FRAMING ACADEMIC SOCIALIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERGRADUATES IN AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY: A CRITICAL ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Hyechong Park, B.A., M.A.

*****

The Ohio State University
2009

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Cynthia L. Selfe, Co-Advisor

Dr. Rebecca Kantor-Martin, Co-Advisor

Dr. Evonne Halasek, Co-Advisor

Dr. Alan Hirvela

Approved by

_____________________
Advisor
College of Education and Human Ecology
ABSTRACT

With globalization, the number of international students is increasing in American higher education. Academic success is important to them. Grounded on critical academic socialization (Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Lea & Street, 2000), communities-of-practice (Wenger, 1998), and dialogism (Bakhtin, 1981; Mercer, 1995), this ethnographic study reports findings regarding the critical academic socialization process of international English as a Second Language (ESL) for undergraduates in an American university. Data was collected with a focus on the parameters of symbolic modality (speaking and writing), unit of learning (individual and collaborative learning), and longitudinal time span. By synthesizing conceptual frameworks and empirical findings, this dissertation proposes an academic socialization model that brings together a diachronic dimension (euphoria—critical academic becoming—evolution phase of academic socialization) and three synchronic dimensions (contextual levels, sites, and modes of learning in academic socialization).

While focusing on the critical academic becoming phase, this study highlights how the negotiation process of each focal student’s learning to write occurs idiosyncratically across intercultural, interdisciplinary, and intertextual levels. Case analysis illustrates the development of critical literacy stance of each focal student (i.e.,
analytical, questioning, and contesting literacies), which can counter the myth of silent transience of L2 international undergraduates in the U.S. Cross-case analysis also suggests that the culture of this study population is silent resistance, grounded on the textual, institutional, and discursive practices, prompts me to propose a theory of discourse hybridization to change the current status quo of commercialization and citizenship discourse in one American state university. Secondly, using cross-case analysis from the zoom-out perspective, this study reports that learning opportunities in the out-of-classroom sites can be as important as classroom sites for increasing student learning outcomes. This finding broadens our understanding of the process of learning to write and speak in a social network of peers and family, in addition to using institutional resources such as writing centers. Thirdly, using spoken discourse analysis from the zoom-in perspective, this study explicates how dialogic thinking (i.e., dialogism) contributes to students’ learning outcomes through monologic coordination and dialogic collaboration with others.

By portraying how international undergraduates resiliently adapt to situations, and how these students contingently and creatively use social resources for achieving their academic goals, this study sheds light on the creative, enabling, and positive force of L2 international ESL undergraduates in their negotiation of literacies individually and collaboratively.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Problem

As one of the most important current social phenomena, globalization results in the exchange of not only resources and commodities across different countries but also people who cross geographical spaces to pursue various ends (Robertson, 1995). The link between globalization and higher education is reflected in high levels of student mobility across countries. The Institute of International Education (IIE) (Bhandari & Chow, 2008) reports that about 2.9 million students at the tertiary level migrate to other countries to pursue globalized education.¹ Among them, the top destination which 50% of students choose is the United States, followed by the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada. These four countries are termed Inner Circle² countries because they are “traditional cultural and linguistic bases of English” (Kachru, 1992, p. 356),³ pointing to the

¹ In my definition, globalized education refers to the migration to other countries for the purpose of building one’s educational credential. This term differentiates itself from transnational education, which “denotes any teaching or learning activity in which the students are in a different country (the host country) to that in which the institution providing the education is based (the home country). This situation requires that national boundaries be crossed by information about education, and by staff and/or educational materials” (Global Alliance for Transnational Education, 1997, p. 1).
² In Kachru’s definition, New Zealand also belongs to the Inner Circle.
³ Kachru (1992) categorizes World English into three categories: Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circles. Outer Circle countries, such as India, Malaysia, and Singapore, use English as a first language whereas Expanding Circle countries, such as Korea and Japan, use English for social purposes. International students’ preference for Inner Circle countries over Outer Circle ones is not discussed because the tension between them related to linguistic and cultural hegemony is not the focus of this study.
significance of the English language as a lingua franca which serves as a pivotal communication tool in an increasingly global world.

In the U.S., international students comprise 3.5% of students enrolled in higher education (Bhandari & Chow, 2008). Most international students are enrolled primarily in undergraduate (31.4%) and graduate (48.8%) degree programs. The International Association of Universities (IAU, 2006) studied on the benefits and risk of globalization in higher education. Results suggest that the two most important benefits are globalization of staff and students (22%) and an increase in academic quality (21%). Of concern, however, is the overuse of English (9%), although international students still prefer to study in Inner Circle schools where English is the medium for communication.

In the changing conception of World Englishes as compared to the norm-based standardization of English, international students’ heterogeneity in their languages and cultures can offer distinct and unique benefits, enriching the U.S. community. Their distinctness and uniqueness can contribute to the local community by being active participants in the local culture, accelerating the globalization process of the local community.

