It [literature discussion group] is very popular in Taiwan, but there is very few scholars working on literature discussion group in Taiwan. I think the research here is more abundant. (Interview, 2/20/2007)

Although Rice had self-doubts about her English speaking and writing skills, she actively participated in class discussions, regardless of the number of native English speakers in the classroom, especially during the Winter and Spring Quarters. The fact that her program focused heavily on language and culture issues was one surprise she experienced when she first started her doctoral education. Furthermore, the first year experience for her also was important in terms of learning new cultural rules and values while giving up some of her own. As she said:

I found that I have to give up or try to reconstruct my own identity and my expectations, and what I learnt before and how I see myself in this field. When I first come here, the first quarter my first courses were not so related the language education (Interview, 4/8/2007)

Other students who interacted with the research participants:

Although the current study mainly focused on the six multilingual students’ academic literacy socialization as well as their collective meaning making processes while engaging academic discourse and socialization, there were several other students who joined in academic and non-academic conversations with the focal participants of the study and actively participated in the support group. Thus, while they were not the focus of the study, they interacted with the main participants and played important roles in establishing social groups among them. These students, whose overall participation in the study was marginal were first, second or sometime third year doctoral students from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds.
Although it is impossible to portray all of these students, I will briefly mention three of them who established close relationships with me and with the main participants of this study at different times and in different contexts. For example, there was one American student in the support group, Alexis, who had lived and taught in Germany for a number of years, was fluent in German, and who, at the time of the study, was in her second year of the doctoral program. She described her group experiences as follows: “This support group has awakened in me a sense of security as I become enculturated in the quickened pace and high-pressure world of doctoral studies” (Support Group manuscript, 4/3/2007). Alexis was especially active in proofreading the manuscript that the group members wrote to submit to a newsletter. She established especially close bonds with Jewel, working on class projects and studying together, even sitting together in most of the class sessions. As Jewel stated in one of our interviews, “I did a group work with Alexis and it worked so good. We met like only one hour on Thursday, and half an hour on Friday and the whole thing was there! She is so easy to work with. After we worked together, we got very close and now we even go out together in our free times” (Interview, 5/25/2007). Her comments illustrate the close bond that she established with Alexis in the early period of her doctoral education. She also indicated that from their social interactions she was learning about various cultural issues regarding living and studying in a U.S. university.

Another doctoral student who marginally participated this study due to her active involvement in the support group and her close relationships with the other participants of this study was Diana. Originally from Albania, Diana immigrated to the U.S. 10 years before the study began, and besides her graduate schoolwork, she worked as an ESL
teacher in a private school. She described her journey in graduate school as “establishing our new identity as graduate students while our family lives have their own demands” (Support group manuscript, 3/22/2007). She added: “Exchanging ideas as doctoral students helped us to come out of a cocoon of isolation and learn to collaborate in the busy world of academic research” (Support group manuscript, 3/22/2007). Diana was one of the group members the other students looked up to, and she provided constant mentoring in both academic and non-academic respects. Diana constantly classified my role in the group as significant by calling me the “big mama” of the program who brought them together. Diana and Fang developed a close relationship early in the Autumn Quarter when they were taking one of the core courses together. One day while we were walking to the class and chatting, Fang passionately said, “I feel that Diana is very similar to me, both of us like talking and both of us have similar experiences and we share a lot!” (Interview, 3/29/2007). In another meeting with Fang, once again, she commented on how much she had learned from Diana’s personal stories:

I learn A LOT from Diana. I feel that she can contribute A LOT to our classroom discourse. You know/// some students do not contribute a lot, maybe they have important thoughts but they DON’T speak up while I do learn quite a lot from her. Actually, maybe///it is not learning, but it is like/// she says what I want to say. Maybe I am not so clearly aware of this point, but she makes that point very clear. She has a lot of life experience, and it seems like we have a lot of common life experiences. I always feel like we are at the same wave-length with her (Interview, 3/29/2007).

Most of these dialogic interactions among the students took place in classrooms, schools buildings, at the university’s Writing Center, and coffee houses around the campus. The space(s) where the students enacted their doctoral education in one way or another played an important role in these students’ academic socialization and their evolving sense of being a part of an academic community.
The next section will describe the environment in which the students were studying, reading, writing and engaging in various dialogs. The contextual information about the physical environment will follow information about the core courses and professors’ expectations from the doctoral students in their first year of doctoral education. After the overview of the context and information about the first year courses, the second part of this section focuses on the fine grained analysis of the six doctoral students’ academic literacy socialization in different contexts with different actors and intertexts.

Part II

**Context of Academic Socialization: The School, the College of Education and the Community**

Most of the participants in this study shared the same physical space during the first year of their doctoral education while taking classes, chatting, reading before classes, or attending support group meetings. How this physical space is structured has important implications for the social roles people (both individually and collectively) perform in a social interaction (Scollon & Scollon, 2003). Therefore, it is necessary to describe the spaces and other meaningful ‘sign systems’ present within the doctoral students’ environments, i.e., the place where they were enculturated during their first year of doctoral study. With this in mind, I will also describe the context of the study including the university, college of education, and the core courses the participants took in their first year.
The university in which the participants of this study were pursuing their doctoral degree is a large public university in the United States, with a student population of approximately 59,000. Of this total student population, 3,650 are international students, and seventy percent of the international student population is graduate students. The participants in this study were studying in different areas of education: Foreign and Second Language Education, Social Studies and Global Education, and Drama Education. At the doctoral level, these programs have a strong emphasis on theory and research, and they aim primarily to prepare students to become effective educational researchers and university level faculty members. As the school website explains, the education program prepares:

….top educators from across the United States and around the world for highly productive careers as educational researchers, teacher educators, and district, state, and national leaders. Through the combination of a rigorous curriculum and a supportive social environment, students become thoughtful, interdisciplinary scholars who investigate issues of learning and teaching in classrooms, schools, families, and other community contexts. Students enjoy extensive experiences working with faculty on current research projects within a supportive, diverse, and vibrant intellectual community.

The education programs in the college are located in two different buildings within a short walking distance of each other, and most of the courses the students took were offered in them. Due to significant space limitations in these buildings, the students could do little besides attend courses in them; there were no places reserved for student use (such as study lounges). The only exception was a one hour period each afternoon when students could meet in a particular seminar room for light refreshments and informal discussion. This was the only concrete attempt to encourage students to congregate with each other and with faculty and thus build a community atmosphere. None of the other
spaces in these two buildings created an environment in which the students’ experienced a sense of community. On of the participants of this study, Fang, remarked on how the space provided for the students might not provide an optimal environment to be socialized into their disciplines: “I do not feel that there is a strong bond in the department. Every time I walk in my department, I say to myself: this is not the place I study! Because, first, there are so many people I don’t know. There is no person or place that gets the people together. Students always try to do it. I feel disappointed about this” (Interview, 3/29/2007). Fang’s remark suggests the importance that physical environment may play in students’ evolving sense of community. In later days, as the students became closer to one another, they expanded their physical space and reserved rooms for their support group meetings or congregated in coffee shops around the university to exchange information, ask questions, and share stories about their daily academic practices.

While the first building, from the basement to the third floor, belongs to the education department and ESL department of the college, the fourth floor of the building belongs to the Department of Economics. This building also includes classroom facilities, faculty offices, a computer lab, the Dean’s office, various administrative offices and a mailroom with a lounge, microwave and a refrigerator. The second building houses various education departments. This building has an important history, as it was built in 1932, and served as a well-known experimental research laboratory for the study of teaching methods. The building, composed of four floors, houses different departmental offices, two computer rooms, faculty offices, administrative offices and a number of large classrooms. As the College of Education offers only a limited number of graduate
assistantships, not many students spend their out of class time in the building, nor are they assigned many office spaces. Students occasionally used the hallway and lounge area during lunch time or before their classes while waiting for class to begin.

One of the attempts to gather students and build a community came within one of the departments. This department held “tea time” periods in a particular classroom facility of the second education building in the mid-afternoon period on weekdays. During this time period, the department provided tea, coffee and snacks for students and other faculty. This space is also used for various academic purposes such as graduate seminar courses, student meetings, student club brunches, or various job talks. This particular room provides an important space for dialogue and operates as a community building space for both faculty and students from various areas of interest. What is inside this combined community/seminar room also provides meaningful signs of different kinds of social interaction. For example, it is filled with books and large posters about books and reading, thus reminding students of the importance of written and visual literacy. In the middle of the room, there was (at the time of the study) a large rectangular wooden table and chairs next to the table. There were also two small oval tables in the corners of the room. The first year core courses which I attended as participant observer usually took place in this same room. During the sessions, students usually moved around the room for group work or other classroom activities.

Another important function of this common area is to host guest speakers from various other institutions, hold student meetings, or have departmental meetings. The participants of this study often congregated in this room before the classes or sometime for tea or coffee breaks.
The First Year Courses:

The first year courses that the students took were oriented towards teaching the main concepts and theories in their fields of study. As will be seen in the table below, the first quarter courses focused on both theoretical and practical issues that students need to be familiar with in order to be successful teacher educators and researchers, while the second and third quarter courses deal with deeper issues and have students begin to locate their research identities. The interviews with some of the professors of the department also demonstrate that the first year courses are designed not only to teach students certain concepts and theories of their discipline, but also teach how to make critical and analytical arguments both in their written and spoken interactions in the department. The following comment by Dr. Hall—a professor who teaches several first year core courses—clearly illustrates the main purposes of first year courses:

Our first year doctoral courses are intended to help students gain some foundation, at the doctoral level, in important ideas, models, perspectives, etc. in our field. That's why we like to have the students start, in their first quarter, with the A and B courses. They should give the students a lot to think about. Then they can build their foundation in the other courses offered in the first year.(Email interaction, 4/20/2007)

This account indicates that the first year courses are mainly designed to familiarize students with major concepts about language, literacy, education and research in general. The main literacy activities students engaged in during their first year courses included rigorous writing, speaking and reading tasks which required students’ use of their critical thinking skills and their ability to analyze the readings and establish links with theory and practice. These literacy activities are also intended to help students acculturate into the disciplinary communities they are about to enter. The courses and their literacy activities
are captured in a table that appears later in this section. Furthermore, professors expect these assignments not only to reflect the knowledge students have gained in their courses, but also demonstrate a line of careful and analytical thinking and argument that could contribute to production of knowledge and to the formation of an emerging research identity. As the same professor cited earlier noted:

In our selection of course readings and course activities (especially writing assignments) we hope to acquaint them with the much higher expectations for reading and writing at the doctoral level (compared to MA study). Thus, there's a kind of enculturation process at work. We especially want them to begin to locate themselves in the world of research, since the doctoral degree is a research degree. Our hope is that the students will become increasingly excited about the world of research, as consumers of it as well as future producers of it, as they do their assigned reading and writing. Finally, we hope that the first year courses help them in the formation of their identity as doctoral students (as opposed to MA students). We want them to begin to define what it means to be a doctoral student.(Email interactions, 4/20/2007)

Dr. White, another professor who teaches one of the classes about learning theories, made similar points. He emphasized the importance of making a valid argument in doctoral classrooms, and explained that analytical and critical thinking are among the most important skills he hopes to teach students from various backgrounds:

I expect students to always think analytically and critically///any materials discussed and shared in the class, and when they offer opinions. I obviously want them to have a basis of those opinions, being their experience, being literature, being theory, being research, being other things that other students discussed///so I am looking for all these things typically associated with critical analytical and effective thinking///so having a basis for what they think, being clear about what they think, taking a position and wiling to defend their position on the basis of theory and evidence and experience. I expect them to engage in thinking as evidence of inferencing, I expect them to collaborate with each other, listen to others and to change their opinions when warrant and wiling to give them time and space to talk///all of these things is being a part of academic community.(Interview, 5/22/2007)
This observation by Dr. White is especially important, as students in this study went
through various identity formation processes, locating and reinforcing various subject
positionalities in different courses. His comment implies that students are expected to not
only analyze the content critically, but also to produce original knowledge. The process
of socializing into an academic world, and producing well-rounded arguments in a
second language, is not an easy one. As Dr. White commented in another interview,

From my perspective, I think students, and particularly international
students, are often at sea lost in the first year, not just with academic
socialization but socialization into the culture of American university and
the U.S., so I speculate that in the first year students are trying to see
themselves as doctoral community and seeing themselves not fitting very
well///in terms of their identity as doctoral students, in terms of their
confidence, abilities, while range of indicators and I am not sure if we do a
good job///it is not only the discourse, it is also learning what it is to be in
academia in terms of their participation/// not just in classes but also in
terms of research, going to conferences, reading critically and analytically,
and in the first year I don’t think international students are coming to grips
with their own place in the class, in the university and in the U.S., and I
think that it is the major barrier for them (Interview, 5/22/2007).

As one of the research participants remarked, one of the most difficult aspects of
academic socialization and learning how to successfully perform doctoral level literacy
activities is the amount of time necessary to complete them. Jewel commented that the
“whole process is intense” not only due to the quarter system, in which the classes run for
only 9 to 10 weeks, but also the kinds of courses available and the professors’ teaching
styles. As she explained:

For some courses, I read something, and boom boom, then I have to write. When I
write for Dr. X for example I have to comment on only two chapters of a book,
so I can concentrate on only two chapters, and I write some comments, and I go
back to the reading if necessary. I have the time to do this small amount of
reading. I can make the readings more personal. I have some ideas to write, I
write it, I present it. You know, I feel like I have something more valuable. But
for this another courses, if I read for instance 300 pages, I can only write the basics and give it [paper] back, but then I cannot put my ideas in it, or my personal experiences (Interview, 4/20/2007).

Although the professors expressed their academic expectations in terms of students developing high level thinking and writing abilities, Jewel’s statement suggests that there were other issues that she was dealing with for some of her classes; the intensity of readings and the limited amount of time given to complete all the reading and writing assignments. She was not alone in this regard. In various interviews, all of the participants voiced their concern about the speedy nature of classes and the quarter system. This, according to the participants, prevented them from probing deeper into key issues and theories in their discipline, let alone developing the critical and analytical skills expected of them.

Historically, the education programs receive many international student applications every year; therefore, most of the classes included at least 3 to 4 international students from various parts of the world. Due to the increasing number of students from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds, the professors recognize the wide range of oral and literate behaviors among them, creating and promoting a range of participation opportunities inside and outside the classroom.

As seen in the table below, the students took various courses intended to build their theoretical knowledge and familiarize them with key concepts and issues in the field of education. The table below summarizes the courses and the literacy activities in those courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Main literacy Activities (written and spoken)</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Language and literacy</td>
<td>Conceptual Paper, classroom discussions, presentations, research paper</td>
<td>Misa, Rice, Carol, Fang, Mike, Jewel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues in education</td>
<td>Presentations, classroom discussions, reflection papers</td>
<td>Mike, Fang, Carol, Jewel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Literacy autobiography, reflection papers, online interactions</td>
<td>Mike, Fang, Carol, Jewel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Presentations, classroom discussions, literature review, Research paper</td>
<td>Mike, Carol, Fang, Jewel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral English</td>
<td>Mock teaching, classroom discussions, reflection papers, online interactions</td>
<td>Misa, Carol, Mike, Fang, Jewel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Support Group</em>(met six times)</td>
<td>Informal discussions about doctoral education</td>
<td>Carol, Mike, Fang, Jewel, Diana, Song, Alexis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Dewey</td>
<td>Presentations, final paper about Dewey</td>
<td>Misa, Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Learning Theories</td>
<td>Critical Response papers, classroom discussions, research paper, presentations</td>
<td>Carol, Fang, Rice, Mike, Jewel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research methods</td>
<td>Critical response papers, presentations, class discussions</td>
<td>Carol, Fang, Mike, Jewel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Group (met twice)</td>
<td>Informal discussions, working on manuscript</td>
<td>Carol, Fang, Mike, Jewel, Song, Diana, Alexis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: First year core courses

As seen in the table above, the students were involved in a wide range of academic literacy practices in their first year. Among the most common literacy practices that the

---

* The names of the original courses have been changed due to confidentiality issues.
students engaged were writing response papers and literature reviews, participating in classroom discussions on the academic articles or books they read, and attending the support group meetings in which they reflected on their academic experiences. I will further discuss the types of academic literacies the students were involved in as well as the classroom dialogs in Chapter 5.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I provided some relevant background information concerning the research participants and described the contextual data that I collected through interview accounts and email interactions. Regarding the brief introductions to the six participants of this study, it is useful to bear in mind that these students, who could be considered as “newcomers” to the doctoral level academic community, had extensive experience in writing and speaking in various languages, including their mother tongue and English. Therefore, they brought with them the sociolinguistic and cultural knowledge of various communities and discourses they had previously affiliated with. Although they came from different linguistic and culture backgrounds, one common denominator they shared was a sense of academic culture shock they seem to have experienced as they moved through their doctoral courses; this is seen in the data reported in the next chapter. Most of these class activities were dialogic in nature, and through looking at the students’ dialogs and narratives, their academic struggles and learning experiences emerge. Here it is important to remember that the central unit of analysis in this study is not the separate individuals or their individual performances occurring in isolation, but rather a group of people acting and reacting to each other in various contexts while attempting to understand the tacit rules and conventions of academic discourse.
The next chapter, Chapter 5, provides an in-depth perspective on the six students’ collective academic socialization experiences and addresses the three research questions that this study investigated. In alignment with my research questions, I will attempt to demonstrate how different modes of participation and language use over one academic year contributed to the students’ academic socialization processes. Although these students followed similar trajectories (e.g., all of them desiring to gain their doctoral degrees and find a teaching job in the education field), they utilized different tools and modes of participation and disciplinary understanding of the academic discourse of their disciplinary fields during the one year covered in the study.
CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS

Introduction

Chapter 4 presented important contextual data that I collected through participant observations, ethnographic interviews, email interactions, and informal contact with the participants. The current chapter, on the other hand, examines the participants’ academic socialization processes and their negotiation of academic literacies through the use of data gathered via a microethnographic approach to discourse analysis of the participants’ language use inside and outside the classroom. The study’s findings are presented in response to the three research questions that guided the study. The overarching goal of these questions is to shed light on the academic socialization processes that multilingual students undergo in their first year.

There are seven central findings of this study with regard to the research questions, and those findings will be traced in the remainder of this chapter. The results of the data analysis that I will share in this chapter illustrate:

1. How the participants’ academic socialization processes included a series of ways of using language (i.e. questioning, problematizing, engaging with academic text, making an argument, discussing an academic issue) in academic classrooms.

2. How students displayed a complex view of their positionality as international multilingual students (i.e. being a foreigner could be used as a resource and as an obstacle in the given context)
3. How academic socialization occurred not only when the topic of the classroom conversation was closely aligned with the topics related to academic socialization (e.g. publishing, presenting), but also in classrooms where the content was different than the topic of academic socialization.

4. How the students established intertextual connections to written texts, other classroom contexts, and other media.

5. How the research participants appropriated academic discourse and created hybrid forms of writing.

6. How these multilingual doctoral students enhanced their understanding of academic practices and academic socialization through collaboration and a support group they established.

7. How community dialogs and collaboration in a doctoral support group empowered these first year doctoral students to be engaged practitioners and members of their academic communities.

The statements above are not meant to indicate that these results reflected the only academic processes that the participants underwent during one year; these are the findings that appeared most frequently throughout the data collected during the study. To address the research questions, this study focuses on representative, selected segments from a total of 75.4 hours of video recorded data from both inside and outside of classrooms as well as 21 hours of audio recorded student interviews and group interactions outside their doctoral classrooms. The criteria for the selection of data samples used are described in greater detail later in Chapter 3.
Definitions revisited

Before presenting the primary results of the study, it is important to restate the definitions of certain key terms by which this microethnographic study was informed, since these terms play a crucial role in theoretical framework that shapes this chapter.

*Academic Socialization*

As discussed in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, academic socialization, as operationalized in this study, is not only perceived as students acquiring the pre-given academic knowledge and skills (i.e., a product oriented approach), but in addition to this product oriented approach, this study also focused on the social and academic processes that the students underwent and the social interactions that they engaged in order to be socialized into the academic communities of their disciplines. This particular approach, which combines a focus on how the participants used language and other communication mediums to socialize into academic communities, perceives academic socialization as students’ negotiation of different literacy practices and as construction of new meanings and social identities. Within this understanding of academic socialization, the construction of meaning and identities is seen to occur in a communicative process which includes multiple actors, texts and contexts. During this co-construction of meaning and identities, the students were acculturated into a new culture with new sets of understanding while learning certain practices that play a dominant role in academia. Therefore, academic knowledge is not merely seen as a set of skills, but also as being socially embedded in deeper epistemological and institutional frameworks (Street and Lea, 2000).
What this study adds to what is already known about international students’ academic socialization is the combined attention to students’ oral interactions via microanalysis of classroom literacy events, and microanalysis of literacy events in peer support groups that students formed in the early days of their doctoral education. In this study, therefore, I also characterize the academic socialization of these international students as their involvement in what I call in this study an “academic culture of collaboration\textsuperscript{10}, which provided a crucial social network in which the students actively participated.

\textit{Cultural Models}

In relation to academic literacies, another term that is central to this study is cultural models. According to Gee and Green (1998), our words are connected to the cultural models we bring to a conversation, to a social context. Following the work of Spradley (1980), Geertz (1983) and Holland & Quinn (1987) they make the observation that:

Cultural models are “story lines,” families of connected images (like a mental movie) or (informal) “theories” shared by people belonging to specific social or cultural groups. Cultural models “explain,” relative to the standards (norms) of a particular social group, why words have the range of situated meanings they do for members and share members’ ability to construct new ones. They also serve as resources that members of a group can use to guide their actions and interpretations in new situations. (p.123)

This socially constructed meaning of culture models is especially important when it comes to exploring multilingual students’ socialization and academic literacies experiences, as the participants in this study brought multiple (and sometime conflicting)

\textsuperscript{10} Here, I define academic culture of collaboration as a set of social practices that include communicative and dialogic actions and interactions (Bakhtin, 1983) within an intercultural group of newcomers in a specific domain of academic discourse.
sets of understanding of what counts with respect to being a doctoral student, to participating in communities, and to writing. In this theoretical framework, cultural models are not seen as fixed and static; people appropriate them as they act and react to each other in social interactions. By closely analyzing students’ actions and interactions inside and outside of classrooms, researchers can understand how people interpret, appropriate, produce and construct meaning. That was a key focus of this study.

**FINDINGS**

The findings presented in the remainder of this chapter are taken from a microanalysis of a series of events and activities in which the students participated in Autumn 2006, Winter 2007, and Spring 2007 academic quarters as they progressed through their first year of doctoral education. The multiple processes that the doctoral students from a range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds went through, as will be seen later in the chapter, suggest that it is important to attribute their academic literacy socialization not only to their individual academic writing practices in a second language, but also to various oral and written interactions occurring among different actors in a range of contexts across the doctoral program.

The microethnographic analyses in this chapter are derived from (i) students’ in-class interactions in their initial contact with doctoral courses, (ii) students’ interactions in the support group, and (iii) students’ personal narratives about the type of negotiations they conducted with classroom assignments. Findings from these analyses are presented in alignment with the research questions they address.
RESEARCH QUESTION #1: What kinds of language processes do doctoral students display in their initial encounters with doctoral courses?

During the first year of their doctoral study, the participants engaged in a wide range of interactions, e.g., conversations with one another, with the professors, with senior students, with me and with various academic texts. As will be seen later in the chapter, these social interactions in their early courses were an important part of their academic socialization experience because they required them to take up, model, practice and even change certain established practices in academia.

Another important dimension of students’ initial experiences with academic socialization was when the subject of a classroom conversation was closely aligned with topics related to academic socialization (e.g. publishing and presenting scholarly work). Two of the classes in which I was a participant observant included issues closely related to this domain of academic socialization. The main focus of these classes revolved around topics such as publishing manuscripts, presenting papers at conferences, finding a job, and teaching (with an emphasis on doing so as nonnative English speaking professionals). Yet, as will be seen in the analysis of another course which the students took in their second quarter (Winter 2007) where the issues discussed did not revolve around academic socialization, the students also displayed a series of language uses and interactional behaviors that could help them become insiders within the academic communities of their disciplinary fields. It is particularly important to look at these initial courses, as these courses appeared to create a shared frame of reference to the rest of their academic experience in their first year. These important courses or, as this study calls them, their initial contact points within academe at a U.S. institution in the students’ first
year, gave them significant food for thought about many academically related issues that they were about to encounter, issues such as academic discourse, academic socialization, and writing academically.

The table below illustrates the number of observations conducted in each of these courses and the main topics discussed in these two courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times observed</th>
<th>Number of times video and audio recorded</th>
<th>Class Participants</th>
<th>Dominant Classroom Discourse</th>
<th>Central Class Topic</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course #1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>First and second year doctoral students</td>
<td>Student presentations</td>
<td>Issues about academic socialization</td>
<td>Reflection papers; Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>First, second and third year doctoral students</td>
<td>Teacher-led discussions</td>
<td>Issues about Language testing 11</td>
<td>Literature Review; Two research projects; Presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Number of documentation and the nature of courses

The findings that will be shown to answer Research Question 1 will focus on several microanalyses of transcripts which come from i) Course # 1, one of the very first courses that the students took from late September to mid December 2006, which specifically focused on issues related to academic socialization and ii) Course #2, a more

11 Although this main topic of the Testing class was related to issues such as Norm Referenced Testing and Criterion Reference Testing, through students request, the topic of the class occasionally diverted to issues related to academic socialization, such as writing literature reviews in research articles, taking candidacy exams or other crucial social events and rhetorical moves that students need to know were also covered sporadically.
conventional doctoral course that the students took from January to March 2007, which focused on the topic of language testing

Course #1:

*Engagement with (Interacting with) academic texts and classroom dialogue*

From the very first week of their first quarter of study, the students began to be exposed to the kinds of knowledge and the uses of language common in doctoral education, and began to learn different ways of making an argument and different ways of writing. From autumn 2006 to spring 2007, the students went through social and academic changes which resulted in different levels of learning and participation patterns, various degrees of investment in the disciplinary community, and different levels of socialization. One of the most common academic socialization processes observed in the students’ academic socialization experience was their level and quality of engagement in both classroom dialogue and academic texts, as will be seen in the series of classroom dialogues below.

The narrative descriptions of the first three transcripts that I will share in this section derive from one of the first core courses that the students took: *Issues in Language Teaching and Learning*, taught by Dr. Kay, a veteran professor of foreign language education with a particular interest in issues concerning nonnative English speaking professionals. The main objective of this course, as the syllabus stated, was “to explore critically some key issues in foreign and second language education, to provide opportunities for discussion and debate on recent second language publications, and to provide an opportunity to teach and lead a discussion on a given topic.” In alignment with the main objectives of the course, as will be demonstrated by the transcripts, most of the
classroom discourse revolved around student presentations and follow-up discussions on a wide range of topics regarding foreign and second language education and nonnative speaking professionals. According to the class syllabus, the evaluation of students’ performance was based on two oral presentations and one critique paper, including “summary, evaluation, and self-reflection” of an article they chose to analyze.

Narrative description of classroom dialogues

The first three transcripts below come from a videotaped class session where the students are discussing issues about publishing as a graduate student, the process of submitting a manuscript, and the hardships that academicians and graduate students undergo during their academic career. I selectively included transcriptions sharing critical moments— or illustrative events in the dialog in which the students were involved in different ways of using language and ways of engaging with the academic texts, which become important processes of academic socialization. These illustrative events were selected, first of all, as they had pedagogical and social influence on students’ academic socialization and second, these events build upon each other as students were acting as architects of their academic socialization. These illustrative events, critical events, as mentioned in Chapter 3, are “highly charged moments and episodes that have enormous consequences for personal change and development” (Woods, 1993, p.357).

In this section, I identified four modes of language use and engagement with the text: (i) collaborative talk, (ii) procedural display (Bloome, Puro & Theodorou, 1989), (iii) contesting talk, (iv) inquisitive talk. While in the first two transcripts, the students were engaging in collaborative talk, which also resonates with what Mercer (2002) calls “cumulative talk”, and trying to find a common ground between the authors of the text
and their own academic lives, later on they critically approached certain parts of the text by problematizing the authors’ arguments via “disputation talk” (Mercer, 2002), or what I call in this study, contesting talk. In the last transcript, on the other hand, we will see a different type of engagement with the text, one in which the students were being more inquisitive about what the text entails in relation to their academic lives.

Furthermore, as will be seen in the data, both students and the teacher of the class are involved in interpreting, extending, and contesting the meaning of the main text, which are important practices and processes of academic socialization and help create a cultural event that could be called doing a doctoral lesson. Seeing lessons as a set of cultural events that is constructed by interactional and academic procedures is called “procedural display” by Bloome, Puro and Theodorou (1989) in their analysis of eighth grade classroom lessons. In their analysis, they explain procedural display as “the cooperative display by teachers and students to each other of a set of interactional procedures that can be counted (interpreted) as doing a lesson by teachers, students, and members of the community” (p.266). In their framework, classrooms are seen as cultural institutions, which provide a “means of enculturation, gate-keeping, and knowledge transmission or production” (p.270), and “accomplishing lessons as a cultural event is related to sets of cultural meanings and values held for classroom education by the local education community”(p. 284). Similarly, in the classroom dialog below, both students and the teacher of the class are working collaboratively to complete certain academic tasks (in this case, a presentation and discussion of an academic book chapter). As mentioned earlier, the fact that the central topics of this class were closely aligned with issues regarding academic socialization and that students took this class in their very first
quarter at the doctoral level also provides an important initial contact frame\textsuperscript{12} for academic socialization. The issue of frame and how it plays out in understanding academic literacy socialization will be explored in greater detail after the analysis of two transcripts from Dr. Kay’s class.

A) Analysis of Transcript 1:

The video-recorded segment of the classroom discourse represented in Transcript 1 comes from a part of Fang’s class presentation on the assigned article, “Demystifying publishing: A collaborative exchange between graduate student and supervisor,” coauthored by Ena Lee and Bonny Norton (2003). This article is about a graduate student and her advisor, who are engaged in an informal conversation about publishing. The style of writing, which includes the co-authors dialoging with one another, is atypical compared to other chapters in the book in which it appears. More specifically, transcript #1 comes from the beginning of the class session, in which the students are engaged in collective interpretation of the text. This collective social interaction is mostly built on their shared frame of reference. The joint creation of knowledge generates a contextual understanding which leads to collective meaning making and social group membership.

\textsuperscript{12} The notion of frame that I refer here derives from Goffman’s and Tannen’s interpretation of framing analysis. Rooted in linguistic research on interaction, Frame Analysis has been used in various fields from media studies to education. Tannen (1993), for example uses the frame analysis to investigate cross-cultural communication breakdown. The Frame Analysis adopted by Tannen refers that “the messages are typically accompanied by internal or external cues which guide the receiver into adopting the appropriate frame within which they may be meaningfully interpreted” (p.271, cited in Malcom, 2001). The notion of frame is used to understand how cultural knowledge is traced in speech, and could also be a useful analysis in understanding academic socialization of second language speakers. I call this frame initial as the time of the frame has an important impact on multilingual students’ academic socialization in their first year.
Transcript 1: Publishing as a graduate student

1  Fang: I am presenting on chapter two, chapter three and chapter four and five today.
2  Before I begin, I want to ask you/// how many of you have published an article or a book?
3  Students://// [5 sec.]
4  John: That’s unanimous.
5  Students: [laughs]
6  Fang: Okay, [laughs], then this book is REALLY wise and useful.
7  Students: Yes [nods]
8  Fang: Actually, Chapter two is VERY interesting
9  and it is in the form of a dialogue between Ena and Bonny.
10  Ena is a graduate student like US,
11  and Bonny is an instructor, A PROFESOR.
12  OKAY, uhmm Ena asks a LOT OF questions
13  Students: Uhhh
14  Fang: And I think that those questions///
15  I don’t know how many of YOU felt that those were OUR questions as well.
16  Students: oh, YEAH definitely.
17  Fang: yeah, the first question is why graduate students have SO much fear and anxiety for writing for publication?
18  I don’t know if YOU have anxiety or fear?
19  Students: hmm hmm
20  Fang: yeah you do?
21  John: yeah, the fear of unknown.
22  It is one of the great three fears, right?
23  We’re scared to death///
24  And it is complicated
25  Fang: Yes, it is complicated
26  Diana: And, the fear of rejection.
27  Dr. Kay: hmm, yeah fear of rejection
28  Fang: And Bonny mentioned that when she was a graduate student, she also had fear and anxiety///
29  because she did not have an idea about where to start,
30  and she was VERY doubtful that anybody would be interested in what she wrote
31  So maybe WE also have those kinds of ideas and feelings?
32  Students: Yeah
33  Fang: so where to begin?

In transcript # 1, Fang begins her presentation by summarizing the main points of the text and then asking questions regarding publishing as a graduate student (line 1-2). As this
particular segment was taken from the fourth meeting of this class, most of the students were already familiar with the general flow of discourse in that course. Student presentations in this class were usually informal and followed a format in which the presenter gave a handout to the other students, summarized the main points of the assigned text, raised some questions, and then facilitated the ensuing class discussion. In this class, the professor, Dr. Kay, usually sat among the students, all of whom were seated around a rectangular wooden table. Mostly leaving the floor to the presenter and other students, Dr. Kay usually provided feedback when students needed an “expert” view on certain topics. Therefore, in this class, students usually functioned as the main “discourse guide” (Mercer, 1995) leading and facilitating the discussion.

In this segment, although most of the students seemed to engage in interpreting and discussing the text, Fang controls most of the discussion; therefore, her role can be considered as being a “primary speaker” (Shultz et. al, 1982) of the classroom discussion. I infer this from not only the directive questions she addresses to the class in lines such as 2, 22 and 31, but also other non-linguistic contextual cues, such as her change in intonation and proximity, and her body language. During the discussion, Fang controls the floor most of the time, while other students constantly backchannel (e.g. nods, uhmms, shifts in gaze) their interest and engagement in the topic: publishing as a graduate student.

In transcript #1, the discussion starts with Fang’s brief introduction to the text’s central theme, and her questions about whether the students had ever published an article. Initially, her question “did any of you publish an article or a book?”(line 2) does not receive any uptake. Rather than responding to this question immediately, the students
first monitor each other and appear to be non-responsive. The silence is then interrupted by John, who says “that is unanimous” (line 4), and his comment is followed by laughter from the other students, who seem to concur with his statement. This segment of the classroom discussion is interesting for various reasons. First, Fang’s attempts to connect the text to the students’ backgrounds could be interpreted as a textual strategy that aims to create a common ground for future discussions. Second, John’s and the other students’ responses to Fang’s question could imply that there is a collective formation of group identity at work, one which marks them as being novices who are not yet experienced in publishing.

Privileging the academic text, Fang’s utterances in Lines 6, 8 and 9 locate key knowledge in the academic texts and imply that the knowledge in the assigned text will sufficiently address the concerns (i.e., fears and anxieties) students have about publishing as graduate students. As will be seen in the next two transcripts, the location of knowledge shifts, and the students experience multiple use of language and interaction with the academic text as the classroom discussion evolves. Up until now, the general flow of the lesson, that is, Fang dominating and leading the classroom talk, implies that the students are acknowledging that the key knowledge is located in the text and in Fang’s representation of the text. By following this interactional procedure—accepting Fang as the primary speaker—they seem to successfully follow the presentation format commonly performed in the academic community.

Another language use and interactional procedure that the students seemed to display in this context is to attempt to connect the academic text to their lives. The linguistic evidence for this can be seen in the way Fang uses the inclusive pronouns
throughout the beginning of her presentation. From lines 10 to 15, Fang attempts to create a bond between the text and the audience by noting the similarities between what the authors of the text say and the students’ experiences. Through comments such as “She is a grad student like us” (line 10), and “those questions are our questions” (line 15), and through the intonation shift on pronouns such as “us” and “our”, Fang seems to closely identify with the authors of the text. As a linguistic strategy to create a link between the text and the students’ background, she constantly utilizes inclusive and collective pronouns in her talk. Furthermore, students’ brief uptakes such as “uhmm”, “yeah” on lines 13, 16, 18 as well as the contextual cues such as the head-nods demonstrate that they concur with Fang’s interpretation.

In lines 17 and 18, Fang asks why graduate students have fear and anxiety about publishing: “Why graduate students have so much anxiety and fear for writing for publication?” and “I don’t know if YOU have anxiety and fear?” A slightly different version of this question is also asked by Ena Lee- one of the authors in the text: “What is it about publishing that causes so much anxiety and panic in students?”(p.45). Fang takes this question from the text in order to initiate a classroom discussion and to connect the text to students’ backgrounds. However, her question in line 17 does not receive a response. Therefore, in line 18, Fang attempts to prompt some discussion by re-phrasing the question in lines 18 and 20 (“I don’t know if YOU have anxiety or fear?,” yes you do?). Although she doesn’t ask a direct question here, the contextual cues such as the rising intonation in line 18 as well as 20 signal the appearance of a question. The students at first do not respond to Fang’s question. A reason why they did not give a specific response here might be that they were not clear if Fang was directing a literal question to
the class. Therefore, it is possible that by not taking Fang’s utterances as a question, they intended to move the class forward by, as Bloome et. al state, “displaying to each other interactional procedures that count as accomplishing the lesson as a cultural event” (Bloome, Puro & Theodorou, 1989, p. 283). On the other hand, Fang’s second attempt to prompt a classroom dialog can be seen in line 20. By looking at the students and asking “yes, you do?” in line 20, she was seeking an answer from her classmates. At this point of Fang’s presentation, John responds to her question (line 21-24). Both John and the other students seem to agree that they also have fear and anxiety about publishing. The claim that John makes in line 21(yeah, the fear of ‘unknown’) is an interesting one, as he is connecting the text with a type of common knowledge. One of the causes of this anxiety, according to John, is the fear of the “unknown,” which is one of the “three great fears” (line 22). Agreeing with John, Diana adds that another source of fear and anxiety in publishing is “the fear of rejection” (line 23).

So far, both Diana and Fang have acknowledged John’s claims. Up until now in the classroom discussion, Fang, Diana, and John are engaged in the text in a cumulative way, not challenging each others’ claims and arguments, but agreeing, building on and extending their claims. Also, they are collectively engaging in meaning making. By repeating and confirming each others’ ideas and feelings, they “build positively but uncritically on what others have said” (Mercer, 2004 p. 146). Furthermore, the interactional features as well as the nonverbal cues that the students displayed to each other show that they were also engaged in procedural display, including common cultural practices regarding “doing a graduate-level lesson.”

B) Analysis of Transcript 2:
Interpreting and reproducing

The next transcript (Transcript #2), which is the continuation of Fang’s presentation, will show how Fang is making explicit connections to the text while initiating fewer classroom dialogues. Here, we will also see how knowledge is both located in texts and in students’ shared points of reference. In this example of engaging in text and classroom discussions, rather than participating verbally, students are listening, understanding and acknowledging Fang’s claims only by backchannelling, without actively contributing to her talk. The main claim that Fang is making in the next segment of the discussion is that graduate students should view their course work as a form of access to different scholarly communities and their term papers as possible future publications. This is a claim which was also made by one of the co-authors of the main text being discussed. Through integrating words from the written text into her presentation, Fang is establishing various intertextual links to the chapter on which she is giving a presentation. The underlined message units in the next transcript indicate the words and phrases that Fang directly borrows from the text and incorporates into her presentation.

Transcript 2: Seeing courses as a window to different scholarly community

34   **Fang:** So where to begin?
35   Where can we start?
36   We can begin with an idea, a question and a desire to understand
37   and we should regard writing for publishing as a means of self reflection.
38   So try to do that, ok?
39   **Students:** [no response]
40   **Fang:** Is it difficult?
41   Self-reflection.
42   We reflect on our prior experiences and we share with other people.
43   **Students:** yes, yes [nods]
44   **Fang:** So now every quarter we need to write term papers.
45   **Students:** Uhhhmm[nods]
Fang: Okay, Shall we write it just as a term paper or shall we have this publication in mind?

Students: [nods]

Fang: I think we should write these term papers publication in mind/

So, what is the major starting point?

Students: [no expression]

Fang: I think we should think each of our courses as a WINDOW to different scholarly community.

So, for instance, in Brown’s course we have a SPECIFIC community

and in this course we have this TEACHING profession for second and foreign languages, that community

Students + Dr. Kay: yeah [nods]

Fang: And while in White’s class we have another group of scholarly community.

We just think that we are MEMBERS of that community

and we think what kind of contribution we can make to this that community.

Okay?

Students: [nods]

Fang: We can have OUR voices in those communities,

Students: [nods]

Fang: so if we think that perspective, probably it might be EASIER for us to write our term papers with a WIDER audience in our mind,

Students: [nods]

Fang: NOT only for our professors.

Students + Dr. Kay: [nods]

Fang: because NOW when we write our term papers,

we think about OUR professor

Dr. Kay: Right.

Students: [laughs]

Fang: Okay. If professors like it and gives a good mark

that is ENOUGH

BUT when we think of a WIDER audience,

what kind of contribution WE can make to such community

then I think that would me EASIER and more meaningful to write.

Students: Yeah [nods]

Fang: And than, are there any differences between writing a term paper and writing a publishable article?

Bonny said to some extent they are not very different.

I THINK there is a huge difference///

Basically, the difference is how much theoretical background you need to think, right?

Students: [no response]

Dr. Kay: [looks at the ceiling, thinking]

Fang: if we write for professors,

we assume that the professors already have some theoretical background,
In this segment, Fang continues her presentation by giving practical ideas for writing for publication. From lines 34 to 41, she underlines the importance of “self-reflection” as a writing genre in which one “reflects on prior experiences” and “shares with others.” By posing the question “is it difficult?” (line 39) with an emphatic intonation, she seems to make a reference to earlier class discussions, possibly emphasizing that writing for publication should not necessarily generate “fear or anxiety” (transcript #1) because writing “self-reflective” papers might not be a difficult task. She continues to elaborate on what the authors think about self-reflective writing. She tries to prompt student response related to the text they all read by posing yes/no questions in lines 39, 40 and 46; however, she does not receive many uptakes. Although the students do not respond to Fang’s interpretation of text, their nonverbal behaviors (e.g. nods and eye-gazes) and backchanelling suggest that they are attentive and on the same page with Fang.

During her presentation, Fang also establishes various intertextual links to the writer text. In line 43--parallel with the order of ideas in the text--Fang moves to another topic: writing publishable term papers. In this part of her presentation, she emphasizes the importance of seeing classrooms “as windows to different scholarly communities” (line 48). Taking this sentence directly from the text, Fang incorporates it into her presentation. Additionally, based on the perspective of seeing courses as “windows to scholarly communities”, she also makes intercontextual connections to students’ shared
points of reference. In other words, she makes explicit references to the courses the students collectively took during the quarter. Concurring with the authors’ idea that students should “think of themselves as members of larger scholarly communities” (p.21) in their courses, she tells her classmates that she also views their courses as different scholarly communities with different focuses. From lines 50 to 56, she makes explicit intercontextual links to other courses and explains how doctoral students should see themselves as members of those scholarly communities in which they can make “contributions” and “have voices.” Similar to the linguistic evidence shown in the previous transcript, Fang uses many collective pronouns. She offers specific examples of courses that the students were taking at that time. From line 55-62, she says: “in White’s class WE have another group of scholarly community, “We just think that WE are MEMBERS of that community” and “WE think what kind of contribution WE can make to this that community”. The underlined parts in the above transcripts illustrate the point that Fang uses the same language as the authors of the academic text on which she is doing her presentation.

Between lines 57-59, Fang claims that writing term papers would be easier and more meaningful if students perceive their role as members of scholarly communities, and goes on to recommend that they should not only think of professors’ expectations when writing a term paper. At this point, although the students do not respond directly to Fang, it is clear from their nonverbal behavior that they, as well as Dr. Kay, recognize and acknowledge Fang’s points. Between lines 66 and 75, Fang repeats her view that they should not only write term papers for professors, but also for a community of scholars. The intonation in her utterances seems to encourage the students to view themselves as
members of larger communities, i.e., beyond the classroom context. In this particular community, however, Fang says there are some differences between writing term papers and publishable articles (line 68). Here, she is challenging the author who wrote “to some extent, writing a term paper is not very different from writing for publication” (p.22). In line 69, she signals that she is taking a different stance from the author, saying that “I think there is a HUGE difference.” To support her claim and reasoning (That there is a “HUGE difference” between writing a term paper and writing for publication”), Fang asserts that one does not need to include much theoretical framework in term papers because one tends to write for professors who already know the theoretical background. On the other hand, she claims, one needs to include more theoretical framework in a journal article (line 78-79 and Line 82-85). The only uptake to her claims comes from Dr. Kay, who says that how much theoretical framework one will include in a paper also depends on the research questions (line 86). It could be that Dr. Kay wanted to use this as a teaching moment and attempted to redirect the conversation by elaborating on Fang’s claims about the differences between writing term papers and a journal article. However, Fang redirected the conversation and proceeded with a new topic: publishing in “obscure journals.”

Compared to transcript # 1, one can see less occurrence of cumulative talk in transcript #2. According to Mercer (2004), cumulative talk is a kind of talk in which “speakers build positively, but uncritically on what the others have said. Partners use talk to construct a ‘common knowledge’ by accumulation” (p.146). The assigned text becomes the center of the classroom dialog, and the interpretation of the text was mostly done by Fang. In her presentation, she was not only eliciting information from the text
that she thought was most relevant and urgent for the audience, but she was also engaged in a certain degree of contesting the selected text. What appears to have occurred in the first half of the transcript is that Fang establishes links to a wide range of texts and contexts, including the main text, students’ recollections about other classrooms, and her personal experiences in writing term papers. In doing so, she extends the ideas and arguments in the main text by creating new ones.

C) Analysis of Transcript 3:

Expanding and negotiating

The next transcript is a continuation of the topic of publishing. While Fang is still presenting on the same text, the students seem to be more engaged in the classroom talk in which they are conversing about publishing in “obscure journals”. Before this discussion, Dr. Kay mentioned the names and focus areas of a few important journals in the education field and gave advice about how to choose appropriate journals to send one’s manuscript. Dr. Kay emphasizes in her comments that one of the most important elements in this process is that students should carefully choose journals that specifically match with their research interests. The discussion in transcript# 3 is an extension of the discussion on the type of journals students could send their manuscripts. Unlike previous classroom discussion, the students seem to be more participatory and engaged in the topic, expanding the meaning of the main text and asking questions.

Transcript 3: Publishing in ‘obscure’ journals

89  **Fang:** The next question is VERY interesting.
90  Is it bad to publish in OBSCURE journals?
91  **Students:** [laughs]
92  **Fang:** I can write in my own language and send it to a small journal in my country
and that could be a publication, right?

Students: [laughs]

Fang: Some students might feel that that is an obscure journal, but Bonny says that NO journal is obscure.

This journal might be obscure for YOU but they are very CENTRAL to someone else.

So this actually made me think that actually I am very interested in foreign language teachers in china,

And I have to look for those obscure journals

Students: [laughs]

Fang: because I want those teachers read what I write

Students: Yeah.

Dr. Kay: Ummm.

Fang: So, intentionally I chose those obscure journals because those people are my audience.