---

4 The total number of American students in higher education is 17,958,000.
5 The remaining population (19.8%) includes students enrolled in non-degree courses (8.3%), such as in intensive English programs and associate degree programs (11.5%).
6 The IAU conducted a survey with 526 higher education institutions in 95 countries with a response rate of 14.7%. North American universities, including schools in the U.S., represented 14% of the respondents.
7 The IAU survey revealed that the two biggest risks of globalization are commercialization (23%) and the creation of foreign degree mills (17%). Apprehension about the commercialization of higher education supports the IIE’s results (2008) where 62.3% of international students in the American higher education pool are financially supported from outside the U.S. More importantly, apprehension about foreign degree mills is interpreted to mean that international students come to Inner Circle countries to build their academic credentials because a degree from these areas is preferred over one from their own country of origin.
8 The IAU used the term “internationalization,” but for coherence I use the term “globalization.”
The number of international students in American higher education is increasing (Bhandari & Chow, 2008). Although academic success is important to international students and to American universities that benefit from their presence, few studies have examined the academic socialization process of international undergraduate students from countries in which English is not the first language (cf. Leki, 2003, 2007; Spack, 1997). Thus, research is needed into the growing population of international English as a second language (L2) undergraduate students9 who come to the Inner Circle. More specifically, this dissertation seeks to capture L2 undergraduates’ own voices by illustrating their individual and collaborative learning process. Portraits of their voices will help the local academy to gain a greater understanding of L2 undergraduates’ academic socialization processes of being and becoming. Thus, this dissertation addresses this lack of research by investigating the international undergraduate population’s process and outcomes of acquiring and using English for learning academic content in the U.S.

I derive the term “academic socialization” from the theory of language socialization,10 which refers to the process of becoming a member of a community by learning and using its language (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). As the definition of academic

---

9 In my study, L2 undergraduate students means L2 international undergraduate students.
10 A concept from sociology, socialization refers to the process by which people learn to become members of multiple communities by adopting their words, values, attitudes, beliefs, and practices. Berger and Luckmann (1967) coined the terms primary socialization and secondary socialization. Primary socialization refers to a child’s coming into childhood, whereas secondary socialization refers to the additional process by which the individual acquires role-specific knowledge and behavior. These concepts are reflected to Gee’s primary discourse and secondary discourse as well as Krashen’s language acquisition and learning. For the most part, this acquisition process takes place socially as the individual interacts with “significant others.” It is through language that social experiences are objectified and reified; language “constitutes the most important content and the most important instrument of socialization” (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, p. 133). Social theory explains that the second major location of socialization is school. By academic socialization, I mean that students are socialized to the academic discourse community through the medium of oral language and written language. Therefore, academic socialization is discourse enculturation through oral language socialization and literacy socialization.
socialization involves becoming a member of an academic discourse community, identity negotiation is critical in academic socialization. The emphasis on identity especially fits in the third paradigm (Duranti, 2003)\(^\text{11}\) of researching language in the U.S. that focuses on language ideology. Current scholarship, represented as the third paradigm, centers on how people use with ideology-laden language, leading to the sociocultural change to the community. This view assumes that people are critically aware of how language-in-use functions and how people construct meaning in an authentic context where linguistic ideology is inscribed in people’s use of language.\(^\text{12}\) Mainstream researchers may assume that L2 students are passive users of English because of their developing English proficiency. However, L2 students would use English in their critical awareness by bringing their critical stances to American languaculture, ultimately advocating for social change.

The identity negotiation process occurs through participation in a situated context, which separates from decontextualized knowledge acquisition. By coming to the Inner Circle setting, L2 students participate in the academic discourse community. However, different social meanings inscribed in language are much less clear to L2 students, challenging their academic socialization. Students do not simply acquire and learn language (Gee’s [1996] “discourse” or chains of words in language use); rather, they are

\(^\text{11}\) Duranti (2003) identifies three paradigms in researching the relationship between language and culture in the U.S. The first paradigm is the research tradition of linguistic relativity; the second paradigm is the research tradition of ethnography of communication which focused on language use; the third paradigm focuses on the ideological role of language such as the impact of language use on identity formation.

\(^\text{12}\) The inherent assumption in this view is that L2 students are effective users of L2. A paradigm shift in L2 education from acquisition to participation is reflected in the term L2 learners compared to L2 users (Firth & Wagner, 1997). The term L2 learners assumes a deficit view of this population which is in the process of mastering L2 whereas the term L2 users assumes that people function adequately with their developing language skills.
also socialized to the values and norms (Gee’s “Discourse”) of the American academic discourse community. These values and norms are more implicit and non-transparent to the L2 population because of the arbitrariness between a linguistic representation and a concept (linguistic relativity of semiotic form/symbolic dimension) and further linguistic relativity in the levels of structure and discourse (Lucy, 1996). In other words, L2 students may lack interpretative frames (Tannen, 1993) that are inscribed in a distinct languaculture. Languaculture is Agar’s (1994) term that expresses the inseparability of language and culture inscribed in a community, similar to the inseparability of Gee’s “discourse” and “Discourse.” A lack of interpretative frames, in turn, makes it difficult for L2 students to act and perform adequately in the American academic community. Therefore, their socialization process in the American context is important because L2 students build interpretative frames by participating in a situated community.