John: Ummm [nods]

Carol: but generally speaking do you think those journals are easier to publish?

I mean the acceptance rate?

Fang: I don’t know.

Carol: Compared to the other international journals?

Fang: I would think so

Mike: Coming from a U.S. university and a grad student From [the name of the university],

I think you would have a higher chance to be accepted. I would say

Fang: Right right,

but not because you are studying abroad,

but because you learning a new perspective and you bring a lot of good experiences.

I don’t know. Maybe they would feel that the quality is better.

Yes, but not only because you are studying abroad.

Carol: I have one question for Dr. Kay,

say if we look for a job in the States, does it help to have a publication in such journals?

Dr. Kay: yes, absolutely, because when we look at applicants’ vita and we see zero publications,

and somebody with two or three publication///

even if those publication is in newsletters or in non refereed articles, it is not good///even those publications in newsletters least we see that this person has tried to publish,

You can see that somebody is working on articles.

so that’s much better than zero or nothing [laughs]
In transcript 3, the classroom discussion about publishing continues, and the students begin to ask more specific questions, such as about the validity of online journals and the type of submissions they can make. By this time in the classroom talk, the students seem to be more engaged in the text: providing more uptakes to each others’ responses, and asking questions to each other and to Dr. Kay to better understand the publishing process.

Transcript # 3 begins with Fang’s question, “Is it bad to publish in obscure journals?” Although she is asking a question, she does not seem to elicit the correct or expected answer, as she is immediately answering her own question. Meanwhile, the students do not verbally follow up her question with a specific response; instead, they backchannel her question with their nods and laughs, illustrating that they acknowledge and recognize the question Fang asks. Part of what is significant here is not only the content of the discussion (which is directly related to academic socialization), but also the way the classroom talk is structured. As Bloome, Puro & Theodorou (1989) claim, in a classroom both the students and the teacher cooperatively use the interactional strategies “to move through the lesson rather than substantive engagement in some academic content” (p. 282). Similarly, the students’ nonresponsiveness at the beginning of this classroom segment could be interpreted as their attempts to move through the lesson without interrupting the flow of the presenter’s discourse.

Between lines 95 and 99, Fang follows up on her own question, “is it bad to publish in OBSCURE journals?” Without waiting for much response from the students, in alignment with the main text’s claims, she states that those so-called obscure journals could be “central to someone else” (line 97). In line 98, she gives a personal example and says that “she is very interested in foreign language teachers in China,” and that the only
way to reach that audience is to “look for those obscure journals” (line 99). In line 104, she explicitly emphasizes the importance of audience in writing and restates her belief that students should target those so-called obscure journals, depending on what and for whom they want to write. Here, she is not only emphasizing an important claim that she read in the assigned text, but she is also giving a concrete example from her own background. In line 106, Carol disrupts the general flow (Fang dominating the classroom talk) and directs a question to the class: “Generally speaking, do you think those journals are easier to publish?” Carol seems to shift the discussion from the issue of audience to the issue of access. Both Fang and Mike seem to agree that there is a better chance of being accepted by low stakes journals compared to other international journals. They, however, seem to disagree about the reason for this acceptance. Mike emphasizes the importance of the name of the institution where they are studying, and seems to think that studying abroad in a Western university could bring more legitimacy into one’s writing, while Fang states that what is more important than that is that one would bring multiple perspectives (lines 111-118). Seemingly satisfied by those answers, Carol asks another question which ties the issue of publishing in “obscure journals” to the academic job search in the United States. However, this time she only directs the question to Dr. Kay (119-120) and thus seeks an answer from a more authoritative figure in the class. Her question, “if we look for a job in the States, does it help to have a publication in such journals?”, references the social implications related to publishing and projects possible advantages that they may gain if students publish in an academic journal. Dr. Kay’s response between lines 121-125 affirms the importance of publication not only as a way
to contribute to a scholarly community but also as a way to find a job in the United States.

In this last transcript, the students are attempting to link the information learned from the text and from Fang’s remarks to their own lives and backgrounds. As Carol commented in one of the support group meetings after this class, “The conversations in this class brought the connection between the academia and the reality.” (2/10/2007, Support Group)

**Conclusions from Course #1**

As shown through the classroom dialogues, the topics covered so far in this particular classroom discussion included the importance of being part of a scholarly community, the importance of publishing in different venues, the importance of writing publishable term papers, and how the theoretical framework as well as research questions shape a research-based manuscript and a research process. The occurrence of these topics signifies, collectively, the first instances in which the students had a chance to explore and discuss such relevant issues. How the students responded the topics in Dr. Kay’s course suggests that multilingual students are in search of insight into the tacit rules of the academic community they are about to enter. Dr. Kay’s course thus set up the frame for the students’ academic literacy socialization.

Bennett Berger says in his forward to Goffman’s (1986) oft-cited book, *Frame Analysis*, that “what goes on in interaction is governed by usually unstated rules or principles more or less implicitly the character of some larger, though perhaps invisible, entity “within” which the interaction occurs” (p.xiii). Frame Analysis, as will be explored again in the next chapter, provides an important means for analyzing the academic
socialization of multilingual students. For instance, besides students’ own attempts to unravel academic socialization, it could also be the case that academic socialization is framed by the educational institution, that is, the university itself. In other words, the existence of such a reflective course in the curriculum and the fact that the course is offered in the first quarter of students’ doctoral study rather than later in the academic year shows how education is connected to important ways of giving access to knowledge. Students’ academic socialization in this initial frame of contact seemed to benefit them in terms of understanding the “setting” of academic socialization in a U.S. institution, as it has positive repercussions such as the support group that the students established after this course. The availability of such a course, especially in the students’ first quarter of study, raises the question: “What would have happened if the students did not have this framework for academic socialization?”

In addition, the analysis in this section not only demonstrates that these students employed different types of participation patterns and language uses as the class session evolved, but also shows that the students underwent different levels of engagement with the text (i.e., textualizing experiences). As seen earlier, the students experienced different ways of doing a doctoral lesson: listening to the presenter, connecting the academic text to real life, giving examples, asking questions, and responding to each other in a way that is acceptable in an academic classroom community. For example, in transcripts 1 and 2, one could see Fang’s deliberate attempts to connect the written text to her and students’ individual experiences as well as other classroom members’ shared knowledge. Through Fang’s presentation about writing and publishing as a graduate student, the students were collectively engaged in a joint meaning-making process: interpreting, extending,
connecting and multiplying various claims presented in the text. Moreover, all three transcripts demonstrate that the students acted as collaborators attempting to make meaning from the text, as their shared understandings of the text evolved through various modes of dialog. Furthermore, the students’ beliefs and knowledge about publishing seemed to increase during the process of conversing, interpreting the text, and listening to Dr. Kay’s experiences related to it.

The use of dialogue in this context constituted an important part of the students’ academic socialization also in relation to their positionality. The types of interactions the students had among each other and with the text also positioned them in a number of ways. For instance, as seen in transcript # 3, Fang saw being an international doctoral student as an advantage, as one can write in journals in his or her second language and can bring “new perspectives” (line 112). Their positioning as resourceful multilingual writers and researchers seemed to shift throughout their first year, as will be seen later in this chapter. Additionally, it seems like Dr. Kay's course addressed various needs they had as international multilingual doctoral students, whereas more conventional doctoral courses did not address this in an explicit manner. In other words, this course--as one of the earliest course in their doctoral program-- had an empowering effect on them, one which carried over into various contexts in their first year experience, such as the desire to build a support group and to continue the bond that was created in the course. It also encouraged them to engage in various spoken and written interactions that seemed to extend the effect that Dr. Kay’s course created.

The findings from these classroom dialogues could also be triangulated with the students’ oral narratives about taking such a course, one which was directly about
students’ academic socialization into academic communities and which was quite
different than their other doctoral courses. Many students indicated that they felt accepted
and comfortable in this course, because it included various topics that were close to their
hearts. Also, the fact that there were many other international students who were at the
early stages of their doctoral degree also created a non-threatening environment for the
students and put them at ease. As Mike expressed in an interview at the end of the
Autumn quarter:

In his class, I enjoy talking about my experiences, and listening to somebody else’s
experiences. I can go with the flow. Reading load is not too bad too. Sometime on
the other hand in Dr. Brown’s course even if I read the whole book, I couldn’t
understand what is going on, I mean the discussions. Oh, I think one of the reasons
is the students. In Dr. Kay’s class most of the students are first year students like
me, so we are pretty much even. I think it is psychological. Whereas in Dr. Brown’s
class, some are second year or even third year students from different fields. I feel
like I don’t have enough background knowledge, as I wish I could give/// that, and
also the obscene amount of readings that we have in that class made it difficult for
me (Interview, 11.20.2006).

Similarly, Fang’s account also illustrates the empowering effect of the classroom
dialogues of this particular class. According to Fang, the empowering effect of this
classroom derives from the background of the other members of the class and the
teacher’s teaching style. Fang, in one of our interviews, expressed this in an upbeat
manner:

In this class people share a lot. For instance, Diana and John/// They give me
different perspective. For example, John /// he is a man and he is American AND
he studies Arabic. This class is like// we are looking at various educational issues,
but they are very emotional. I don’t feel like it is an academic class sometime///
We share stories, we comfort each other. Also, Dr. Kay is sitting next to us all the
time/// it is like she is with the same level with us. She lets US talk. She is also
very good at using humor and strategies to make everybody at ease (Interview,
11.30.2006).
Similar to Fang, Jewel also commented on the impact of the class professor and how she thought her approach helped her to learn the materials and feel physically and emotionally “comfortable”.

I feel comfortable in this class. First of all, she [Dr. Kay] is a very very very nice person. I think she is very gentle and elegant, and I think that affects us. You know, she has this calmness. We do yoga in classes, we do these relaxing techniques, I think it is interesting. I mean her approach. She asks us to study something about let’s say publishing and present it later on. That is how we learn in her classes// we are reproducing things in order to comprehend them.”

(Interview, 12-2-2006)

From these interview accounts, we can see that Fang, Mike and Jewel felt a special attachment and closeness to this course: its participants as well the instructor of the class. While some articulated that the students’ academic level in the class (i.e. their being first or second doctoral students) had an important impact on how much they felt they could contribute to the class discussion, others put more emphasis on the instructor’s general approach to the students and her teaching methods.

Course #2:

The course mentioned above was not a regular doctoral course, as the topics covered in the class were mostly in alignment with the academic socialization processes that scholars undergo during their academic career. The interactions in the class heavily involved issues that revolve around important practices and processes of academic communities in American universities. Although the three segments shared above were typical of the classroom interaction of that class, this course had a different emphasis compared to the other courses in the department. However, the academic socialization processes that the students engaged in that course were also observed in a class in which the class content was not related to the issues about academia, that is, Course 2. In order
to illustrate how the students interacted in a more typical doctoral classroom, I will share two classroom dialogues that come from this course that the students took between January and March 2007 (i.e., in their second quarter of doctoral study). Another reason to compare and contrast the students’ initial frame of contact within two different courses is that discourse style and language use is a significant marker of academic socialization. Therefore, it is useful to illustrate the language processes that students display in two different classes. Below is an analysis of two classroom dialogues from Course # 2, which followed a more traditional and teacher-centered interaction and was taught by Dr. Hall, another veteran professor of foreign language education.

D) Analysis of Transcript 4:

*Initiation Response and Evaluation/Follow-up*

One of the findings for research question 1, as illustrated in the analysis of the first three classroom dialogues from Dr. Kay’s class, is that the participants’ academic socialization processes included a wide range of interactions and communicative practices, in which they experienced different ways of participating in a doctoral classroom community and displayed different ways of engaging with one another and with the academic text. One of the other classes in which students engaged in various interactional processes was Course 2, the *Testing* course. Focusing on the issue of language testing, this class was one of the courses that the students had to take in order to complete their coursework requirements within their program. The main objective of the testing class was to explore significant issues in the field of testing. More specifically, the class focused on two primary modes of testing: norm-referenced (NRT) and criterion-referenced testing (CRT). As the syllabus suggested, the students were expected to leave
the course with a “more developed understanding of their own beliefs regarding approaches to test design as well as key issues in testing, particularly in the realm of the ethics of testing.” In this course, the students read two assigned books on language testing and reviewed the national Pre K-12 English Language Proficiency Standards for English as a Second Language students in relation to the language testing world explored. Some of the major assignments of the class were to design a norm referenced and a criterion referenced test, in which students were asked to develop a scenario, rationale and plan for their language test that they would design for a course to develop English learners’ academic language proficiency. The students were also asked to write a literature review paper exploring some key issues and discussions on a topic related to language testing. Additionally, students had a present on a test that they designed themselves using the main concepts and ideas used in this class.

Narrative description of classroom dialogues

The two classroom dialogues below come from a class session that took place on March, 8th 2007. In the first dialogue, Dr. Hall, the instructor of the class, is directing a question to the class, whereas in the second dialogue the students and Dr. Hall are discussing some of the principles of CRT and NRT and the way that these tests are executed in different parts of the world. As the Testing class unfolded over 10 weeks, the students recognized the classroom patterns that they were encouraged to practice in this class. Here, unlike Dr. Kay’s class, where students mostly dominated the classroom talk, Dr. Hall’s Testing class followed a more traditional classroom structure, where the instructor was the “primary speaker” of the class. Although the participation structures and the interactions varied across time, the discourse traffic in this class mostly followed
an IRE and IRF sequence, which involves initiation, response and evaluation or a follow-
up. As Cazden (1988) states, the IRE sequence is “the most common pattern of classroom
discourse at all grade levels” (p.29). The IRE sequence, which was not very prevalent in
Course 1, was observed in this doctoral course

Similar to most teacher-led classrooms in students’ first year courses, the
instructor of the class usually initiated the classroom discussion in various ways (e.g.
asking direct questions, addressing imperatives etc.). The transcript below is an example
of an IRE sequence

**Transcript 5: What is task representation?**

1  **Dr. Hall:** I If I were assessing students’ listening skills, for example
2  I would be focusing A LOT on [writes on the board]//
3  On this notion of TASK REPRESENTATION
4  Did WE talk about this? I cannot remember now.
5  **Students:** YES, YES. We did.
6  **Dr. Hall:** Do you remember what it is?
7  What is TASK REPRESENTATION?
8  **Carol:** Uhm. Each student might have different interpretation
9  according to their///uhmm///different frameworks, ideas///
10  **Students:** YES, YES
11  **Dr. Hall:** Yes, yes, good [and he continues to elaborate on this notion]

The classroom interaction above begins by a series of informational questions directed by
Dr. Hall. First, he asks students’ recollections of whether they reviewed the notion of
“task representation” (Line 4) before in the class. After receiving an approval from the
students (line 5), he asks for the definition of the notion. The instructor’s initiation is
followed by Carol’s reply, which was then followed by the instructor’s evaluation. Carol
in line 6 individually nominates herself to answer the instructor’s question, rather than
waiting to be called on, as Carol and the other students had already acquired the expected
discourse pattern in this class. It is also important to point out that the nature of this
course in particular is significantly different than Dr. Kay’s by the core topics covered in the class. While Dr. Hall’s course was more about a traditional kind of academic content, Dr. Kay’s was about topics more directly relevant to the students’ lives as doctoral students. Thus, the nature of class sessions has an important impact on how students interact with one another and with the instructor of the class.

Although the IRE sequence was observed frequently in this course, the classroom discourse did not always follow a distinct IRE sequence. Instead, the students and the teacher were also involved in an argumentative form of discussion, in which the students presented logical arguments and then agreed and disagreed with each other.

E) Analysis of Transcript 6:

*Argumentative Discourse*

In this segment of the classroom discussion, Dr. Hall and the students are in the midst of discussing the varying testing practices in different countries and the fairness of standardized testing, such as the NRT. Students gave varying responses to the question asked by the instructor of the class. In this instance, the classroom discourse does not follow a clean IRE pattern. Different from the previous dialogue, where Dr. Hall sought specific pieces of information, the next segment is an example of an argumentative discourse, where the students are identifying their positions in response to the question raised by Dr. Hall. The discourse style of the below segment is representative of the classroom discussions over the duration of this entire course, which was approximately 10 weeks.
Dr. Hall: When you go to Columbus Public Schools, you see very different worlds.

All the kids are expected to perform the same way on the tests.

Let’s raise the question then.

You know like No Child Left Behind or other situations in other parts of the world///

Is it POSSIBLE for a norm referenced test to operate FAIRLY when the conditions are NOT the same?

Or is there someway to overcome that?

OR Is that simply possible?

Diana: How can you expect that everybody can do the same

Because this is what we were saying about EQUAL opportunities for everybody

How can you define equal opportunities for everybody when we ALL discuss that it is not equal

Somebody who does not learn the same way cannot be tested in the same way.

Somebody who does NOT have the same conditions in their learning shouldn’t be tested in the SAME way

Dr. Hall: So are you saying then it is pointless to have NRT?

Diana: No. BUT

Fang: NO, NO [OVERLAP]

Diana: Well, I think it has to be a two way communication.

Because this way is only one way.

Fang: No, No. I think it is a myth.

We cannot find completely A HUNDERED percent fairness in the world.

But, can you give another alternative?

Diana: Yes, yes

Fang: There has been a lot of discussion in China/// saying that the entrance examination should be eliminated.

But people ask: can YOU give another alternative which is better that this one?

A lot of people CANNOT answer this question.

If you do not have an ALTERNATIVE, then how can you make sure that it is FAIR.

For example, if it is all CRT, how can you make sure that it is more fair than the NRT.

Dr. Hall: Uhmm. Yeah, right, So///

Jewel: So, the examinations in china are [Undecipherable]

So you have a syllabus that says you have to know these things for each subject so that you can pass the entrance examination?

Fang: Actually in china it is a little bit complicated.

Actually all schools have the SAME textbooks.

So basically they have the SAME syllabus.

Jewel: YES, Okay.

Fang: But of course, different places, they have like
///for example/// One school might have wireless internet///

But other schools might be very POOR

Some schools do not even have TABLE or CHAIRS.

Carol: Or BOOKS!

Fang: Or books, yeah.

BUT/// at least those poor kids from poor areas///at least they have one CHANCE to go to the SAME test and complete with others.

If we don’t have those tests then those kids have no chance at all to go to a university.

Jewel: So as you explain it/// it is not like it is completely norm reference?

Or is it?

Diana: Even the norm reference tests have some skills that student need to learn

It is not completely that///it is not based on that grade level only, it is more like//////general skills that they take.

Fang: Yeah, but there IS content.

I actually asked this question before to Dr. Hall before. Is the university examination in China a norm reference test or criterion reference?

Dr. Hall: This is an interesting situation. Because, of course, there is syllabus and there are standard materials. I would say that///first of all something we haven’t talked about yet in this discussion is one of the most important aspects of testing…..that is the group that represents the norm [Continues to answer Fang’s question and gives more information about NRT] (3/8/2007)

Following up on an earlier classroom discussion and the discussion on the assigned course text on the politics of testing (The Power of Tests, by Elena Shohamy), this segment starts with a series of questions directed by Dr. Hall (lines 5-7). The questions initiate a debate regarding the way that NRTs function when the learning conditions are different from those related to the norming population. To answer Dr. Hall’s question, Diana takes the floor and responds to the question (lines 8 -12). Her response refers back to the previous class discussion, which was on the limitations of the No Child Left Behind Policy, and also the previously mentioned textbook. By stating her responses with a series of rhetorical question (e.g. How can you say that everybody can do the same; how can you say…) and by making several truth claims about the test takers ( e.g. Somebody who does not lean the same way cannot be tested in the same way), Diana
takes an obvious stance on the fairness of NRT—that it does not create a fair testing environment. Referring back to the previous class discussions, she claims that it is unfair to give standardized tests when the learning practices are not the same for everybody, and when the students are not given the same opportunities for education. Here, Diana’s reasoning could be based on the example that Dr. Hall gives about public schools, or the previous discussion on the use of standardized tests around the world. At this point, Dr. Hall moves the discussion forward. His question “Do you mean NRT is not?” in line 13 asks Diana to expand and justify her ideas. However, before Diana clarifies her thoughts and answers Dr. Hall’s question, Fang takes the floor to react both Diana’s and Dr. Hall’s utterances. Starting from line 18, she gives an elaboration on Diana’s ideas and shares some concrete examples from China’s education system, where she, in fact, seems to disagree with Diana’s claims. However, her response could also be interpreted neither as an agreement nor a disagreement, but rather a way of challenging Diana’s appeal to emotions and of exploring rational answers to the question. In lines 22-26, she claims that there needs to be an alternative form of testing before we totally reject NRT. Due to the university examination system in China, although she says it is not the perfect model, at least it gives students, even from poor socioeconomic backgrounds, a chance to succeed.

So far in the discussion, the students are making claims and trying to back them up with the use of evidence. Beginning with line 30, the rest of the classroom dialogue seems to revolve around the topic of the university examination in China. None of the students seem to provide a counter argument to Fang’s remarks, but Jewel asks some clarification questions (lines 28-29). Even though Fang explains the situation in China, Jewel’s response, in lines 42 and 43, suggests that it was still unclear to her how the
Chinese university exams could be identified as norm-referenced tests. The students begin talking with one another at this point. After they discuss back and forth about whether the Chinese university examination is a type of NRT, Fang directs the question to Dr. Hall: “Is the university examination in China a norm referenced test?” Her question seems to end the argumentative dialog among the students. This interactional move could also suggest that Fang is asking for an expert answer to clarify the issue. From line 48 on, Dr. Hall uses this as a teaching moment and gives some more information about the NRT and how the university testing system in China could be evaluated from the NRT framework. While the students take various interactional roles during this three minute long discussion, Dr. Hall assumed a role as both information provider and inquirer.

Although on the surface level the classroom discussion follows an I-R-F format, Dr. Hall’s questions in line 5, 6, 7 and line 13 seem to encourage the students to validate their point of views about the Norm Referenced Testing and its fairness in education. In response to Dr. Hall’s questions, the students act and react to each other as they discuss the equality of standardized tests around the world. In the discussion, the students support their claims with the use of evidence based on their own personal experiences. Similar to Dr. Kay’s class, we see that these multilingual students tend to use the shared frame of reference to strengthen their argument. For instance, Fang’s warrant that NRT should not be eliminated is backed up with the use of an example of the university entrance examination in China as a response to Diana’s critique of Norm Referenced Testing.

Overall, the discourse style displayed in this class is at variance with the ones displayed in Dr. Kay’s class. While the students interacted with collaborative talk in Dr. Kay’s
class, they made use of claims and warrants to make reasonable arguments in response to Dr. Hall’s initial question.

**Conclusion for Course # 2:**

Various studies on classroom literacy events reveal that the academic purpose of a lesson could be different than what students realize (Bloome, 1983; 1986). In the segments from Dr. Hall’s course, the aim of the course seems to be to encourage students to think about the pedagogical aspects of NRT. The students, on the other hand, seem to focus on the authoritative power of the test and the kinds of alternatives that could be created in lieu of this test when the testing situations do not create democratic testing practices. There are several interesting features of the students’ academic socialization in this segment. First, the students utilized different forms of argument, talk, and interaction than they did in Dr. Kay’s course. They took turns, asked questions, responded to each other’s questions, disagreed and agreed with one another, and finally appealed to the instructor when they were unable to resolve the issues about the use of NRT. Although the class dialogue was not in alignment with issues directly associated with students’ immediate academic socializations (as opposed to course # 1), the students were engaged in various classroom practices and behaviors that seemed to help them become insiders of the doctoral community. That is, they were performing the kinds of discourse acts expected of students in conventional doctoral courses. For example, as a context of an academic conversation in this classroom interaction, the students, in support of their positions, were using argumentative discourse to construct meaning out of the academic content.
What this means in response to research question 1 is that the multilingual students’ initial frames of contact (courses 1 and 2) in academic communities is shaped by their encounter with various discourse styles in the doctoral courses. For instance, in Course 2, while addressing Dr. Hall’s initial questions, the students not only engaged in various ways of presenting ideas, they also took an active role in explaining and reporting their ideas within their own cultural framework. In Course 1, the students played an active role in unraveling the academic socialization through intensely engaging with the course readings and questions they asked to one another and to Dr. Kay.

The above classroom discourse analysis suggests that the academic socialization processes were also observed in a class in which the class content was not related to the issues about academia. Unlike Dr. Kay’s class, Dr. Hall’s class did not specifically focus on topics that were directly related to the students’ academic socialization or the kinds of knowledge and skills that they need to have in order to function successfully in the academic discourse community that they were about to enter. Despite this basic difference in the two courses, through their argumentative classroom discussion in Dr. Hall’s course, it could be said that students were developing “particular ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding and arguing that define the discourse of the community (Bartholomae, 1986, cited in Hyland, 2002, p.1094).

In addition to the discussions the students had on testing issues in every class session, they also engaged in student presentations in which they created their own testing projects. They did academic presentations on their projects and wrote academic papers. In such academic literacy activities, some first year students also experienced various struggles due to some cultural conflicts. For instance, for a final paper, Fang had
changed the assignment according to her own understanding, appropriating certain parts of it so that it fit her expectations from how this writing task should be handled. However, she felt uneasy, as she thought that changing an assignment could be interpreted as an insult to the instructor. This act of appropriation also influenced her oral presentation. As Fang put:

I felt that I did a VERY bad job in the presentation of my project. It seems like Carol and Kim said I was okay. They did not feel like I did badly but I feel that I did badly. Maybe mostly because I was pretty much concerned that I will OFFEND the professor. So I tried to speak very carefully so there is A LOT OF hesitations, a lot of ///Uhmm/// it was NOT fluent. (Interview, 4/1/2007)

Although Fang usually seems very confident in her speaking and presentation in her courses, she was not completely comfortable with her presentation in this particular class session. As she said in one of our interviews, she had many “hesitations” in her speech and felt that it was not “fluent”. This shows that Fang was not only paying attention to what she was presenting, but also to how she was presenting her project. Later, when she described the reasons for her uneasiness, she said that the fact that she changed the project and that she thought it was not “doable” for her had emotional repercussions.

While presenting, I thought it was already very offensive /// because /// I said to myself // you are NOT doing what Dr. Hall showed you to do. He gave an example, you SHOULD follow my example, I try to make everything easy. Why don’t you follow my example? You know /// if I were a professor and I gave students an example and they just challenge my example and say it is not doable, how do I feel? Of course, I understand /// but I couldn’t convince myself to do that way, because I could not pursuable myself that it is doable, but I know that I have to speak very carefully. So that is why I had to put a lot of apology at the beginning of the speech (Interview, 4/1/2007).

Here, we see that Fang is exercising her agency and appropriating the project according to her own understanding. Since she did not identify with the project and thought it was
not ‘doable’, she approached it differently than the other students. Additionally, what is interesting in Fang’s task appropriation is that Fang negotiated the writing task in her own mind, talking on behalf of Dr. Hall (e.g. “you SHOULD follow my example, I try to make everything easy. Why don’t you follow my example?”). However she was uneasy and felt self-conscious due to her appropriation of the assignment.

Finally, it is also important to add that the analysis of 12 hours of video recorded data from classroom discussions in the Testing course showed that the course also included topics that are more directly related to students’ socialization into their program. For example, on 1/3/08 the students and Dr. Hall engaged in a long discussion about the candidacy examination procedures, such as the importance of writing clear literature reviews for the candidacy exam, and the steps students need to follow in the written and oral portions of this high stakes exam. In this discussion, the discussion of the candidacy exam that students need to take upon completing their course work was also evaluated in relation to the Norm Reference Testing, which was one of the primary topics of this course. This discussion not only provided students information about academic tasks ahead of them as members of doctoral community they are about to enter but it also contributed to their academic knowledge by linking the main topic of the class to the students’ academic lives.

**Summary of Answers to Research Question # 1:**

The main purpose of this research question was to identify the kinds of language practices the students used in their initial doctoral courses and how it influenced their initial academic socialization. This section has provided a discourse analysis of six videotaped classroom discussions to illustrate how several multilingual students participating
in an academic discourse interacted with an academic text and classroom talk as they addressed issues revolving around publishing and presenting as graduate students (Course # 1) and issues related to language testing (Course # 2). The analysis suggests that language events in doctoral courses constituted an important component of academic socialization for these multilingual students. This analysis also suggests that the academic socialization processes that the students went through were not homogenous. They were contextual and included multiple uses of language and communicative events.

With respect to the first research question, there are three important findings arising from the analysis of the students’ classroom interaction in Course 1 and Course 2, which were two of the required courses that the students took in their first year at the doctoral level. First, the data analysis suggests that one of the processes of engaging academic socialization is to display different ways of using language. Through analyzing students’ classroom interactions, we have seen that both in Dr. Kay’s and Dr. Hall’s courses, the students were actively interested in the process of their academic socialization. In other words, they weren’t only interested in the academic knowledge they were gaining from the courses, but they also seemed to consider the first year, and especially the initial contact courses, as a crucial step for enculturating into the doctoral program. While doing so, they displayed a wide range of interactional patterns such as relating the text to their cultural background, using specific information from the text in the oral presentation and extending it, engaging in cumulative talk, argumentation and presenting and reporting data related to the main topic of the course. Therefore, the data suggest that language use was a significant marker of their initial experience of academic socialization.
The above analysis also seems to show how much these students valued, and later benefited from, taking a course such as Dr. Kay's. This course, due to the very nature of the class topics and the social relationships the students built with one another and with the instructor, seemed to have an empowering effect on them, one that carried over into their support group activity, which will be discussed in response to research question 2. Furthermore, while Dr. Kay's course directly and explicitly addressed some needs the students had as multilingual doctoral students, more conventional doctoral courses such as Dr. Hall’s course did occasionally address such issues. Yet, the students were still negotiating the kinds of language they were using in classroom discourse, both while arguing with one another or with their individual presentations. It is also important to emphasize the timing of these two courses, i.e., the fact that the students took these when they started their doctoral study (first two quarters), seemed to have an impact on how they perceived the academic socialization into their doctoral program. This impact could be seen not only in students individual narratives about the first courses but also in their desire to create a support group in which they played an active role in their own academic socialization and sought mentorship about the academic tasks and events ahead of them.

In this section, the academic literacy socialization the students underwent is demonstrated by the types of classroom discourse that they experienced. The students’ early experiences in the academic community suggest that socializing into academic communities was a communal event (as also seen in next analysis) in which the students relied on their shared understandings and inferences that “rest[s] on the knowledge of the social and cultural world, knowledge of interactional frames, and knowledge of the linguistic and nonlinguistic signaling mechanisms that cue these inferences” (Hyland,
2000, p.331) Within these inferences, the students also established a wide range of intertextual and intercontextual links, which illustrate how they resisted, challenged, and attempted to appropriate academic discourse. As the students became more attuned to issues revolving around academic socialization, they established a group in which they continued to support and mentor one another. This will be discussed with the next research question.

**RESEARCH QUESTION #2: What types of intertextual links and semiotic meanings do multilingual doctoral students establish to make meaning from academic discourse?**

It was either by participating in the class discussions, writing academic papers, or interacting with professors and other students (such as those who were further along in the doctoral program) that the participants were exposed to academic rules and conventions and negotiated various cultural and social norms as well as the values of academic disciplinary knowledge and academic writing. In the meantime, they were also exposed to other conversational acts such as asking questions to professors outside the classroom, negotiating expectations of writing assignments, deciding what courses to take, or visiting university services such as the Writing Center. In other words, the students’ academic literacy socialization processes were influenced by various dialogic and social actions, both in academic and non-academic contexts, which took place in different environments that were provided for them (e.g. classrooms) or that they collaboratively established (e.g. doctoral support group).

During their first year, the students made use of various spaces from which they sought to understand the dynamics of how to do a doctoral lesson, or how to be a doctoral
One of these important spaces for the students in which they could learn and discuss different elements of experiencing graduate school was the support group that the students initiated after being influenced by the first class they took with Dr. Kay. Inspired by this course, wherein native speaker and nonnative speaker English teachers’ issues widely emerged, a couple of students decided to continue the discussions about their needs and expectations as doctoral students with the hope of receiving some peer support about their courses, qualifying exams, and other academic practices common among doctoral programs. Facilitated by myself, the group—which was comprised of six multilingual first and second-year doctoral students—met once a week. The students met in various places, such as classrooms and coffee houses, while conducting their support group meetings (See figure 5.1).
**Figure 5.1:** The visual representation of Doctoral students’ face to face interactions in the support group

The students’ interactions included multiple modes of communication. Besides the face-to-face meetings, the students and myself also used online communication for various reasons. One of the reasons was to communicate about the meeting time and location every week. We used different means of online communication such as email exchanges and an online service called google docs\(^\text{13}\) which provided us an online space to create a collaborative manuscript reflecting students’ experiences in the support group. This will be discussed in response to research question 3.

**Figure 5.2:** Visual representation of students’ online interactions

The students’ desire to create a student-driven support group demonstrates that they were looking for richer access to the academic community, and as many of them stated, the group provided them “emotional and intellectual support” (Fang, Carol, Support Group

---

\(^{13}\) Google docs is a virtual space that Gmail provides to store and edit documents. In a nutshell, one of the functions of Gmail is that different authors can contribute to the various texts in different times and spaces.
Discussions, 4/23/2007). In these support group meetings, the students discussed various issues of importance in their lives as doctoral students, such as their struggles and challenges as writers using a second language to express and represent themselves.

The data that I will share in response to research question #2 were drawn from a microanalysis of the intertextuality of six doctoral students’ spoken interaction within a student-driven doctoral support group. In contrast to routine activities in the students’ day, the support group seemed to have an important influence on their academic literacy socialization in their first year. The data shared in this section comes from a four-minute transcript of students’ spoken interaction in one of the support group meetings.

This section illustrates two examples of intertextuality within the academic culture of collaboration the doctoral student participants established outside of their courses. Academic culture of collaboration, as defined earlier in the chapter, is a set of social practices that include communicative and dialogic actions and interactions (Bakhtin, 1983) within an intercultural group of newcomers in a specific domain of academic discourse. As I show later, the practice of this academic culture of collaboration, which includes dynamic spoken and written interactions, reveals how these doctoral students were willing to build “safe houses,” which Pratt (1991) considers as “social and intellectual spaces where groups can constitute themselves as horizontal, homogenous, sovereign communities with high degrees of trust, shared understandings, and temporary protection from legacies of oppression” (p.40). As will be seen in this section, the students established various intertextual links within this academic culture of collaboration that they built after being inspired by the kind of emotional and intellectual support they received from one another in Dr. Kay’s course.
In my discussion of the construction of intertextual connections in the doctoral support group, I build on Bloome & Egan-Robertson’s (1993) five steps for analyzing intertextual links in classroom discourse. Bloome & Egan-Robertson suggest using five components to describe the social construction of intertextuality in their microanalysis of a 15-minute lesson of a first-grade classroom: “(1) describing individual messages, (2) identifying the boundaries of interactional units, (3) locating the proposal, recognition, and acknowledgment of intertextuality, (4) describing the social consequences of intertextuality, (5) locating uses and references to written language” (p. 314). Following this procedure, to investigate the intertextual relationships in a spoken text, I first created the transcript of a 4-minute segment of our discussion in one of these support group meetings. The transcript was created out of the audio-recorded data. Next, I conducted message-by-message analysis to describe the evolving events by indexing the texts and contexts referred to during the spoken interaction. The message units are determined on the basis of “contextualization cues” (Gumperz, 1986), such as the stress and intonation of the speakers. Contextualization cues, according to Gumperz (1986), are verbal, nonverbal or prosodic signs that speakers signal during the conversation. As he puts, “contextualization cue is any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signaling of contextual presuppositions. Such cues may have a number of such linguistic realizations depending on the historically given linguistic repertoire of the participants” (p.131).

Inspired by Dr. Kay’s course, a couple of the students in that class decided to continue the discussions about their needs and expectations as doctoral students with the hope of receiving some peer support about their courses, qualifying exams, and other academic practices common among doctoral programs. Facilitated by myself, the group—which
was comprised of six multilingual first and second-year doctoral students—met once a week from January 2007 to April 2007.

**Narrative description of the support group transcription**

The intertextuality that occurs in this transcript and the collaborative attempt to create a manuscript illustrate two important points: 1) The students textualized their academic writing experiences as graduate students by referring to various other texts; 2) the students’ construction of alternative literacy spaces—which included both features of oral and written interaction—reveals their attempts to search for empowerment and liberation in academic writing. Transcript 1 below is part of an in-depth microanalysis that describes the message units as well as the intertextual connections the students established during an informal conversation in the support group. The students in this segment are in the midst of discussing their experiences with academic writing in graduate school.

**Transcript # 1: Citation conventions in academic writing**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Message units</th>
<th>Conversational function</th>
<th>Intertextual / intercontextual links: Proposed, recognized, acknowledged and having a social consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Personally, I ask other people,</td>
<td>Response/Informing</td>
<td>Proposing an intercontextual link to other events and people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>what experiences they had…Classmates, professor</td>
<td>Response/Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>or if the professor is willing to read the paper</td>
<td>Response/Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>I ask him.</td>
<td>Response/Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>I go to the writing center.</td>
<td>Response/Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Or my colleagues, they read it for me</td>
<td>Response/Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>Taking a turn Agreeing</td>
<td>Acknowledging or making a transition to a new topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>And for me besides, the jargon, I mean big words</td>
<td>Expressing personal opinion Marking of a beginning of a conversation</td>
<td>Proposing a new intertextual link to academic text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would choose HIGH level vocabulary [L]</td>
<td>Highlighting an academic issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lisya</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>Recognizing</td>
<td>Recognizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>So you know when writing academic papers</td>
<td>Initiating a topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I try to use difficult words in one sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>at least two or three</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lisya</td>
<td>I feel the same way sometime</td>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Because if you write, you know, just in SIMPLE language it doesn’t look attractive at all…to the…</td>
<td>Expressing a personal opinion</td>
<td>Social consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>To… I don’t know…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>to the professors.</td>
<td>Social consequence (being recognized as a doctoral student by professors, being a part of the academic community)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lisya</td>
<td>Hmm, that is a good point.</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>I feel the same way sometime.</td>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td>Recognizing the intertextual link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>XXX do you look for?</td>
<td>Request for further information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lisya</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>You mean, why or where?</td>
<td>Asking for clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Where?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>From the papers I have read before.</td>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>Intertextual link to academic text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>For instance, I always look at …. Ummm…. the papers that Dr. X and Dr. Y write…</td>
<td>Refering to academic texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Those are really good for theory building</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Intertextual Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>(OVLP) That is the thing that I really don’t want to do</td>
<td>Disagreeing</td>
<td>Recognizing the intertextual link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>(OVLP) XXXX</td>
<td>Side comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>I think I am more XXXX</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lisya</td>
<td>Do you do the same thing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>I really like creative writing.</td>
<td>Expressing personal opinion</td>
<td>Proposing a new intertextual link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claming an identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>Side comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>I think I am more like a XXXX</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>[OVLP] I do not want to include anything XXX</td>
<td>Reacting Carol’s line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t like it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>I mean just the words, just the words</td>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>[OVLP ] XXXX</td>
<td>Side comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>It is like a torture.</td>
<td>Claming an identity</td>
<td>Social consequence: defining academic writing: dichotomizing academic writing as “creative writing as being fun versus academic writing like a torture”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>BECAUSE we… every culture has its own WAY of writing.</td>
<td>Making a truth claim</td>
<td>Proposing a new Intertextual link to “culture”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>Right, right</td>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td>Recognizing the intertextual link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>And well, in Greece when we write,</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>Intertextual link to writing in Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>we don’t REPEAT somebody else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>SX</td>
<td>Hmmm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>You rephrase it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizing the intertextual reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>We say the same thing in our own way,</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>but we are very, very CRITICAL</td>
<td>Restating the argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Critical?</td>
<td>Asking a clarification question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Response informing</td>
<td>Link to C.’s utterance in line 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Intertextual Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>for example, if we hear something we think of it</td>
<td>Elaborating her previous claims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>and definitely express ourselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>But I understand that in America, people are more diplomatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>and the writing is also more diplomatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Oh, uhmm, Alexis says that and Mike says this, so probably both of THEM are RIGHT&quot;</td>
<td>Acting out</td>
<td>Proposing an intertextual link to the genre of &quot;literature review&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>SX</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Recognizing and acknowledging the intertextual connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>oh yeah, that is one thing that I hate [L]</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Acknowledging. Social consequence: Mismatch between students’ preferred writing style and the academic writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>You know, yeah</td>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>It all goes around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>Yeah, that’s one thing I hate</td>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>[OVLP]</td>
<td>Side comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>And ohhh…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>So, do you mean you want to take a position in your writing and you are..?</td>
<td>Asking clarification question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>Of course, I want to take a position …what’s the point to write?</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>So, do you mean in English academic writing you are not asked to tell a position? Or are you talking about communication?</td>
<td>Asking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>[OVLP]</td>
<td>Side comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>Yeah, it is THE WAY that I XXXX</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>It’s a dictated one</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>[OVLP] Yeah, right XXXX</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>[OVLP]Yeah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>[OVLP] Yes, XXXX for the sake of publication XXXX</td>
<td>Aggressing</td>
<td>Providing an intertextual link to writing for publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>[OVLP] Academic setting dictates you your position…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>Yes, yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>Writing for the sake of publication only</td>
<td>Highlighting an academic issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>[OVLP] Yes, yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>[OVLP] I hope in my future I do not have to do those things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Yes, THANK YOU. THANK YOU.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>XXX Go SISTER. We will XXXX</td>
<td>Validating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>I hope in my future, I do not have to do those things</td>
<td>Restating response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>I want to XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>But that is the way academic game is playing… …</td>
<td>Challenging F. Proposing an intertextual link to literature review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>for the first part you have to put the big names,</td>
<td>Elaborating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>but for the second part</td>
<td>Elaborating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>There should be a middle way.</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>There SHOULD be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>yes, in the second part, you have to say something but you are NOT</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>… uhmm…straightforward…</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>you have to say something that involves all the theoretical work</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>It goes around and around and around.</td>
<td>Agreeing Recognizing the intertextual link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>And who knows who said ORIGINALLY that word</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is not original</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>Agreeing Recognizing the intertextual link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is like Street 1986 and Bloome 2000,</td>
<td>Giving an example of rhetorical move Proposing an intertextual link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>and they AGREE.</td>
<td>Giving an example</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Yeah [L]</td>
<td>Response Acknowledging the intertextual link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>Even if you have ideas, you have to READ something.</td>
<td>Acknowledging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Of course XXXX</td>
<td>Acknowledging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>You have to validate your point because then</td>
<td>Acknowledging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>You are allowed to make A POINT on your own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Until the day you become like Dr. X, or somebody</td>
<td>Agreeing and elaborating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Lisya</td>
<td>Hmm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>I mean a BIG name, then you can have a chance to speak whatever you want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Lisya</td>
<td>So you mean your ideas are not recognized until you quote someone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>We call this in English slang</td>
<td>Initiating a new topic Providing an intertextual link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Riding on someone’s coat tail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Lisya</td>
<td>Riding on?</td>
<td>Asking for clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>coat tail</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>So it’s like you know how…XXX</td>
<td>Elaborating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Yeah, yeah</td>
<td>Agreeing Recognizing the intertextual link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>And you are just sitting there and he is walking</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>You are considered riding along behind them</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Yeah, yeah</td>
<td>Acknowledging Recognizing the intertextual link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>And what ever you say have to be validated by this authority</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The discussion starts with Diana’s contribution about the strategies she uses to improve her academic writing. From line 1 to line 4, she makes clear intertextual references to other texts (intertextuality) and contexts (intercontextuality) such as “writing centers” and “conversations with other people such as professors and classmates.” Following Diana’s comments on obtaining assistance in academic writing, in line 7, Carol provides an uptake to her comments. Yet it is not clear whether Carol acknowledges the intertextual link proposed by Diana. In line 7, where Carol says “yeah,” her response is ambiguous in its conversational function because it might not serve as an acknowledgement or recognition, but only as a transition to the new topic. Next, in lines 8 and 9, Carol proposes a new intertextual link. Having apparently acknowledged Diana’s comments, she adds that while writing academic papers, she is always in search of “jargons” in other texts-- “which are good for theory building” (lines 8-9). Carol seems to believe that this would give her more legitimacy in her writing. In line 23, Diana requests more explanation of Carol’s proposal, and Carol gives specific examples from the texts and contexts from which she finds disciplinary terminology intended to make her papers sound more academic.

At this point in the interaction, we can see that between lines 1 to 24, the students are juxtaposing several texts in order to share their textual experiences with academic writing (i.e., Carol’s search for “jargons”). Bloome et. al.(2005) emphasize that in order for an intertextual link to be established, “a connection among events has to be reified by others; the participants have to acknowledge and recognize the connection, and the connection has to have some social consequence” (p.44). In a similar vein, in this interaction and what comes after, the students are recognizing and acknowledging each other’s textual
references—which mostly derive from the classes they had taken together or the articles which they had all read. The intertextual links established so far here reflect a certain degree of social significance, which is embedded in the desire to be a part of the relevant academic discourse community and to be recognized by its established members, such as professors. From the rest of the spoken interaction in this support group, we can see how the intertextual link Carol made in lines 8 and 9 was recognized, acknowledged, and has social consequences. In lines 24 to 30, Fang picks up the intertextual link that Carol proposed, yet she indicates her discomfort about what Carol said about borrowing words from articles. By saying “that is the thing that I don’t want to do” (line 27), she is juxtaposing what Carol proposed against a new topic, what she calls “creative writing.” In line 31, she claims her writerly identity and identifies herself as a “creative writer” who sometime finds writing in academic genres “like a torture” (lines 31-34). The simultaneous responses of other students, which come in later lines, illustrate that the intertextual link that Carol proposed has been socially established and collectively debated among the students.

From lines 37 to 47, following Fang, Jewel also juxtaposes several textual worlds in her speech. She establishes an intertextual link on two different levels: 1) at the level of intercultural rhetoric; 2) at the level of genre. She starts a new interactional unit\(^\text{14}\) in line 37, where she compares the rhetorical construction of American writing with that of Greek writing by saying that in Greek people are “very, very critical”, and adds “but I understand that in America, people are more diplomatic, and the writing is more

---

\(^{14}\) Bloome et al. (2005) point out that “interactional units can be viewed as the smallest units of social activity, that is by definition, an interactional unit involves both the actions and reactions of people toward each other” (p. 26).
diplomatic” (lines 40-47). Notice that here Jewel is establishing a clear intertextual link between writing in Greek culture and western academic culture. On the other hand, her second attempt to construct intertextuality involves a reference to a specific academic genre. That is, in line 54 she proposes an intertextual link that matches with the genre of literature review in academic writing. Although she does not explicitly indicate that she is juxtaposing the discussion with that specific academic genre, the example she provides in line 54 (i.e., Alexis says this, Mike says this and they both agree) seems to indicate a spoken version of a textual reference to the literature review genre, in which students are expected to build on others’ research. Again, she juxtaposes this genre with that of Greek, when she says “in Greece, when we write we don’t repeat somebody else” (line 41). The rising intonation at the end of the message unit in line 55 signals her disagreement with and astonishment due to the rhetorical moves she is expected to make while writing a literature review as part of the world of Anglophone academic writing. Moreover, the contextualization cues (i.e., overacting and mocking) in line 54 seem to indicate the verbosity and implicitness of academic writing she seems to experience.

The group discussion from this point centers on the intertextual proposal that Jewel put forward in lines 49-55. From this point on, the students more strongly share their resistance to the genre of academic writing and discuss their sense of self-representation and culture in academic writing. For instance, consider Diana and Fang’s interaction in lines 68-81. Here, the spoken interaction revolves around the differences between academic writing and other sorts of writing, such as creative writing. Their interaction appears to be a response to the intertextual link that Jewel proposed about academic writing, that is, the genre of literature review. Diana, in line 67, states, “academic setting
dictates you what position you need to take.” Many students’ utterances overlap at this point. Although individual message units from other students are indecipherable, the cacophony of paralinguistic contextual cues signals their agreement with and support of this statement. In line 84, however, Carol disrupts the general agreement and offers a counterargument to what has been said about always citing others’ voices when it comes to writing academically. Her comment, “but this is way academic game is being played, for the first time you have to put big names” (lines 82-84), is followed by Fang’s and Jewel’s utterances. Here the students provide several uptakes to Carol’s utterances and talk about the “second part” of literature review, where the writer is expected to add his or her own opinion.

When we consider lines 85 to 97, we see that the conversational segment in this part of the group discussion is a response to the intertextual links both Jewel and Carol provided previously. Diana and Jewel’s comments between lines 87 and 97 challenge Carol’s counterargument, where she asserted that one can also add his or her perspective in academic writing after quoting others, that is, by building on previous research. However, Diana and Jewel emphasize that they believe that in this “second part” (line 84), the writing “goes around and around” (90); one cannot be “straightforward” (line 88), or “who knows who said originally that word” (91). This illustrates how the intertextual link proposed by Carol (lines 82-84) was acknowledged and recognized, and has a degree of social significance among the support group members. Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1998) assert that intertextual link is not established until there is a social significance of it. This social significance is not always overt or established in a conscious way. For instance, in this support group example, students might not be
consciously talking about writing literature review, yet their utterances show that they recognize and acknowledge each other’s proposals on citing, building on other scholars’ work and so on. Students recognize that Carol is juxtaposing writing literature review and it’s considered important by the other peers. So, here there exists a social significance to the intertextual link.

On the other hand, in lines 94 and 95, Jewel again makes an intertextual reference to two texts they have read in their course work in order to show evidence and support her point about not being “straightforward” in academic writing. The students’ laughter and other contextualization cues that overlap with Jewel’s comments show that the other students are also recognizing and acknowledging the set of intertextual links created by Jewel.

As the discussion proceeds, Fang responds to the previous interactions as follows: “even if you have some ideas, you have to read something” (line 97). Alexis at this point takes the floor and provides an uptake to Fang’s response as well as the previous spoken interaction that took place in the support group. Thus, in between lines 99 and 113, Alexis suggests an intertextual link between an English idiom and the feature of academic writing that has been debated so far (where one needs to quote previous literature). So far Carol, Alexis, Diana and Jewel seem to agree that in academic writing, in order to validate their ideas, they need to quote a “big name” (line 83 and line 103). By saying “riding on someone’s coat tail” (line 106), Alexis recognizes and acknowledges the intertextual links proposed so far and begins to describe the social significance of this intertextual link. This segment in the interaction also illustrates what Bloome and Egan-Roberson (1993) and Bloome et al (2005) emphasize about the social significance of
inter textual links. That is, the socially constructed inter textual links have been reified by the group members. In other words, throughout the support group discussion, the inter textual references made to both spoken and written texts have been acknowledged and recognized.

The inter textual links created by the students in this communicative interaction illustrate several important aspects of the students’ academic socialization at the doctoral level, such as the inseparability of the micro and macro level linguistic processes that the students were involved in while acquiring deeper knowledge of academic literacy, and the multidirectionality of spoken and written texts within an informally formed academic culture of collaborative discourses, such as the one described in this study. The above narrative description of the students’ support group interaction could also be seen as an example of a joint learning experience where students are voicing their concerns about the academic culture shock they have been experiencing as newcomers in the doctoral program. Through the academic culture of collaboration, they seem to build on each others’ voices as well as the texts and contexts which exist outside their support group. Moreover, as is evident in the narrative analysis of the transcript, these students seem to have been collaboratively constructing the meaning of academic writing at the doctoral level. Although they are different individuals with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, they are engaged in a “community conversation” (Flower, 2002) in which they are creating a shared understanding of what it means to construct an academic text. And they are doing this by the inter textual links they created during their oral interactions. In so doing, the students are constantly working on an ongoing definition of academic literacy and collectively learning about the nuances of the doctoral community.
of practice by rigorously engaging in discussions about academic writing. The intertextual links proposed in the informal interaction are recognized and acknowledged by the students.

There are several social implications arising from these intertextual and intercontextual links in this informally formed social event. First of all, the analysis shows that students’ perceived writing in the academic context as creating an authoritative distance between the students and the text. Examples for this authoritative distance between the writer (multilingual doctoral students in this case) and the text (academic writing) could be seen throughout the students’ spoken interaction about academic writing. For instance, Alexis’ identification of quoting scholars (or “big names,” as Carol calls them) via the English expression, “riding on someone’s coat tail” (lines 105-114), or Fang’s and Diana’s comments on academic writing as writing “for the sake of publication only” (lines 74-81), suggest that these students drew a line between academic writing and the self, and they voiced that they experience a clear sense of authority in academic writing in that they need to mask their personal views and follow certain academic conventions of which they were highly aware. Such discussions about the position of author and the authority in academic writing raise profound questions, such as Foucault’s (1977/1984) well-known inquiry, “What is the author?”, where he suggests that the author is an invention of modern times.

Moreover, the students’ apparent resistance to academic writing is also an example of critical awareness of voice in academic writing (Ivanic & Camps, 2001). That is, the students are critiquing the “dictated” (line 68) conventions of the disciplinary discourse community they are entering. Yet within this academic culture of collaboration,
the students seem to freely voice their academic culture shock and co-construct their own meaning of academic writing. For instance, while Diana and Fang were discussing what appeared to them to be the monolithic features of academic writing and how they felt restricted by them, they commented that they wished to do more creative writing. Similarly, Jewel juxtaposes several texts from the classes that they all took together, and gives an example of the rhetorical moves they need to enact in order to build their theoretical framework in an academic paper (lines 94-95: “It’s like Street, 1986 and Bloome, 2000, and they agree”). Jewel’s comments, which were articulated in an upbeat and a loud manner, prompted other responses that describe the academic writing games group members need to play in order to have a legitimate voice in academic discourse.

The uptake of others here is notable: “even if you have ideas you have to read something,” “you have to validate your point because then you are not allowed to make a point of your own,” “until the day you became Dr. X or somebody” (lines 96-101). The contextual cues signal not only their emerging genre awareness (i.e., their familiarity with the rhetorical moves they need to make in English academic writing.), but also their collective resistance toward and problematizing of the dominant discourses they were encountering in their early years of doctoral education. This resistance could be observed within the set of contextual cues speakers provide between lines 96-104 (e.g. increased intonation, rhythm of stress, overlaps). Within this academic culture of collaboration (which mainly includes spoken interaction), these multilingual students are critically reflecting on their writing practices as doctoral students, negotiating the conflicting discourses, and attempting to resolve the academic conflicts they are experiencing.
Another interesting observation to make about this transcript is the identity issues that emerge through the use of pronominalization among the students. The use of pronouns in transcript # 1 suggests that students in this discussion positioned themselves on three different levels: (i) being an international student (e.g., the use of us and we); (ii) being a member of an academic community (e.g., them, in America, professors) and (ii) other social positions or characteristics that emerge from their idiosyncratic differences and differences derived from students’ home culture (e.g., in Greek culture). The table below is a line-by-line mapping of the pronouns that the students used to create social identities and to position themselves in the academic community of their disciplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Student (I and US: group identity)</th>
<th>Academic Discourse Community (Them: the other)</th>
<th>Other (e.g., cultural and idiosyncratic differences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (lines 1-6)</td>
<td>Other people (line 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professors (line 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing center (line 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (lines 8,9,12)</td>
<td>Professors (line 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (lines 24-27)</td>
<td>Dr. X and Dr. Y(line 25)</td>
<td>I—personal choice (line 29,31,32,33,34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We (line 38)</td>
<td>In America (space—line 52)</td>
<td>We –Greek culture (line 40, 41, 46, 47, 50,51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, go sister! (lines 74-81)</td>
<td>People and general you (lines 52-73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big names (line 83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You (lines 87-89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You (lines 97-101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A big name (line 103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You (line 111-113)</td>
<td>He (line 111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Them (line 112)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You (line 114)</td>
<td>This authority (line 114)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Pronoun analysis of Transcript # 1

As seen in the transcript above, the use of pronominalization plays a significant role in how students position themselves in relation to their academic communities and academic text. The use of pronouns such as I, you and them tell us several things about how students produce and reproduce certain identity positions as first year doctoral students. While words such as professors (line 2), big names (line 83), in America (line 52), people (line 52) or them (line112) indicate an authority positioning that seems to create a dividing practice, the words such as we (line 38), our (lines 46, 51), and I (24-27) indicate both a group identity and identity positions that are created by students’ own cultural or idiosyncratic characteristics. For instance, in line 55, we see Jewel imitating how a person in academia would cite previous literature (i.e., Alexis says that and Mike says this, so probably both of THEM are RIGHT). Fang, in line 57, reinforces Jewel’s comment by saying “yeah, that is one thing that I hate”. Both Fang’s and Jewel’s comments are followed by Diana, who indicated that a certain practice in academia is a “dictated” one, and states “Academic setting dictates you your position” (line 72).

Students provide uptake to Jewel’s and Diana’s comments about academic writing, indicating their increasing group identity. While students seem to distance themselves from the academic writing, they still position themselves as writers. For instance, in line 31, Fang calls herself as a “creative writer”, who, at times, finds the academic writing “like a torture” (line 37). This comment of hers also appeared in various interview accounts. She describes her writerly identity as clashing with her academic one. (e.g., I’m a creative writer. I sometimes write whatever pops in my mind, Interview, 12/10/2006).

Another example where a student’s identity as a writer shifts from being an academic
writer to a critical or creative writer can be seen in lines 38-55, when Jewel describes her writerly self as “critical” (line 47), someone who says things in her “own way” (line 46). In this transcript, students’ new and evolving relationship with academic writing is manufactured through their use of pronouns. In other words, the use of pronominalization in this group interaction shows how students categorize writing (e.g., academic, non-academic) and being a writer in academic communities of their disciplinary fields.

**Summary of Answers to Research Question # 2:**

This section aimed to answer the second research question: What type of intertextual links and semiotic meanings do multilingual doctoral students collectively establish to make meaning from academic texts? To answer this question, I conducted a microanalysis of students’ support interactions, or as I call it in this study, students’ academic culture of collaboration.

In summary, the academic culture of collaboration described through this analysis of intertextuality is comprised of a set of literacy practices in which the students are not only swapping stories, but also engaging in a cross-cultural meaning making activity. Through establishing various intertextual and intercontextual links to different texts, languages and contexts, they are attempting to make meaning from the “writing games” (Casanave, 2002) they are involved in. In this informal conversation, the students were collectively learning about the nuances of academic writing, more specifically the genre of literature review.

This analysis of the students’ support group interaction also suggests that the ‘writing games’ the students were playing at the doctoral level did not operate as a smooth and seamless experience. The students did not simply learn the rules of the games
and then become fully prepared to apply them; instead, they adapted or adjusted the rules of these writing games through talking, negotiating, and sometimes resisting the conventions which constitute these academic writing games. In addition, the oral interactions of the students are evidence of the socially constructed nature of writing and illustrate “the importance of understanding how individual writers draw on resources from within and around themselves as they gradually learn to identify themselves as writers for particular communities or to recognize that they do not want to belong” (Casanave, 1995, p.91).

Looking at intertextual links that the students consciously or unconsciously established enables us to see the kinds of meanings that they gave to academic writing. It is within such a student driven group that they were challenging the established writing practices and developing a critical attitude towards academic discourse, which eventually led them to analyze their own discursive practices in their first year at the doctoral level. As Canagarajah (2002) asserts, “when discourses are treated as ‘skills’ and ‘information leading to successful performance in academy, students won’t have the space for asking larger questions of power and difference” (p.33). As will be seen in the answer to the next research question, the multilingual students in this study drew from their own resources to ask larger questions and more importantly act on them, infusing their own interests and creating their own social spaces to engage with some collective writing.
RESEARCH QUESTION 3: How does social interaction (spoken, written and online) among multilingual doctoral students mediate students’ academic socialization and help them negotiate academic literacies?

Another space the students used to search for more answers about the rules of various academic games was their online or face-to-face interactions, such as Writing Center tutorials, interviews, or email exchanges. All of these alternative spaces, along with their academic classrooms, provided information about the academic community; the students used these spaces to search for answers to various practical questions about doctoral studies in general, courses they should take, the candidacy examination which precedes the dissertation, or more academically oriented questions about subjects such as learning theories or other educational issues that they were having a hard time understanding.

The data shared in this section comes from (1) a dialogic manuscript that the students created through the use of an online environment and (2) a four-minute transcript of students’ spoken interaction in one of the support group meetings, where they talk about negotiating and appropriating academic rules and expectations. The microanalysis includes answers to both research question # 2 and 3, and reveals how the students not only acquired certain academic literacy practices, but also acted on them by negotiating, resisting, questioning and even appropriating them according to their immediate needs and interests.

Collective writing through the use of Google-docs

After having heard about the importance of publishing in various doctoral classes, the students wanted to ‘get their feet wet’ with publishing and contribute to the scholarly
dialogs of their discipline. One of the questions that appeared frequently in the peer group meetings was, “How and where can we publish as a graduate student?” (Meeting 3 and 4, as well as informal chats). After searching for several options and research topics that they were interested in, the students decided to write about the benefits of such support groups, and the kinds of support they received from the peers and mentors. The dialog below shows how the students discussed and negotiated the themes of this potential manuscript

Transcript 1: Negotiating the writing task in the support group

Fang: I liked the categories we came up. I think we should each write a paragraph first, and then we combine them together. And, then we can put it in a dialogic format.
Carol: Like the one in Bonny and Ena’s collaborative article.
Fang: Right, right, right.
Mike and Carol: Yes, yes.
Fang: But there is an expert in that dialog. It’s Bonny Norton. Maybe we could write our sections and Dr. Kay can respond.
Alexis: Yes, to get started we can all write something and show it to Dr. Kay. Maybe she could react to what we write, like when we’re dialoging.
Lisya: Yes, that’s a good idea.
Mike: Yes.
Fang: So dialog is only a form of writing, right? So we could still use our themes, right?
Carol: Yes, I think so
Lisya: So we can get started in Google-docs [explains the functions of google-docs].
(Support Group, 3/23/2007)

With the next analysis, we will see another example of the academic culture of collaboration which was created through the use of an online environment as the students drew upon the various communicative resources at their disposal. This online “safe
house” (Pratt, 1999), or academic culture of collaboration that the students created in an online space via computer-mediated communication (i.e. interactive online space of Google docs), not only illustrates the connection between orality and written text in a virtual world (and thus also addresses research question #2 to some extent), but also suggests that the students were engaged collectively in more individualized and localized writing games in which they attempted to create alternate literacy practices, thereby expanding their notions of text.

This collective writing sample that I will share below is a literacy event that illustrates the dialogic writing that the students collaboratively created through their doctoral support group discussions. The process of creating this online manuscript was an ongoing endeavor. The students and I conceptualized this example of academic literacy as a dialogic manuscript because the text was constructed jointly through spoken and written conversations/interactions among the group members. In this literacy event, we see nonacademic writing mixing with academic writing as the students negotiated the world of academic discourse. The students worked on this dialogic manuscript as an informally constituted community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). That is, each of them contributed to the creation of an online text. The content of this online text is about the benefits the students derived from being part of a support group during the early stages of their doctoral studies. The students decided to write a multivoiced article in which each of them, including myself, wrote about the experiences we gained in this support group. The discussion below is based on a short extract from a very early draft that was constructed through the use of Google docs, which served as the online environment in which the students participated.
In a nutshell, Google docs is a function of a gmail email account that enables writers to edit the same text in different times and spaces. For instance, when I edited the document or entered new information, a student who was also editing the same document at the same time could see the changes in real time. In addition, students can invite others to join in order to view and even edit a document. After editing the document, one can publish it, which means that once the document is published it could be shared with the others via a URL link sent by gmail. In addition, one can also see the history of the changes made to the document; each change is recoded by different colors indicating different authors/users. After I introduced the students to the functions of Google docs and invited them to open a gmail account, I posted an early draft of our manuscript for them to comment on and modify. This introduction was based on the discussions we had in one of the support group meetings. After each author contributed to the manuscript and worked on the introduction, we arranged a face-to-face meeting to edit the whole text together. The discussion that follows will only illustrate the online interaction concerning an early draft of the introductory part of this manuscript.

The following collaborative writing segment illustrates students’ multiple authorship experience which unfolded in this online space. As this manuscript could be published in a newsletter, I will only share a short part of it where I exemplify students’ online interactions.
### Tentative titles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From isolation to collaboration: The benefits of support groups in the midst of busy academic lives. (Alexis: GREAT TITLE, prefer this one) (Mike: Me too!)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joining the conversation as a collective action: A story of a support group (L.: ok, what about this one? just came to my mind)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| One of the missions of XXXX is to encourage the formal and informal gatherings of nonnative speakers in various contexts. In alignment with this mission, several first and second year multilingual doctoral students got together in order to create a friendly atmosphere where they can voice their academic concerns, report how they negotiate their multiple identities in the field as multilingual speakers (L.: NNESTs? Mike: I don't think it's necessary) and eventually build intellectual community of learners. Having started as a part of one group participant’s dissertation study, the support group have been focusing on the issues, concerns and expectations that multilingual doctoral students have during their first and second year of education in the US. This multivoiced (C.: dialogic?) (Alexis and Mike: Multivoiced sounds better) article is an attempt to illustrate the importance of mentoring, sharing emotions and the necessity of information exchange in doctoral level. |

| Research has shown that a peer support group holds promise for the personal and academic growth of graduate students (L: need help with references?) (Mike: We can use that article we read for 917, Can't we? L: yes, great idea! Thanks! Any other references?) |

| Fang: Attending the support group meetings has become an important part of my life and has benefited me both intellectually and emotionally. With all the members voluntarily sharing and supporting each other, the group gives everyone opportunities to inspire and be inspired… |

| Mike: Yes, Fang. I was pleasantly surprised by the dedication of all the members of the group… |

Table 5.3: A first draft of collaborative writing example with the use of googledocs.

As seen in this excerpt of the online group interaction, many voices participated in the production of this dialogic online text. Each author contributes something to this text and responds to other members’ writing. Not only had the students jointly contributed to the creation of the text; they also provided uptake to each other in terms of the content of the text. Each author entered their views on the early draft, and they also included a 100-word description of their experiences in this support group (which are not included in the above... |
Some of the collaborative actions included providing help to each other with the lexical choices and rhetorical moves necessary in order to improve this text. The collaborative, multivoiced writing in this example appears as a hybrid genre where the students appropriated the literacy practices of graduate school to suit their own needs and expectations. After working on the first draft, the manuscript was sent to a newsletter for a publication opportunity. The dialogic article was very well received by the editors of the newsletter we sent. However, since it was difficult to get hold of the students after their first year, as of now, we are waiting until the next issue of the newsletter to resubmit the revised article.

There are two issues worth noting in this online interaction. The first is the importance of problematizing the notion of academic discourse, as the students mentioned in their support group interactions. With this engagement in collaborative writing, we see that they are intentionally complicating or problematizing academic discourse by creating this interactive alternative space that fuses their native discourses with the target language academic discourse. The literacy practice the students were involved in was manuscript writing, and in contrast to the debate they had in the support group about the necessities and expectations of academic writing, in this discourse they expanded the academic textual world by creating this dialogic manuscript. The second issue worth noting in this literacy event concerns the dialectic relationship between spoken and written text. To create this dialogic text, the students collaboratively discussed the linguistic and rhetorical choices to be made in their manuscript. Their collaborative endeavors also carry features of spoken discourse. In other words, in this sample of collaborative writing, we can see oral features, such as providing uptake or frequently using the first person pronoun. The table below compares and
contrasts the linguistic and paralinguistic features seen in the students’ support group interaction, the academic writing they refer to in their interactions, and finally the online dialogic text they jointly created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Discourse</th>
<th>Academic Written Discourse (based on the support group discussion)</th>
<th>Collaborative written discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Easy shift from content</td>
<td>1. High focus on content</td>
<td>1. Easy shift from content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Absence of “big words”</td>
<td>3. Increased use of “big words”</td>
<td>3. Decreased use of “big words”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overlaps, interruptions</td>
<td>5. High use of relative clauses</td>
<td>5. Use of fillers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Characteristics of spoken, written and collaborative written discourse used in the support group

What this table reveals is that the students in this support group shared a common commitment to the meaning making process of academic discourse they were about to engage. During their academic culture of collaboration in their support group, the students...
integrated multiple uses of texts, spoken and written, thus expanding the notion of textual world by bringing their agency into the act of writing. This seemed to give the students a sense of liberation or empowerment in their academic writing. For instance, in their oral interactions, academic writing at the doctoral level is represented as creating authoritative distance between authors and readers through its extensive use of disciplinary terminology, the citing of scholarly literature, and so on. However, in this collaborative writing experience, the students did not draw heavily from the standard moves found in academic writing games, which they discussed in the support group. Instead, they seemed to create their own conventions or writing games where they used a less formal register with less reliance on disciplinary terminology and references to professional literature. In other words, the students modified their writing depending on the nature of the event (e.g., joint online writing).

In these online attempts to create a dialogic manuscript, the students’ interactions (e.g., providing online uptake to each other) show an understanding of the idea that students are willing to challenge and appropriate the textual practices around them. Moreover, by commenting on each others’ texts and creating a dialogic text, they move away from the responsibility of single authorship as well as create a more equal power relationship among the group members. This act of appropriation seemed to free them from the restraints of standard academic writing and empowered them to take risks in the act of creating a dialogic text. Such social interactions within the “small culture” (Atkinson, 2004) of multilingual doctoral students also calls attention to the hybridity and multiplicity of rhetorical forms in academic writing. By building on such localized and culturally situated aspects of writing through microethnographic analysis that focuses on day-to-day
social interactions of academic communities, the static notions of text as unitary and stable—which was the dominant understanding in the field of contrastive rhetoric for many years—could be problematized or challenged, leading to an expanded view of textual worlds. Although this study did not aim to answer questions regarding the cultural differences in students writing, which is the focus area of the field Contrastive Rhetoric, also known as Intercultural Rhetoric (Connor, 1999, 2002, 2004, 2006), the study has also added to the current discussion on Intercultural Rhetoric by expanding the notion of culture and text. Some indirect implications on how we can conceptualize text and interaction in the context of multiplicity, plurality and looking at the intersection of written, spoken and online interaction of multilingual students/writers could help further the directions of the Intercultural Rhetoric field.

In addition to the online attempts to be a part of the academic community and incorporate various features of written and spoken text into their jointly written manuscript, the students also engaged in dialogues in which they voiced their concerns about academic writing in a second language and how they negotiate between their interests and the expectations of academic culture they are experiencing. Therefore, another layer of interpreting students’ academic socialization is represented by the categories that emerged in the students’ support group discussions.

**Academic socialization as an act of negotiation**

One of these categories is the act of negotiating in their first year, or as students described it, perceiving academic writing as a “seesaw”. As will be seen in the short segment below, the students responded differently to the practices common in the academic community. The social interactions they had in the support group reveal how students dealt
with the personal and academic challenges they faced as foreign students. The interaction discussed below took place a few weeks before the students worked on the online manuscript.

_Academic learning as a seesaw_

The transcript below comes from an audio-taped discussion of a support group meeting where the students gathered to discuss what to write for the manuscript that they wanted to send to one of the newsletters in their field. However, the discussion went in another direction, and the students began to share their personal narratives and their perspectives on the struggles involved in being an international graduate student as well as their perceptions of academic writing in a second language. In this transcript, they highlight important issues such as negotiation of expectations and the consequences of their lack of linguistic and cultural background in some classes. They are also building on the metaphor of a seesaw to describe their experiences in academia.

_Transcript 2: Academic writing as a seesaw_

1. **Jewel:** for US, studying in English language, that is our SECOND or THIRD language is one obstacle.
2. And, then understanding the CONTENT is another one.
3. However for the native speakers the ONLY thing is to understand the content.
4. And if they STUDY, they understand the content.
5. **Fang:** Hmm. It is true.
6. **Jewel:** And then we have more constrains///like adapting to different culture.
7. and knowing how to speak PROPERLY.
8. you need to know the whole thing
9. the WHOLE system.
10. **Fang:** Yeah, learn the NEW ways.
11. **Jewel:** YEAH! learning NEW ways
12. **Lisya:** So, do you think you are resisting to these new ways during this adaptation process?
13. **Jewel:** Do you know this word (shows with her hands)?
14. Uhmm, how do they call it?
15. Ah! Seesaw?
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18. Carol: That’s what Dr. Merry always says!
20. Jewel: I allow you to use this in your dissertation [Laughs]
21. Lisya: Oh, Thanks [laughs]
22. Students: [Laughs]
23. Lisya: So, Seesaw. Okay. It is a good metaphor.
24. but what do you mean by seesaw?
25. Jewel: Oh, Sometimes we are trying to get THEIR/// get in the American culture.
26. or sometime we are getting into more OUR own culture///
27. you know, it is like that.
28. According to the situation and according to context, we CHANGE [hand gestures]
29. Lisya: Uhm. She has a good point.
30. Carol: [cannot hear]
31. Lisya: Sorry, what did you say Carol?
32. Carol: Yeah, according to the context.
33. Hmm/// I would also say that I am accommodating, NOT assimilating.
34. So I am trying to put two things together on my own
35. but not trying to CHANGE myself completely into the native speaker identity.
37. Fang: I like the word negotiating.
38. Students: Yeah
39. Fang: Whatever we do in the graduate program.
40. Everything we do///
41. we are trying to negotiate,
42. we try to balance between our ability and the expectations.
43. Carol: Yeah
44. Fang: and///you know////you say publishing.
45. Students: Yeah.
46. Fang: Of course it is VERY effective.
47. and EVERYbody wants to do that.
48. But how much time do we, do I need to put?
49. How much effort will I put?
50. You know, for me it is NOT that easy to publish.
51. You know, if I write in my FIRST language, I can finish it easier.
52. I don’t have to worry about my language.
53. All ideas come out and I don’t worry if it is 20 pages or 30 pages.
54. Since it is English, I am placed in the same classroom with native speakers.
55. and I have to know language, content, and bring new…..
56. Jewel: Yeah, last quarter, one problem that I have in one class was about content.
57. I know we had so much workload/// for all of us.
58. But for me in order to understand Carolina, which is two states.
59. It took me so much extra time to go to google and search maps to find the information///
60. It is double and triple the effort.
61. To know HOW to write is VERY important.
62. Fang: For me, ideas is not the problem,
63. I have all the ideas but how to put the ideas on paper///
64. sometimes it takes, maybe double/// it is true, double effort and tripple
effort[laughs]
65. Carol: Is it only the language?
66. Fang : Of course. There is also the thinking process.
67. But language is intervening my thinking process.
68. If I can do it in my first language, I can easily go VERY deep and VERY broad..
69. Lisya: Hmm.
70. Carol: That is the opposite for me.
71. For MY situation, I write English much better than Chinese.
72. You wouldn’t believe it.
73. It takes MUCH longer for me to write a Chinese essay.

The discussion above begins with Jewel’s comments on how she views studying in one’s second language as an “obstacle.” She adds that it is not only the language but also the content that makes it challenging for international students. Here, she seems to have in mind a double socialization process where nonnative English speaking students are not only asked to understand the linguistic and cultural knowledge that the English language entails, but also the disciplinary knowledge of their fields. Moreover, she compares her experiences with her native speaking doctoral student peers in line 5 and offers a truth claim about their academic experiences. Between lines 6 and 9, she claims that they need to learn “the WHOLE system” (line 8), which according to her involves “adopting to a different culture” (line 6), and “to lean how to speak properly” (line 7). Her comments in lines 1-9 were recognized and acknowledged by many students. This could be inferred by the contextual cues such as the “uhmm”s and other non-linguistic behaviors such as head nods.

Both Jewel and Fang attribute the difficulties they are experiencing to “adapting to a different culture” in which one needs to learn “new ways.” In an attempt to
understand what exactly they are doing in this process (line 13), Jewel provides the metaphor of a seesaw to explain multilingual doctoral students’ experiences. Many students recognize and provide uptakes to her metaphor. At this point, in line 18, Carol makes an intertextual link to one of the professors in the department, saying that the same analogy was used in another class as well; however, this was not taken up by the other students. In lines 24-27, Jewel elaborates on what she meant by “seesaw”. She says “Oh, sometimes we are trying to get their/// get American culture///or sometimes we are getting into more in our culture. It’s like a seesaw. We change according to situation and according to the context.” Several students backchannel her comments, indicating that they acknowledge her claim about “changing according to context.” These statements are interesting because they illustrate the point that the students understood the diverse nature of academic discourse (i.e., that academic discourse is not monolithic) in which one needs to change his or her language, style and register according to different contexts. Although the students do have the academic language necessary to explain the socialization processes they are going through, from their statements it seems clear that they are attempting to grasp some key processes that they need to command to be a part of the academic discourse. The metaphor of a seesaw is a good example of this, such as the moment where Jewel is stressing the point that she needs to code-switch (linguistically and culturally) to adapt to this “whole new system” (line 10).

The next part of the segment shows that the students responded differently to the experience of academic socialization. Following Jewel’s seesaw metaphor, Carol, in an upbeat manner, interrupts and says “I am accommodating, NOT assimilating” (line 32). She continues in lines 32 and 34, explaining that “I am trying to put two things together
on my own, but not trying to change myself completely into the native speaker identity.”

Here, Carol is taking up what Jewel said previously about changing according to different situations and giving her own personal view about how she does not “change herself completely,” but she “accommodates.” Jewel in line 35 follows up Carol’s comments by saying “I would never try to” signaling she, as well, does not have intentions to “change herself completely” (line 34). Similar to what Jewel and Carol expressed about accommodating and changing, Fang throws out new concepts to express her own experiences in doctoral education: negotiating and balancing. From line 38 to 43, Fang is highlighting the importance of negotiation in doctoral education. More specifically, she expresses her belief that students “try to balance between [students’] abilities and the [professors’] expectations”. At this point in the discussion, she makes a reference to publishing, a topic that frequently arose in many of their classroom discussions. Here, she also indicates that one of the difficulties in publishing and being recognized in the field is her language abilities. As she says in lines 52 and 53: “If I write in my first language, I can finish easier. I don’t have to worry about my language.” While language issues frequently emerged in the students’ conversations, another issue was their lack of cultural knowledge. Jewel’s personal narrative about her lack of geographical knowledge illustrates that the difficulties they face with in their doctoral courses are not only language oriented. The fact that the nonnative speaking students do not have the same shared knowledge as their native English speaking classmates results in the former spending more time in understanding the disciplinary knowledge they are expected to acquire. Although there seems to be a consensus about the primary struggles they experienced with the language and content, Carol’s claims between lines 71 and 75
problematize the common idea built by the members of the support group so far in the discussion (i.e., one cannot “go very deep and broad” when she or he writes in her second language).

As we can see from the transcript above, the students are making various claims building on certain key words such as “seesaw”, “metaphor”, “identity”, “appropriation,” and “negotiation”. The sequencing of their comments as well as the key words that are used in the discussion illustrate their reasoning processes and personal experiences with regards to the challenges they faced. The table below provides a summary of the messages they conveyed in the order of their appearance during their support group discussion. It also shows the types of message functions that occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Messages (in the order of appearance)</th>
<th>Personal narrative</th>
<th>Truth claims</th>
<th>Acknowledging</th>
<th>Challenging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studying in the second language is obstacle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On needs to Adapting to a different culture</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s easier for Native speakers to do graduate school</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The metaphor of seesaw—changing according to context</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating not assimilating</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating between our abilities and the expectations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples: Publishing and understanding Carolina is two states</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to write in first language</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: The message functions in the order of their appearance
This classification allowed me to identify the main messages that the students were attempting to convey as well as the message functions they employed. As the table shows, two out of 10 messages were challenged; the rest of the time, the students mostly acknowledged each other and agreed on most of the points raised about the struggles they were all experiencing. The intense use of personal narratives and acknowledgment suggest that the students engaged in a collaborative exchange in which they rarely challenged each other’s arguments. Although these students come from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, being an “international student” became an important common characteristic that each of them shared. This seemed to have an empowering effect on them and give them a common ground to base their arguments about the difficulties they experience with second language writing.

Juxtaposing students’ dialogues in different contexts also revealed that they seemed to display a complex view of their status as multilingual international students. On the one hand, that status seemed to them to be an asset in some regards (e.g. being able to bring multiple perspectives on an educational issue), while in other regards they seemed to see that it was a disadvantage (e.g. writing difficulties). Thus, they seemed to be using these informal dialogues, or academic culture of collaboration spaces in their first year to negotiate a relationship with their status as multilingual international doctoral students.

Table 5.5: Continued

| Easier to write in English than writing in first language | X | X |

...
Scaffolding Sources other than the Support group:

The support group discussions and the kind of activities the students participated in have provided them abundant opportunities for scaffolding. It is important to point out that the students made use of each and every opportunity that could help them unveil what was expected from them in terms of classroom assignments, writing quality, presentations, or other future steps they would take after their first year (e.g. choosing a minor, putting together a candidacy committee, writing for the candidacy examination, and the dissertation). For instance, in one of the interviews, Jewel pointed out that it is not only the mentors that she consulted from who she benefited, such as the support group members and professors within the department, but also from other friends and family members:

For instance while writing papers I am always going back to what Dr. Hall says in the class and what my classmates say. For example, in the interaction yesterday somebody said something about driving tests. And I think it was Carol who said that in the classroom and I used that example in my paper. Because that is what made me understand the Criterion Reference testing. Also, in terms of my writing, you are influencing me very much. Because when I write now, I think about our writing center conversations so I say to myself “Explain, explain more specifically, narrow down”. Or I say “why, explain and give examples, give examples”. I think our writing center talks influence me a lot. Obviously, you help me to adapt in American way of writing. (Interview, 4/30/2007)

What is interesting in Jewel’s comments is that she is actively seeking support and scaffolding from various venues. One is the classroom discussions, and the other one is the Writing Center discussions she and I had about her research papers. Her comments suggest that she is relying on the multiplicity of texts to make meaning and create academic knowledge. Referring to a class discussion to write the introduction of her paper and the fact that she replayed our discussions in her mind while crafting her writing
suggests that her academic socialization involved scaffolding on multiple levels which not only took place at the time of that academic activity, but also after the activity was completed. That is, her academic socialization process seemed to transcend time and space. During their first year, the students discovered the existence of various institutional support systems, such as the Writing Center, within their university. Just like Jewel, the other participants also visited the Writing Center to become better writers in English and to talk about the struggles they experienced in writing in a second language. In other words, they sought scaffolding as they learned more about its availability.

Jewel continues to tell me about the kinds of scaffolding she receives outside of the classroom in the next interview segment:

Like a few days ago, we had a discussion with Mike and his wife///she finished her Ph.D. and she already has been in our position, so she was telling us the class she took and she was explaining to us what to do in classes, how to approach the professors, how to form a committee, she was very very helpful. Like explaining everything about what should be done. She was talking from experience but professors sees things from different perspectives///like how I need study, or what I need to study or how I need to present. Professors don’t tell these details. They are not going to tell me everything about doctoral program because//also these things come through confidentiality///you cannot take something like that from a class///class is a class/// because you have that culture of class and you are assessed in a class. But this is not like assessing a friendship// you know///friendship is not something you asses. (Interview, 4/30/2007)

Jewel’s comments on seeking support and guidance outside the classroom suggest that the role of the academic culture of collaboration in peer groups is an important aspect of academic socialization. Students do not only rely on the guidance of their professors or the academic knowledge they gain from the texts, but they also seek knowledge from more expert people around their friend circles. Students’ academic literacy socialization, therefore, is a composite of peer collaboration, more expert friends’ guidance, and as
Jewel stated, “professors don’t talk about such details”, so certain information “come through confidential” relationships friends establish through time. The students also sought assistance from their native English speaking friends. An example of the academic culture of collaboration will be shared below where Rice and Misa were in conversation with their native English speaking counterparts.

**Assistance and Resistance Within the Course**

In addition to the above mentioned scaffolding sources that Jewel sought for access, the students were also actively seeking support and assistance from native English speaking peers in order to better understand the assigned academic content or gain command of the academic writing rules (spoken and unspoken) at work in their doctoral courses. For instance, Rice (transcript 4) eagerly looked for opportunities for scaffolding and assistance in order to feel more confident about her reading of the academic content in her courses. As a first year multilingual student, Rice, just like the other participants in this research, utilized the peer dialogues inside the class for various purposes, such as filling gaps in her academic knowledge. In the transcript below, Rice played the role of a “novice” asking questions and seeking assistance from a more experienced member of her doctoral community, in this case a native English speaking classmate who was a second year doctoral student. On the other hand, in transcript 5, Misa, a Japanese doctoral student in her first year, played a different role than Rice. Misa, with her native English speaking classmates, discussed the expectations for academic writing and showed resistance to certain aspects of academic discourse, such as the use of technical terminology and scientific language. Although in each transcript the communicative intent is different, both of them are examples of how these two multilingual students
actively sought assistance as well as showed resistance to certain academic conventions in their first year of doctoral education. These two illustrative dialogs are also examples of different aspect of academic culture of collaboration that occurred within the course (as opposed to students’ support group) and with native English speaking classmates.

Transcript 4 below comes from a short, informal discussion during a class called “Learning Theories” that Rice was taking in the Spring quarter. The aim of the class was to review the key learning theories in the field of education. The students encountered many new technical terms in this course, which sometime caused them difficulty in understanding the main underpinnings of certain learning theories. The dialog below is extracted from a class session in which the students were examining various notions from Bakhtinian perspectives on language and learning. Rice was sitting in her usual seat next to Mary, who was a second year native English speaking doctoral student in the same program. Mary was also older than Rice and was teaching a university level course in addition to her doctoral work. Rice and Mary seemed to develop a close relationship during this course due to Rice’s curiosity about American culture and Mary’s willingness to share her knowledge with Rice. The discussion below revolves around the term ventriloquation, which Rice had a hard time to grasp.

Transcript 3: What is ventriloquation?

1. **Rice:** Yeah, HERE IT IS: ventriloquation….
2. Is this kind of an INNER speech?
3. **Mary:** One voice speaks from another voice.
4. When you think of ventriloquation.///Uhmm///
5. Have you EVER seen the show?
6. when they have a doll and they make it speak///
7. **Rice:** Hmm, maybe.
8. **Mary:** Well, he is saying that it is kind of like that
9. well maybe your mother always said to you///
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The discussion above begins with Rice’s question about ventriloquation. Rice, at the beginning of this conversation, juxtaposes two new terms that they recently discussed in the class: inner speech and ventriloquation and asks Mary for some clarification. Mary from lines 3 to 6 gives her own definition of the term ventriloquation. In her initial explanation, Mary gives two examples in order to explain the term to Rice. The first example is a doll example, where she asked Rice if she has seen ventriloquation in a TV
show (line 6: when they have a doll, and they make it speak”). In line 7, Rice’s response “maybe” does not imply that she picked up on the TV show reference. Mary then gives her a second example to explain the term. Her second example seemed to make more sense to Rice. This is inferred by the rising intonation in the uptake she provides in Line 13. In lines 14-17, Mary continues to elaborate on her explanation by saying “Do you understand? and she checks with Rice to see if they are on the same page. In Line 18 and 19, Rice formulates an utterance based on what she heard form Mary and says “We borrow from someone in another context.” However, the falling intonation in her voice in lines 18 and 19 as well as her question in Line 21 show that she needs more explanation from Mary to fully understand this term. Between lines 23-28, Mary and Rice exchange a few utterances to make the concept clearer. Mary employs different strategies to make herself understood. Picking up on the different explanations that Mary gives, Rice shows evidence of having understood by rewording Mary’s explanations in lines 27 and 35.

In this conversation, there is an unstated communicative convention that both Rice and Mary are closely following. Both Mary and Rice seemed to be aware of the activity in which they are engaged. Mary, in this conversation, appears to operate in the position of a more experienced student, a helper or mentor, whereas Rice is in the position of a learner who seeks assistance. As seen in this segment, there are basic assumptions that both interlocutors hold about the nature of the conversation. These assumptions are called principles of conversational implicature (Grice, 1975). Both Mary and Rice used their knowledge of language and conversation in order to make each other clearly understood. This occurred through the use of several signaling contextualization
cues such as back-channeling, asking more questions, repeating each others’ words and
so on. Gumperz (1981) states that

we use our knowledge of grammar, lexicon, contextualization conventions, as
well as whatever background information we have about settings and participants,
to decide on what activity is being signaled or to establish communicative goals
and outcomes. We then build on these predictions to identify the communicative
intent which underlies particular utterances. (p.14)

Similarly, in this conversation both Mary and Rice are aware of the purpose of this
conversation and make attempts to move the conversation forward toward its intended
objective, which is an explanation of the term “ventriloquation”. It is not only the words
that the speakers in this conversation use to signal the nature of the event, but also the
contextualization cues and prosodic signals which are “parts of the acts people make
toward each other” (Bloome et al, p.9). in a social interaction. Besides its conversational
features, the conversation between Mary and Rice provides some important insights
about their academic socialization. Like the other four participants of this study, Rice was
also looking for different opportunities to access knowledge in the academic culture she
was about to enter. This conversation between Rice and Mary could be seen as another
example of the academic culture of collaboration that the students were involved in
through their support group. In this case, the academic collaboration takes place between
a native speaker and nonnative English speaker. Rice, as a nonnative speaker, sought
assistance from the native speaker.

The next transcript comes form a group discussion in a course that both Misa and
Rice were taking during the Winter quarter. The course was focusing on the educational
philosophy of John Dewey, and the classroom activities included peer group discussion,
individual presentations, or whole class discussion of the books the students read about
Dewey. The transcript below is part of a peer group discussion that Misa was involved in. Misa and her native English speaking peers in this conversation are talking about the major papers they wrote for the Dewey course. The transcript below is part of the peer discussion group activity where the students were providing each other with feedback about their writing. The instructor for the class asked each member of the class to send their final drafts to their group members for peer review. The group that Misa was in included two male native speakers of English. Although the discussion started with Misa’s comments on one of the group member’s writing about Dewey’s theory, it shifted into another direction, where the students began to discuss the use of terminology in academic writing.

Transcript 4: The use of terminology

Fred: When we use easy language, it can lose that scholarly touch, but it is kind of the norm though. I think that you need to sacrifice. But you see all of these scholarly articles and all of these jargon and research then you loose the practicality at the same time.

Misa: That is a very good point. I think that I guess kind of putting back the Dewey’s philosophy, you know what is your ultimate goal? what do you want to do with your knowledge? Do you want to help the practicing teachers or do you want to bring theory and publish your paper in a journal?

Tim: Yeah.

Misa: Yes, so I guess hopefully EASY writing will also get more respect. Because it is nothing EASY to do, so especially when the content is difficult. It might look easy but it is NOT.

Tim: YES. the ideas are the important thing

Bred: That is the thing with Dr. Mell When I read her work it is VERY clear. I can see the picture that she is trying to paint. And you know that is difficult as a writer to paint the picture that you have in your mind. I think that sometimes the scholars they use the words that I think, it promotes uhmm it gives that SCHOLARLY touch to it, but they diminish the image that they are trying to paint almost.
Misa: Yeah, And in that sense maybe they LOOSE more audience because if people
don’t understand, what is the point of writing. Right?

Tim: Maybe the more it is not understood, it is better///[cannot hear] some people will
say/// oh, YOU didn’t understand but I understood that [laughs]

In this conversation, unlike Rice in the previous transcript, Misa was not in the position
of seeking assistance from others or certain answers from the dialogue. Instead, she was
participating in an assigned class activity with two other first year doctoral students, who
were native speakers of English. The students’ comments about writing with an “easy
language” and the use of terminology suggest that both multilingual speakers for whom
English is a second language and native English speakers struggle with finding a balance
between writing for a scholarly community with more reliance on the use of terminology
and “easy writing” that could be easily accessible to practitioners in students’ disciplinary
fields (e.g. Misa: “Do you want to help the practicing teachers or do you want to bring
theory and publish your paper in a journal?). The students, as seen in this conversation,
were collectively unpacking what it is that makes a piece of writing scholarly or
academic. Misa, Fred and Tim seem to imply that participation in an academic
community sometimes necessitates the use of disciplinary terminology, but it might get in
the way of “diminishing understanding” as Tim and the other students seem to value the
writing of a professor they all know. Misa’s comment that “I hope that easy writing will
get respect” is recognized and acknowledged by the two native English speaking
students. This could be inferred by Tim’s utterance, “The ideas should be more
important”, and Fred’s utterance that “it gives that scholarly touch to it, but they diminish
the image that they are trying to paint almost.”
It could be that what counted as knowledge for these first year students was not only the “scholarly touch” that Fred mentioned in this dialogue, but also the ability to negotiate certain rhetorical and linguistic moves and navigate writing expectations as they exist among different audiences. The discussion among Misa, Tim and Fred in this assigned class activity appears to be another example of the academic culture of collaboration, and it once again involves a nonnative speaker-native speaker combination. However, this time, all three participants of this interaction are in the same boat of trying to negotiate a certain practice. Misa, unlike Rice earlier, could be seen as on an equal footing with the native English speaking peers. These two examples of assistance within the course illustrate the different ways in which the academic culture of collaboration was enacted within the nonnative-native speaker interactions. Nonnative speaking participants sometimes position themselves as novice participants, seeking knowledge whereas they seem to be in the same level with their native English speaking classmates, who are also trying to unravel the certain aspects of academic writing.

**Summary of Answers to Research Question #3**

There are several issues worth noting in this analysis. The first is the importance of problematizing academic writing that the students mentioned in their support group interactions. In the support group interactions, the students noted that they felt a need to use technical terminology and to cite others’ work, which could prevent them from producing creative writing, something that some of them found appealing. However, with the engagement in collaborative writing in the example of google-docs, the students were problematizing academic writing by creating this interactive alternative space in which
they used features of written and spoken discourse by fusing their immediate academic interests and needs with what was expected of them in academic English.

Second, the students were creating this hybrid writing piece by bringing their agency into the act of writing. In this alternative writing practice, they had a specific audience in mind: other graduate students like themselves. Therefore, these multilingual students created this alternative rhetorical context (i.e. online writing) and became involved with a writing community. They studied who they were writing for (i.e., the newsletter to which they were submitting their piece) before starting the act of writing. The narrative rhetorical context that the students created allowed them to write for or about the community they were in, rather than only writing academically for their instructors. When we look at the recent scholarship on L2 composition, we see that scholars are trying to expand the kinds of rhetoric and structures used in academic writing, in light of the concern that a dominant international language like English could create injustices for minority student populations who are not native speakers of that language (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999; Casanave, 2002; Pennycook, 1996, 2001; Phillipson, 1992) This becomes especially crucial when we talk about multilingual and multicultural writers who enter U.S. academic communities. The creation of a collaborative text shown in this section suggests the importance of hybridity and the multiplicity of rhetorical forms in writing for an ethnolinguistically diverse student population (e.g., Bizzel, 2004; Matsuda, 2004).

Overall, the students’ support group interactions, that is, the academic culture of collaboration that they established outside of the classroom environment, seemed to empower and encourage them to challenge the academic conventions they encountered in
their first year and to become active practitioners of the doctoral community of their
disciplines by reshaping what they were exposed to and by fusing their own interests.
Examples of this can be seen in the students’ attempts to publish a manuscript or their
interest in submitting a proposal to a professional conference.

Finally, the scaffolding and assistance that Jewel, Rice and Misa engaged in
suggest that academic literacy socialization occurs in different contexts with the help of
different actors. While Jewel made use of sources outside the school (conversations with
Mike’s wife, or her other friends), Misa and Rice were actively engaged in dialogs with
native English speakers in order to clarify the academic content (as in Rice’s example)
and to look for confirmation and resistance about the expectations for academic writing
(as in Misa’s example). Here, too, the academic culture of collaboration was in play, but
in these examples it represents another dimension of academic socialization, one in which
the students sought help from each other.

**Chapter Summary**

Similar to any social practice, academic socialization in this study is perceived
within a historically situated framework focusing on the micro interaction students had
inside and outside the doctoral classrooms. While socializing into academic communities
both inside and outside their doctoral classrooms, the research participants were not only
trying to learn the academic content (i.e. research methods and theories of their
disciplines) and understand the rules of the academic genres of writing they needed to
produce for their courses; they were also involved in negotiating, resisting, appropriating,
and creating texts, meanings and social identities. Therefore, the results from this study
suggest that it is particularly important not to reduce students’ experiences only to their
textual productions, or individual accounts, but rather to look at the sequence of different episodes (i.e. classroom and peer group dialogues) and their historical relationships (one year in this case) and investigate the interactions between their dialogs, written work, and their individual and collective narratives in different contexts. It is especially worth noting that this social group, which I characterized in this chapter as an “academic culture of collaboration,” provided a crucial social network in which the students actively participated. The support group did not only provide them with an alternative space to negotiate and appropriate certain academic practices, but it also provided an emotional support system which they utilized to overcome their uncertainties about various issues raised in their first year (e.g. dialogue on citing practices and writing a literature review in section 2).

Bringing a micro ethnographic perspective to L2 academic socialization, the basic unit of analysis in this study was not the texts in isolation, but rather people who are constantly “acting and reacting to each other” (Erickson & Schultz, 1977). Within this context, doctoral students are constituted as groups, and they are contexts for each other (Erickson & Schultz, 1977).

To summarize the major characteristics of the microethnographic approach to the first year doctoral students’ academic literacy socialization, this analysis section will end with three main assertions, which will be discussed in the next chapter:

1. Academic literacy socialization is a dialogic process which takes place in multiple spaces and includes a wide range of social interactions.
2. An ‘academic culture of collaboration’ provides multilingual students a safe space to collectively challenge and question academic writing by establishing intertextual links to various texts.

3. Academic literacy socialization involves the acts of group resistance, assistance, and appropriation.

The next chapter, Chapter 6, will start with discussion of these assertions. The recapitulation of the findings and what the findings mean in the larger framework of L2 academic socialization are presented within the framework of these three central assertions.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

International graduate students are the fastest growing student population in the U.S. post-secondary institutions. According to the Open Doors resource, the number of international students currently attending different fields of U.S. higher education is reported to be 580,000, of which 40,000 are Ph. D. students. As indicated earlier in this dissertation, most of these students come to the doctoral level with a high level of English academic literacy skills in their first, second and even their third or fourth languages, thus leading to the term “multilingual” to describe them. In addition to their language abilities, multilingual graduate students generally have different characteristics and trajectories than other student groups who are nonnative speakers of English, such as undergraduate ESL students, foreign exchange students, or 1.5. Generation (i.e., immigrant) students. For instance, compared to the undergraduate ESL student population, these multilingual graduate students face different types of difficulties and struggles regarding the complex literacy demands of their academic disciplinary communities, primarily due to the vicissitudes of doctoral education. In addition to the L2 literacy difficulties, these students also face a different cultural system of meanings and procedures that pertains to Anglophone doctoral level education. This cultural system within the local educational community in which the students in this study were
socializing required them to produce well-written academic papers for their courses, attend and present papers at regional and national conferences, and be knowledgeable about a wide range of research methodologies and theories in their disciplinary fields. These will eventually lead them to produce a significant research project (i.e., a dissertation) in which they will be expected not only to contribute to the research and theoretical knowledge of their disciplinary fields, but also to display the expected “rhetorical moves” to express their scholarly ideas. Within this process, it is crucial that graduate students like those in this study produce a professional voice (both in the written and spoken domains) and advanced scholarly ideas which will contribute to the larger intellectual communities of their disciplines.

Although the whole process may seem to be challenging, even intimidating, regardless of one’s background, students whose native language and culture are different than that of the Anglophone university mainstream face a double-edged sword: not only adapting to the new set of linguistic issues and demands, but also to institutional issues that might be different than what they were accustomed to previously. Among the many hurdles involved in completing their graduate work, international doctoral students might also lack the necessary social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977), which are expected of those who enter graduate school. As many second language literacy scholars have pointed out, these students might be reluctant to criticize the work of established scholars (e.g., Belcher, 1995), might encounter difficulties in citation practices (e.g., Li, 1996), or struggle to represent their voice and identity in academic research papers (e.g., Hirvela & Belcher, 2001) due to the cross-cultural or educational differences between the academic practices in the students’ home countries and those of the U.S institutions. In this context,
therefore, it is crucial for educators and policy makers to know more about the kinds of academic and social processes that these graduate students undergo to become legitimate participants in their disciplines and understand the types of negotiations, adaptations and transformations that these students experience in their first year of doctoral study.

In order to address the important above-mentioned educational issues regarding multilingual students’ academic socialization, this study focused on several first year students’ academic literacy socialization experiences both within and outside the doctoral classroom context, focusing primarily on their social interactions within the “safe houses” (Canagarajah, 1994) or “academic culture of collaboration” (Seloni, 2008) they established. Language plays a key role in these experiences and interactions. Therefore, the main aim of this study was to further our understanding of the complicated language processes which constitute the central component of the academic socialization of multilingual students, to investigate the social relationships that seem to provide more than a scaffolding space, and to explore how the participants in this study collectively acted relative to the academic expectations of their disciplinary communities (e.g., publishing papers) both in and beyond the culture of their classrooms.

More specifically, in this study, I not only addressed the socialization processes that the students underwent in their courses, but also the processes that occurred outside of their classrooms. Through the use of microethnographic discourse analysis, I also explored the kinds of intertextual and intercontextual links the students established to make meaning from the new academic environment they participated in, to negotiate academic literacy expectations they encountered, and to build social relationships that
eventually led them to challenge, resist and appropriate the academic literacy practices that were presented to them in their first year of study.

This study aimed to answer the following research questions:

- What kinds of language practices do doctoral students display in their initial encounters with doctoral courses?
- What types of intertextual links and semiotic meanings do multilingual doctoral students collectively establish to make meaning from academic texts?
- How does social interaction (spoken, written and online) among doctoral students mediate students’ construction of academic writing and help them negotiate academic literacies?

The overarching goal of these research questions was to shed light on the academic literacy socialization processes that multilingual students undergo in their first year of study. With this in mind, this final chapter will first summarize the answers to these research questions, situating the findings within the larger framework of the field of second language literacy and academic literacy socialization. Next, the theoretical and methodological contributions resulting from this investigation will be presented. In addition, the limitations of the microethnographic approach to the study will be discussed. Finally, the chapter will end with a review of possible directions for future research regarding the academic socialization of doctoral students as well as some final comments about academic socialization.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

The primary findings relative to the research questions of this study suggest that there was a wide range of dimensions that shaped the academic literacy socialization of
these multilingual doctoral students. These findings echo previous studies conducted on various other aspects of multilingual students’ academic socialization (Belcher & Braine, 1995; Bronson, 2005; Canagarajah, 2002; Casanave, 1995, 2002; Shi & Beckett, 2002; Spack, 1997, 2004; Zamel & Spack, 1998, 2004). However, contrary to the previous studies conducted on multilingual students’ academic socialization, this study specifically focused on the first year experience at the doctoral level. By investigating, in particular, dialogs both inside and outside of the doctoral classrooms, this study aimed to closely explore the language practices which proved to be a crucial part of these students’ academic socialization in the first year of their doctoral program.

The ethnographic component of this study enabled me to identify three spaces of academic socialization in doctoral level. These spaces included initial contact points (frames), typical academic spaces, and academic culture of collaboration, created by the students outside of the classroom setting. Although one must acknowledge that there is a wide range of spaces in higher education, what this dissertation found was these three main spaces. Through the use of microethnographic approaches and discourse analysis, I looked at the language processes and social interaction within each of these spaces. What was happening in these spaces is the key in understanding academic socialization of these students as well as different aspect of language use.

In this section, the recapitulation of the findings and what the findings mean in the larger framework of L2 academic socialization are presented within three central assertions related to the study’s research questions. These assertions will also summarize the ways that these spaces were constructed among students and the nature of such spaces.
1. Academic literacy socialization is a dialogic process which takes place in multiple spaces and includes a wide range of social interactions.

2. An ‘academic culture of collaboration’ provides multilingual students a safe space to collectively challenge and question academic writing by establishing intertextual links to various texts.

3. Academic literacy socialization involves the acts of group resistance, assistance, and appropriation.

The remainder of this section of the chapter discusses these assertions in the same order in which they appear above and relative to the research questions they address.

1. *Academic literacy socialization is a dialogic process which takes place in multiple spaces and includes a wide range of social interactions*

The first research question which this study sought to investigate dealt with the classroom dialogs and the kinds of language that the students displayed in their initial doctoral courses, or what I call the social interactions within the *initial contact points of students’ doctoral education*. These first doctoral courses proved to be crucial spaces for the students to learn about their disciplines, to begin picking up the tacit rules of the disciplinary discourses of their academic communities, and to participate in their academic communities of practice while utilizing the writing and speaking practices that were expected from them as doctoral students. As also seen in the previous chapter, many classroom activities in this first year involved intense interactions.

Engaging in these intense interactions (both spoken and written) became especially complicated for these multilingual students for various reasons, such as
mismatches of expectations or linguistic and cultural differences which may lead to some students dropping out from the program, despite the high motivation and desire to further their education in a U.S. institution (such as Virginia in Casanave, 1995, 2002 or Zhang in Schneider & Fujishima, 1995). Earlier studies (e.g. Belcher, 1994; Casanave, 1992) have emphasized that without strong support and mentoring, multilingual students may not “learn to participate in academic literacy games even peripherally” (Casanave, 2002, p.90). Supporting this view, the initial courses such as the ones that I described in this study had important impacts on the students’ academic socialization, which eventually seemed to help prepare them for the kinds of academic participation that was expected of all doctoral students.

To better understand what happens inside these initial courses, the first research question looked at students’ language use and social interactions in such classrooms. The microanalyses conducted to answer the first research question suggest that the participants of the study used a wide range of discourse styles and interactions in order to make meaning from the academic texts and tasks they were assigned. Looking at how the students made meaning from these academic texts, and how they “acted and reacted” to each other in their doctoral courses revealed the type of participation modes that the students socialized into within different classroom communities. For instance, while the dominant modes of language use revolved around collaborative and inquisitive talk in Dr. Kay’s class, Dr. Hall’s class included various instances of argumentative talk through which the students actively engaged in academic debates. The analysis of both courses suggests that textual engagement at the doctoral level is a dialogic process and that students’ interaction with one another and engagement with the assigned texts varies
depending on the class content, the professor’s teaching style, and the presence of other participants in the class. The microanalysis of classroom dialogues with a focus on verbal and non-verbal cues also showed that the students mutually constructed the classroom interactions. The linguistic features that I analyzed included verbal and nonverbal cues as well as word stress, overlaps and hesitations. As explained in more detail in Chapter 3, the selection of these segments was based on the contextual information gained in the field as well as the theoretical and methodological decisions made by the researcher. What is important in analyzing these short segments is that they shed light on how the students academically socialized in their first year doctoral courses by situating the classroom interactions on what happened before and after the segments. As Bloome & Clark (2006) explain, “the meaningfulness of any communicative behavior or of any stream or sequence of behavior is not found within itself but in its use and import within the flow of interaction. People engaged in interaction with each other must constantly monitor what is happening, what has happened, and what might happen to assign meaningfulness to communicative behavior” (p. 233-234). Following this premise, the claims and arguments were made in terms of the linguistic and nonlinguistic interpretation of message units based on what came before and after those message units.

Another important point that needs to be raised about the students’ initial encounters in their first year is in relation to the issue of framing. For instance, it is important to remember that the students took Dr. Kay’s course in their first quarter. The fact that her classroom topics were in alignment with the academic socialization experience of the students helped them to be more attuned to important academic practices such as publishing and presenting at academic conferences. The students’ initial
contact point can be examined within two dimensions. The first one is the existence of this initial framing. The fact that the students took a class that was about academic socialization topics made them more sensitive to issues revolving around life in academia and helped them become more reflexive about their own academic socialization. Second is the nature of such initial framing. Dr. Kay’s class created a relaxed atmosphere that promoted meaningful discussion, as many students said in the interviews. The discussions were open and broad enough for these newcomers to feel accepted, to ask questions, and to eventually build a mutually enriching emotional and intellectual group that helped them to unravel the complexities of the doctoral journey ahead of them. Besides this initial contact that students experiences in Dr. Kay’s course, students also experienced a wide range of language practices in Dr. Hall’s course, which could be considered as a typical academic space. In it, students engaged in questioning, arguing, giving evidence or refuting each other’s positions in the classroom discussion. This academic space also provided the students with the content information that is necessary to move forward in their doctoral education.

2. An academic culture of collaboration provides multilingual students a safe space to collectively challenge and question academic writing by establishing intertextual links to various texts.

The second research question sought to illuminate the types of intertextual links the students established in their support group discussions concerned with the texts and contexts that they drew from in order to make meaning out of L2 academic writing, more particularly, research writing.
According to a number of L2 writing scholars, academic socialization and learning about academic writing in a second language is a multilayered and culturally oriented phenomenon, one which includes creating a new identity, adapting to a new culture, and learning new ways of thinking and being (e.g., Canagarajah, 2002a, 2002b; Casanave, 1996, 2002; Fox, 1994; Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Spack, 1999, 2004; Zamel, 1997). For example, Spack’s (1997) study of a Japanese undergraduate student’s encounters with academic literacy at an American university illustrates the importance of being familiar with the host institution’s linguistic, cultural and social background in order to successfully perform the academic literacy acts that are expected from students. As Spack indicates, most of this knowledge is tacit and not easily accessible to international students. While Spack’s longitudinal study was conducted at the undergraduate level, it has various implications for graduate students’ socialization as well, as reflected by the findings of this study. At the graduate level, scholars such as Belcher (1994), Casanave (1996, 2002), and Hyland (1999) have also suggested that, in order to achieve competency in academic writing, these students need to learn the tacit rules of academia which are situated in larger social practices. Learning these “game-like strategies,” as Casanave (2002) calls them, helps students gain command of important academic literacy practices and thus helps them to successfully participate in the discourses of their academic disciplinary communities.

Although the results for research question 2, and this study as a whole, echo previous research, this study also suggests that graduate students do much more than merely learn a set of academic rules, which could be initially tacit and covert. Instead, they actively participate in, resist and act on these “game-like” strategies that Casanave
highlights, fusing them with their own interests, values, behaviors and appropriating what their institution seem to espouse. Alternative spaces such as the support group the students created seemed to help them play an active role in their socialization by asking questions or challenging what was available to them, as well as learning from each other about the sources of institutional support they could access at the university as a whole (e.g., the Writing Center). Within this alternative space, or what I have called in this study the *academic culture of collaboration*, the students acted and reacted to each other by establishing intertextual links which were recognized and acknowledged by the group members. As seen in Chapter 5, these intertextual links mostly involved certain academic writing rules or conventions, such as citation practices. The students voiced their dilemmas about finding a balance between accommodating themselves to academic expectations (e.g., citing other scholars, writing scientifically) and expressing the creativity and originality that they wished to bring from their native language to their second language writing. The analysis of the support group discussions showed that the academic culture of collaboration was an important resource for building social relationships at the doctoral level. When I entered the academic culture of these first year multilingual students, I did not expect the support group and mentoring to be such a prominent part of the first year experience, but as it turned out, the academic collaborations the students created played an important role in negotiating academic literacies, learning certain rhetorical moves, and being acculturated into the culture of the department. Therefore, these outside social interactions proved to be as important as the ones inside the classroom.

---

15 Although the data shared in this dissertation only derive from the conversations about academic struggles
The focus on intertextual links in this analysis also suggested that the students developed an early awareness of the genre of academic research. The discussions on citing other scholars’ works and the metaphor that one student used—“riding on someone’s coat tail”—also suggest that there exists some resistance to certain academic writing practices students encounter in their first year of doctoral education. This analysis also unveils what counts as knowledge from students’ perspectives and how students gain access to that knowledge in order to become legitimate participants of their academic communities.

3. *Academic literacy socialization involves the acts of group resistance, assistance, and appropriation.*

The results for research question 3 revealed that the students’ academic literacy socialization processes also included the acts of resistance, scaffolding, negotiation, and appropriation. The analysis of the students’ support group discussion about seeing academic writing as a “seesaw” and the students’ attempts to create a dialogic manuscript through the use of an online medium suggest that they not only resisted and questioned certain academic practices, but they also assisted each other and appropriated those practices according to their own interests. The use of agency in this phase of the students’ academic socialization was triggered by initial courses such as Dr. Kay’s as well as assistance and support provided by their peers. The social interactions within the group can be portrayed as occurring in four steps. The following figure captures the steps the students underwent from the beginning of their support group discussions about academic or surprises the students experienced, the students in this group also shared general discussion topics about life in the U.S. as newcomers. These topics, due to their confidential nature, were not discussed or analyzed in this study.
writing as a seesaw until they drafted the collaborative manuscript about their group experience.

Figure 6.1: Steps of student interaction

These multilingual students’ resistance toward certain academic rules also led them to assist each other in understanding what the rules meant and how they operated within this system. Through assisting each other, they created a hybrid form of writing. The creation of their collaborative text suggests the importance of hybridity and multiplicity of rhetorical forms that multilingual students bring into their academic lives. These students’ attempts to publish an article, and the dialogic approach by which they wrote it, support Flower’s (1994) assertion that “the meaning-making function of every text is situated in the free and collaborative social context described by conversation [i.e., as an undirected conversation]” (p. 59).
As indicated in the answers to research question 3 presented in Chapter 5, this study also suggests that students may like to seek support and assistance in spaces or from actors outside of their academic circles (e.g., Jewel consulting Mike’s wife, who was a senior graduate student at another institution) and within their classrooms in order to penetrate the obscurity and unfamiliarity they encounter in their first year of study. This finding suggests that students seek support in various mediums, including their immediate and extended environments, and that academic socialization includes a wide range of types of scaffolding from various mediums. Like Mike’s wife, or Mary who were helping Rice with her question about ventriloquation, these helpers were not necessarily experts in their academic communities, but they could be friends or senior students who have experienced similar situations.

**Contributions of the Study**

One of the contributions of the study is in how the academic literacy socialization of the students is demonstrated not only through personal narratives of multilingual students’ socialization processes, but also through their collective classroom dialogues, as well as the dialogues in the support group that the four core participants of this study established during the early stages of their doctoral experience. Therefore, the academic socialization analysis that I shared in this dissertation attempted to situate academic literacies and students’ textualizing experiences in their collective voices and in their lived experiences (cf. Freire, 1987; Guerra, 1998), rather than only their written products, cognitive processes, or individual academic socializations.

Although useful, previous studies have predominantly based their results on analyzing interview accounts, case studies or surveys investigating students’ perceptions
of their academic literacy learning. Given the nature of doctoral education and the seemingly slow paced process of academic socialization, it is important to conduct research that provides a thick description of multilingual doctoral students’ day to day experiences in their first year, particularly the interactions they engage in. Therefore, one of the most important contributions of this study is that it offers an ethnographic perspective of academic socialization focusing on the micro language processes that the students experience in their day to day lives. The microethnographic discourse analysis framework that I adopted in this study helped me to conduct a fine-grained analysis of language and discourses as the first year multilingual students interacted in different communities of practice. This approach, although not used frequently in the second language literacy field, could be beneficial in understanding what students do with language, and for what purposes while socializing in the academic communities of their disciplinary fields. In this study, paying such close attention to students’ discourse during interaction revealed the kinds of language processes students experience in everyday classroom life and helped me identify what counts as academic knowledge and academic socialization. In this approach to capturing the essence of academic literacy socialization, the role of language is perceived to be critical “in creating and negotiating everyday life” (Bloome et al, 2005, p.2). Their academic socialization was exhibited within their social interactions in and beyond the classrooms and, more specifically, the language guiding those interactions. In classroom interactions, “social processes are also being constructed, modified, selected, checked, suspended, terminated, and recommended by the participants as they engage in instructional conversations” (Blumer, 1976, cited in Green and Wallet, p.161), and that was clearly the case in this study. The microethnographic
analysis approach to second language academic socialization, as exemplified in this research, could help educators and researchers identify how these social processes are actively constructed by students and how knowledge is created by these interactions.

Additionally, this study placed particular importance on language socialization and how the use of language in different contexts creates certain realities relative to students’ first year doctoral experiences. As indicated in Chapter 2, earlier studies on academic socialization focused predominantly on the written interactions of students and the kinds of struggles they experience as they shuttle between different writing practices. However, more recent studies (e.g. Duffy, 2002; Kobayashi, 2004; Morita, 2000; Seloni, 2008; Zappa-Hollman, 2007) have investigated oral discourse and the kinds of struggles students face as well as the strategies (more specifically, presentations and class participation) they develop to successfully engage in academic literacy practices in a second language. Similarly, this study provides a thick description of doctoral students’ oral discourse in various academic environments. The unique nature of this study is that it brought together two research areas not normally linked in second language writing research: second language academic socialization and microethnographic discourse analysis. Given the emphasis on language and interaction, discourse analysis provided a useful framework for understanding the academic literacy socialization of these students and for exploring what counted as knowledge and socialization among these first year multilingual doctoral students. As academic socialization is a complex and a slow paced process, a fine grained analysis on a study conducted over an extended period of time such as the one described in this dissertation contributes to the creation of a more complete picture of academic socialization.
As explained in Chapter 5, academic socialization does not happen in the isolation of the individual studying texts or being exposed to certain values and thinking. Instead, as seen in this study, classroom and outside classroom spaces had cultures of their own. Looking at those spaces in the way this study did could provide educators a way of discussing the academic knowledge and socialization that students bring with them or co-construct as a consequence of social interaction. Given the importance of these classrooms and beyond classroom settings and communities for students’ socialization, another important contribution of this study is the notion of academic culture of collaboration. The academic culture of collaboration involves a set of social practices that include communicative and dialogic actions and interactions (Bakhtin, 1983) within an intercultural group of newcomers in a specific domain of academic discourse. This social space provided a crucial social network in which the students actively participated. This view also echoes earlier studies on academic socialization which have underscored the importance of mentoring and peer relations in higher education (e.g. Belcher, 1999; Braine, 2001; Casanave 1999, 2002). Extending the findings of these earlier studies on the importance of peer support and mentoring, this study has put special emphasis on the kinds of discussions and social interaction the students had in such “safe houses” (Canagarajah, 1999) and on the kind of informal literacy activities the students engaged within their peer culture. Moreover, the empowering effect of these community dialogs revealed that the academic culture of collaboration that the students were actively engaged in both inside and outside the classroom constituted an important part of the first year experience. I observed that by acting and reacting to each other as speakers and writers in an intercultural space, these adult multilingual students were not only taking up
new literacy practices, but they were also resisting, challenging, and creating hybrid forms of literacy practices according to their own academic interests and expectations. As the findings demonstrate, the spaces created outside of the classroom enhanced the students’ understanding of academic literacy practices and empowered them to be engaged practitioners and members of their academic communities. Whether, or how much, this happens when they act solely as individuals as opposed to within a group setting is unclear, but it seems likely that operating within a group made it easier for them be engaged in these ways. In addition, the analysis of the dialogs outside the classroom showed evidence of the students’ early genre awareness in a second language. Although L2 students may have difficulties in displaying the expected academic rhetorical moves in their academic papers, the student peer dialogs suggested that the students were gradually gaining awareness of the intricacies of the genre of research as defined in their discipline and what is necessary to include or not to include in their writing. The microanalysis of the students’ group discussion for research question 2 and the academic culture of collaboration example of Misa’s conversation with two of her classmates are examples of this.

Bloome et al (2005) conceptualize classrooms as having two integral parts, namely discourse of schooling and discourse of disciplinary fields. While the former is related to the “ways of using language, ways of interacting with others, values, goals, and resources that promulgate the culture of schooling” (p.53), the latter pertains to the academic discourse referring to “organization, selection, and display of knowledge consistent with the practices of a disciplinary community”(p.53). From an ideological frame of learning, both discourses are laden with meanings, and interpretations occur
amid the complex cultural politics of the classroom (Pennycook, 2001). Likewise, in this study, classrooms appeared to be an integral part of a broader social system; I perceived students and teachers as architects of the classroom discourse who construct the cultural worlds in the classrooms through “acting and reacting to each other” (Bloome, 1985). It was through language that the students were able to display their actions and reactions. The use of microethnographic approaches to analysis offered a deeper understanding of the day-to-day classroom practices of these multilingual students at the doctoral level. The classroom and support group interactions created a local history within the students’ intercultural space. It is through looking at these micro interactions that we can see what counts as knowledge and whose knowledge counts as well as what it means to act as a member of an academic community (Bloome & Egan Robertson, 1993).

Lastly, it is important to underscore the notion of doctoral programs being “peopled environments” (Casanave, 1995, 2002), which includes multiple spaces and ongoing social interactions between people, texts and literacy events. The pedagogical model below portrays academic socialization as involving initial contact points, typical academic spaces and academic culture of collaboration space.
More specifically, the model depicted in Figure 6.2 illustrates the communicative processes and the dynamic relationship between doctoral students, events and texts. While students enter academic communities and interact and participate in their local communities, they make use of various semiotic tools in order to construct meaning.
negotiate and challenge certain practices, and take social actions. This dynamic and fluid view of socialization contributes to our understanding of the interconnectedness of academic reading, writing and speaking events in multilingual doctoral students’ lives. In this study of the academic socialization of multilingual doctoral students, the students are seen connecting various resources in order to talk about their textual construction (e.g., writing a literature review) in academic writing, or, as Bloome and Egan-Robertson (2004) argue, “textualizing” experiences. With the academic socialization model depicted in Figure 6.2, L2 socialization into academic disciplines goes beyond the view that socialization is mostly facilitated by academic texts or an expert. It also involves newcomers’ (in this case, first year doctoral students) dynamic participation and interaction that includes a multiplicity of spaces and a plurality of genres that are jointly constructed by the local histories of the students, curriculum, texts, instructors and other actors and institutional capacities in academic communities (e.g., mentors, writing centers, libraries).

**Limitations of the Study**

Academic socialization is a complex and multidimensional process which I examined through the use of microethnographic discourse analytic approaches to social interaction. During the process of data collection and data analysis, I also discovered some limitations of this study which in part could be addressed in future research on academic socialization. One of the limitations of this study may lie in its lack of generalizability. While the methodological aspect of this study could be transferred to different qualitative studies on the academic socialization of multilingual students, this study’s findings cannot be generalized into all multilingual doctoral students’ experiences, particularly
due to the small number of the participants in the study. Related to this, it is also important to note that the study was conducted in the field of education. Therefore, the findings of this study should be applied to other disciplines with considerable caution. Another reason for being cautious in generalizing the results is the linguistic and cultural variation among the participants. There were widely differing linguistic and cultural backgrounds among the participants, let alone their personal and experiential backgrounds. Therefore, great caution should be taken while attempting to apply the culture of the participants in this study to the entire population of multilingual students in American doctoral programs or similar programs in other Anglophone countries.

Another limitation might be related to the tools that I employed during the course of data collection. One of the important data collection methods used for conducting a micro ethnographic analysis is video and audio recording participants’ classroom interaction. The main purpose of the video recording is not only to record the participants’ verbal interaction, but also their nonverbal interaction such as body posture or eye gaze. While I did take field notes that could complement the video camera and audio recorder, it proved to be difficult to record every verbal or nonverbal form of communication taking place in the classroom.

Furthermore, by adopting a micro analytic framework, I was only able to present small segments of interaction due to the nature of the kind of analysis performed in microethnographic research and the extensive amount of data collected. Presentation and analysis of all of the interaction data gathered would require thousands of pages; thus, I had to rely on presenting representative samples of interaction. A closely related limitation, one faced by all qualitative researchers, regards the issue of subjectivity.
Although the qualitative researcher spends an extended amount of time in the field collecting and reviewing the data corpus, it still is difficult to provide a true emic perspective due to the researcher’s own subjectivity. As Bogdan & Biklen (1982) note, “all researchers are affected by observers’ bias” (p.43). In this study, I, as a researcher, needed to make many difficult decisions about the segments chosen for video analysis and audio analysis and for inclusion in the dissertation. To guard against observer bias, I attempted to provide a thick description of the context at hand through the use of field notes. More analysis of students social interactions, although will not be practical in the context of dissertation writing, could have given a more in-depth understanding of students’ academic literacy socialization experiences.

**Directions for Future Research**

As researchers and educators who are concerned about social change and improving the academic learning quality of all students, scholars need to continue developing studies that investigate the socialization experiences of ethnolinguistically diverse student populations from an ethnographic perspective. As the number of international students in the U.S. education system (and other Anglophone countries, such as Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom) increases, classrooms at different levels of education will likely include more multilingual students whose native language and culture is not English or Western-oriented. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct additional research that will address the academic literacy needs of this student population. In particular, it is important to move beyond the traditional reliance on product-oriented research on academic socialization (e.g., analyzing texts written by students) by looking at students’ narratives about their experiences and their day-to-day
literacy activities during the course of certain literacy events inside and outside the university setting. Looking at how these students individually or collectively act relative to certain expectations of Anglophone academic communities could help educators understand what goes on in classrooms and in students’ peer culture. This could also help promote educational pedagogies that account for the cultures of students and view multiliterate environments as resources rather than barriers toward academic success.

Taking these perspectives into account, one line of research that scholars could focus on is the upper levels of doctoral education, such as the socialization which occurs in the second and third years of study and the dissertation writing experiences of multilingual students. Such investigations could look at issues such as how students continue to take up the rules and conventions they are exposed to in their first year and what they make out of these rules as they move from being novice writers and researchers to more experienced scholars in the field. One related question could be: How do advanced multilingual doctoral students or even first year multilingual faculty members socialize into the culture of their disciplines and acquire academic writing and speaking practices that help them contribute to their fields of study? Researchers could also explore a closely related set of questions that includes: How do multilingual writers at different levels of higher education deal with the complexities of higher education within different disciplines? Are there any interdisciplinary differences that the students encounter? How do these multilingual speakers and multiliterate students develop patterns of writing, speaking and thinking across different disciplines?

Additionally, most of the research conducted in higher education is restricted to English speaking countries such as the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia.
Given the increasing attention to World Englishes (Kachru, 1995) and English as an International language in the sociolinguistics and applied linguistics research communities, it is also crucial to recognize how students in postcolonial or developing countries socialize into different academic communities within institutions in their own nations and cultures. One of the research questions that could be addressed is: How do students in the non-US context deal with issues related to shuttling between their home languages and English and socialize into their own local communities of practice in which English is used as a primary tool for gaining membership in the academic community?

An important issue which was not explored in the present study is the creation and acknowledgment of alternative spaces in other educational levels outside the students’ own department. As this study revealed, the students were active inquirers about their own academic socialization. They took ownership of their socialization in the support group meetings, classroom discussions or other informally formed contexts. It would be worthwhile to look at how different academic units in the university level construct various sites and spaces that will offer students rich access to a wide range of opportunities to be exposed to the rules of academia as soon as they enter these institutions. For instance, academic units such as writing centers or curricular initiatives such as writing across the curriculum programs are important institutional sites that mediate academic knowledge and culture; therefore, it would be worthwhile to investigate how these sites work with different disciplinary communities and create alternative pedagogies that could help ethnolinguistically diverse students and faculty to negotiate conflicting discourses. Some of the research questions that could be asked
include: How do educational units such as writing centers, or various other academic communities on university campuses perpetuate, reinforce, and challenge certain writing practices in academia? How can these units place ethnolinguistic diversity in the foreground of higher education? How do multilingual students and faculty create alternative learning contexts through the use of emerging technologies (e.g. blogs, wikis, games) to pluralize the literacy practices of western academic discourse? Some research questions at the policy level could be: How can institutions assist in the creation of spaces that recognize multilingual students’ alternative literacy practices in higher education? What kinds of efforts need to be made to accept other type of literacies and ways of participation in graduate programs?

**Concluding Comments**

This study has aimed to broaden the notion of academic literacy socialization of multilingual students at the level of doctoral education, placing language use and interaction at the heart of its focus through the tools of microethnographic discourse analysis. Furthermore, I proposed the term *academic culture of collaboration* to try to illustrate the social interactions the students engaged inside and beyond the classroom setting. This academic culture that the students created was identified and traced by examining specific settings in students’ face-to-face interactions in their day-to-day social settings. The results of this study generated the three assertions that were discussed earlier in this chapter. These assertions include:

> Academic literacy socialization is a dialogic process that includes a wide range of social interactions.
An ‘academic culture of collaboration’ provides multilingual students a safe space to collectively challenge and question academic writing by establishing intertextual links to various texts.

Academic literacy socialization involves the acts of group resistance, assistance, and appropriation.

The processes of academic socialization, as depicted in this dissertation, involve many ups and downs. The students’ individual and collective remarks suggested that academic literacy socialization for multilingual doctoral students is not a seamless process, in that the students did not simply or easily become a part of the academic community of a classroom or a community of doctoral students from the same cohort in a short span of time. The academic socialization of these multilingual graduate students was not restricted to acquiring certain set of rules and conventions regarding how to write or how to make presentations. The ethnographic approach to academic literacy socialization could help move beyond product oriented approaches to second language literacy and socialization and reach a stage where collaborative interaction, resistance, assistance, negotiation, and appropriation became integral parts of academic literacy socialization. These processes were shaped by a group of peers within the academic community, institutional factors such as which courses the students needed to take or what content the courses covered, as well as the writing assignments and other assigned tasks in the courses.

In the presentation of this dissertation, I have attempted to illustrate important manifestations of the ways in which multilingual graduate students can make meaning out of the academic literacy games they are playing in their disciplinary fields. This study
illustrates Bizzell’s (1992, 2002) notion of hybrid academic discourses in which she points out that such alternative discourses challenge the dichotomy between students’ vernacular discourses and school discourses, thus blurring the divide between academic and daily spoken interactions. Similarly, the doctoral students in this study transformed what they had been exposed to in their formal doctoral study experiences through the use of a wide range of communicative means, including outside the class conversations (both their native English speaking and non-native English speaking counterparts), support group discussions, and online interactions. At the same time, these interactions draw attention to the importance of community relations and the transformative power they carry. The collaborative nature of both speaking and writing events that the students organically formed within their academic culture of collaboration involved powerful meaning-making processes that enabled the students not only to informally discuss the academic literacy practices common at the doctoral level, but also encouraged them to produce an alternative genre (their dialogic writing in an online space) departing from the standard academic writing games and blending with other nonacademic discourses. This new genre did not necessarily appear as a direct form of opposition or resistance to standard academic discourse; instead, it operated as a hybrid alternative discourse that emerged through the collaborative and informal speaking and writing practices the students were involved in during their daily lives. Moreover, it is important to note that the students felt the need to be engaged in such an activity and found a way to fulfill it through creating their own spaces outside the classroom context. That is, the students in this study were not passive recipients of academic knowledge and academic practices. Instead, they appeared as active agents taking into their own hands the power to address a
need they felt in their first year doctoral study. Furthermore, it was these multilingual students’ rhetorical and linguistic struggles and the collective endeavor to deal with them that contributed to their academic literacy socialization in their first year of doctoral education.

Writing in academia is an important means of knowledge construction. In terms of L2 academic literacy socialization, it is important to explore the day-to-day microsocial interactions that occur in order to shed light on how macro-level concerns in academic discourse play out in classrooms, as well as how and by whom knowledge and meaning are constructed. As suggested by Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1993), Kress (1995), and Street (1993), meaning and texts are constructed in semiotic spaces through the use of various multimodal textual environments, such as visual, spoken and written. That was seen in this study. Also, working as a team rather than as individuals within the communicative domain of an academic culture of collaboration (both in face-to-face and online interactions), the students in this study became active agents who gained the power to transform the textual practices that they were facing in the early period of their doctoral studies. Within this academic culture of collaboration, the students provided uptake to each other, took up multiple positions, and made intertextual links through indexing each other’s oral narratives in interactions and indexing the scholarly articles they all read as a part of their doctoral education.

This analysis also suggests that students’ experiences are textualized within their narratives and interactions. These textualization practices reveal that text, especially at the doctoral level, is more than merely written or spoken in nature. The knowledge constructed about academic writing in classroom dialogues, the support group
discussions, and in the online dialogic manuscript revealed the social significance of the 
actions and perceptions associated with academic writing. It was within the students’ 
social and historical shared experiences both inside and outside of the classroom that they 
were able to appropriate the academic writing games that they were acquiring. Moreover, 
the students’ textual construction included dialogues that adopted other voices and texts. 
Taking a Bakhtinian approach that emphasizes the dialogic nature of language, our 
utterances are always responses to previous and future utterances (Bakhtin, 1981). 
Similarly, in this study, the students’ spoken and written texts were inherently dialogic in 
nature. The students’ dialogic understanding of their textual world emerged specifically 
as a result of the academic culture of collaboration that assisted them in becoming 
autonomous actors who resisted, negotiated, and eventually transformed the academic 
literacy practices that they were being exposed to in their doctoral studies.

Finally, researching intertextuality at the doctoral level within a 
microethnographic framework will hopefully encourage discussions about and expand 
our views as to how texts are constructed and reconstructed through the written and oral 
interactions among people. This, in turn, can also add to our current understanding of the 
relationship between speaking and writing practices of multilingual students in different 
levels of education, and our understanding of intercultural rhetoric in the L2 literacy 
field. As opposed to mere textual analysis conducted in traditional contrastive rhetoric 
research, studies that focus on the social interaction (both spoken and written) in 
tercultural spaces(such as the one in this study), or-- as Connor (2004) and Atkinson 
(2004) emphasize-- studies that foreground a dynamic notion of culture and a context-
sensitive analysis of discourse, could raise awareness of the interconnectedness among
people, texts, and events found in the new domain of intercultural rhetoric, which posits that there is a dynamic and fluid connection among speaking, writing, and other nonlinguistic communication means such as gestural, electronic or pictorial signs. Thus, the focus on intertextuality in social interaction, as conceptualized in educational linguistics studies, could serve as a cornerstone in understanding the dynamic and evolving relationship between spoken and written text at the doctoral level and how students socialize into their immediate academic environments. Looking at the intertextual links these doctoral students established in the course of acquiring academic literacy practices not only expands our views of academic textual worlds and intercultural rhetoric; it also increases awareness of the juxtaposed and interactive nature of texts and events (i.e., spoken, written, electronic, etc.).

Through looking at the details of multilingual students’ graduate lives both inside and outside classrooms, we can see students’ struggles and their attempts to appropriate literacy practices. More specifically, such microanalyses suggest that multilingual students may be doing far more than merely acquiring the academic rhetorical conventions of their disciplinary fields; they may also be talking about, negotiating, and attempting to transform the academic literacy practices surrounding them. This is in line with Flower’s (2003) claim that “intercultural rhetoric operates by definition and by choice in a space where discourse practices and complex networks of situated knowledge are known to differ. Moreover, it chooses to build the knowledge on the constructive potential and reflective agency of people” (p.43). With this understanding of multilingual doctoral students’ textual construction and academic literacy socialization, we move the emphasis away from a view of people as being passively transformed by academic
rhetorical conventions to a deeper understanding of how people use their agency to resist, challenge, and eventually creatively construct the rhetorics and texts around them (see also the growing emphasis on agency in L2 academic writing, e.g., Canagarajah, 2002; Casanave, 2002; Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Kubota & Lehner, 2004; Prior, 1995).
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APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT LETTER FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS

Dear (Name of participant)

Hello. I am a Ph.D. candidate in Language, Literacy and Culture with a specialty area in the Foreign and Second Language Education program at the Ohio State University. I am writing today to invite you to participate in my doctoral dissertation research on the academic literacy practices of first year doctoral students. The main purpose of this study is to illustrate the complexity of negotiating new academic literacies and identities in graduate programs by focusing on the demands and expectations posed on multilingual graduate students, as they are enculturated into new academic literacy environments. For understanding the experiences of multilingual graduate students like yourself in academia and to make your journey more valuable, your perspectives on various academic literacy activities that you will be involved in your classes are highly important for the purpose of my study. This study does not only seek your perspectives but it will also include the professors that guide you throughout your graduate studies at the Ohio State University.

The research methodology that I will employ will be series of interviews via online or face-to-face interaction, classroom observations and video recordings of some of your classroom discussions. The duration of my data collection is one academic year and with your permission, I am hoping to interview you three times per quarter (Fall, Winter and Spring quarter. Enclosed please find a more detailed description of my study and an informed consent form.

Multilingual students of the academic discourse in doctoral programs go through a lengthy process to adapt to the reading, speaking and writing style of the western academic discourse and its associated socio-cultural dimensions. The vernacular literacy practices that you bring with you are valuable and important parts of your academic identity (ies). These tensions and adaptation processes during your academic socialization can be rich resources. It is these resources that can serve you to be creative constructors of knowledge in this new academic community you are prepared to participate. With this study, I would like to explore these issues with you. Not only am I hoping to contribute to the L2 academic literacy field, but I also hope to assist you during your first year experience in your doctoral program.
Thank you very much for your time and consideration. Should you have further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at seloni.1@osu.edu by email or 614-263-0751 by phone.

I am looking forward to working with you,

Sincerely,

Lisya Seloni
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview questions for Autumn 2006

Language, literacy and culture background check

1. Tell me about your education background.
2. How long have you been studying in the United States?
3. Tell me about your English learning experiences.
4. Tell me about your teaching experiences.
5. When did you come to the United States?
6. Why did you decide to pursue a doctoral education?
7. Why did you apply to your current Ph.D. program?
8. What is your view of a doctoral education (Define doctoral education)?
9. What do you expect to do upon completing your program?
10. What do you want to gain out of this program?
11. What languages do you speak?
12. When did you start learning English? Could you please talk about your English learning experience?
13. Could you please talk about your education background in your native country?
14. Did you have any teaching experience? If so, please explain.
15. How would you rate your reading and writing skills (1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest)?
16. What is your TOEFL score?
17. Have you taken any ESL class in the U.S.?
18. Do you work on campus? How many hours do you work per week?
19. Which metaphor would develop for your experience in your early stages of doctoral education?
20. Tell me about your course work this quarter. What types of challenges are you experiencing?
21. What about writing and reading? Class Participation?

Interview Questions for Winter 2007

16 It is important to note that these questions were tentative and adjusted according to the individual interview. The questions were also modified when the participant needed more clarification.
1. How are you doing with the second quarter courses?
2. Tell me about your writing process. Where do you usually write? How do you write? Do you visit the writing center or get any other help with your writing?
3. What time of the day do you do your academic reading and writing?
4. Do you use dictionaries while writing and reading in English?
5. What do you think about your classroom participation when you work on your papers? Do you refer to spoken interactions you had in your courses when you write?
6. When do you feel most comfortable taking turns in a classroom discussion?
7. How do you think the oral participation in your doctoral classes are assisting you learn the academic conventions and the content?
8. How do you think your social network help you in your first year?

**Interview Questions for Spring 2007**

General questions:

1. Which courses are you finding challenging this quarter?
2. What writing and reading practices are you involved in this quarter?
3. How many papers have you written so far? How many more are you supposed to write?
4. What were the challenging aspects of the papers that you already wrote?

Mentorship/support group at doctoral level:

1. Where do you learn about the disciplinary conventions of education field?
2. What do you think about peer mentorship?
3. Do you think your senior students should provide you with mentorship? (e.g. course assignments, lit. reviews, how to prepare for generals)
4. Do you think this should be obligatory in doctoral level?

Academic change:

1. How different do you feel academically compared to your first quarter here?
2. How did your first year fulfill your personal and academic goals?
3. One thing that surprised you in academy/in your discipline?
4. How do you think you have acquired the conventions of your discipline?
5. How do you think you are being socialized to your discipline?
6. Do you think there is anything called as “communities of academic practice or academic discourse? If so, how do you define it? And where do you see yourself? A visual representation or a metaphor could be given.
7. What contradictions and tensions do you experience in academic literacy practices in your first year?
8. Which one do you put more emphasis on your writing style or the content
Prioritize these from 1 to 7

Style
Concepts
Theory
Grammar
Word choices
Sentence construction
Organization

**********

Prioritize these from 1 to 7

Citing previous literature
Integrating your stance on it
Criticizing the authors/previous literature
Synthesizing knowledge
Reporting knowledge
Talking about the implications
Focusing on the concepts and theory

** Discipline specific questions (reading, writing and speaking): **

1. Do you believe that global education/SLA/Drama Ed. scholars write, speak or see the world different than other academics? If so, explain.
2. How are the following assignments related to your field and how are they helping you to socialize into your discipline?
   -- literature review paper
   -- annotated bibliography assignment
   -- critical review paper
   -- research papers
3. Which of the above assignments are more important do you think for your scholarly improvement?
4. Which of the following class activities do you think are more beneficial for your academic improvement?
- class presentations
- teacher led discussions
- student led discussion
- teacher lectures
- student presentations
- group work
- any other

5. How have your ideas about second language learning/teaching/Drama education/global education changed from the beginning of the year until now?
6. What is your preferred way of writing and speaking (communication) in your field?
7. What is the most important discipline specific language that you have learned to use in your field?—that is, the key concepts/theories that you can comfortably use in your writing and speaking.
8. Before you begin your doctoral degree, what aspect of academic literacy practices did you think would be most challenging for you?
9. When you look back now, what were in fact your biggest challenges in your program/discipline?
10. What courses and readings have influenced you most this year?
11. What do you think about the group work in your classrooms?
12. How do you benefit from group work/support group?
APPENDIX C

TRANSCRIPTION KEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Jewel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Diana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Carol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>Undecipherable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[OVL]</td>
<td>Overlaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[L]</td>
<td>Laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>////</td>
<td>Wait time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....</td>
<td>Though goes on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SX</td>
<td>Unidentifiable student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>