Given the purposes of this dissertation, it is necessary to situate my study in the research field of academic socialization. In a previous literature review, I identified three parameters of key research gaps to ground my dissertation of L2 academic socialization in higher education: symbolic modality, unit of learning, and time. First, the symbolic modality of academic socialization includes both spoken and written language. Traditional language socialization research focuses on children, specifically on their process of acquiring spoken language (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). In literature about L2 academic socialization at the graduate level, the modality has typically focused on either writing (e.g., Casanave, 1992; Prior, 1998) or speaking (e.g., Morita, 2004; Zappa-

---

13 Ferdinand De Saussure argues that a linguistic unit, a sign, is a double entity. A sign is made up of a signifier (linguistic representation) and a signified (concept). The bond between a signifier and a signified is arbitrary; the arbitrariness of the bond means that the language use is a social convention.
Hollman, 2007a). However, because this L2 population builds academic credentials mediated by English as a spoken and written language, I view academic socialization to incorporate both speaking and writing (e.g., Bronson, 2004). Although symbolic modality for communication includes linguistic and non-linguistic modalities (Besnier, 2001), given the purpose of this study, I operationally focus on symbolic modality as spoken and written language.

Secondly, the unit of learning in L2 academic socialization occurs both individually/independently and collaboratively/interdependently through students’ interactions with their peers and instructors. Academic socialization is not only an individual cognitive act of learning, but also a process of action and reaction mediated through a social network relevant to each context (e.g., Bronson, 2004; Seror, 2008). With the theoretical development of communities of practice (CoP, Wenger, 1998) and community of learners (Rogoff, 1994), the unit of learning is not only conceived as an individual activity but also as a collaborative activity and dialogic thinking. By collaborative, I refer to people’s acting together to solve a problem (e.g., group activity as a form); by dialogic thinking, I refer to people’s thinking together to solve a problem (i.e., sharing ideas through talk or reading a note at the margin of the dissertation).

Third, L2 academic socialization is a gradual and lengthy process. Students learn both academic content and the implicit rules and conventions of the academic discourse community by acquiring and using language. The socialization of one’s self to the academic community is inseparable from learning particular skills. Accordingly, to capture change in identification (Casanave, 2002) and learning (Lave, 1996), a relatively long engagement in the context is required. As pointed out by Grabe (2001) and Tardy
(2006), it is especially true that research on L2 students has been limited to composition classes or the graduate student population. Therefore, I implemented my study for at least one calendar year to track each undergraduate student across their learning sites.

Drawing on these three parameters of research gaps (i.e., symbolic modality, unit of learning, and time) regarding L2 academic socialization, I aim to examine the processes and outcomes of L2 undergraduates’ participating and becoming in U.S. higher education.

**Objective**

This study examines academic socialization of L2 international undergraduates. Academic socialization is the process in which people actively formulate an academic identity in their interaction with others in context by acquiring and using oral and written language and eventually by negotiating rules and values of the academic discourse community. People bring their autobiographical selves (Ivanic, 1998) to each new context. When the autobiographic selves continue in the transition across contexts, social meaning differs according to context (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). People are expected to negotiate tensions and conflicts that occur due to multiple memberships in different contexts where power and power relationships are laden. Therefore, the intercontextuality of people, a term that I define as people’s moving across contexts, becomes an important analytical framework to examine how international students make social meaning by negotiating themselves across multiple contexts. The levels of context vary, such as their home countries/the U.S., academic institutions in the U.S, academic disciplines, classrooms, and texts. Accordingly, the tensions and conflicts inscribed in the heuristic tool of intercontextuality parallels glocalization because a person moves across various
contexts of the universal and the particular as well as in the global and local human cultures (Robertson, 1995).

I delineate three pivotal parameters to ground my study in the field of academic socialization: symbolic modality, unit of learning, and time to capture change in identification and learning. Using intercontextuality as an analytical tool, I conceptualize L2 academic socialization as a process of actively formulating an academic identity through the interaction with others in context. L2 students negotiate tensions and conflicts in crossing international and intranational communities, fine-tuning themselves to the host community through learning and using spoken and written English. This study offers new insights into L2 academic socialization research by using three parameters of L2 academic socialization, proposing an academic socialization model, and theorizing discourse hybridization to explicate L2 students’ active, creative, and productive roles in their own monologic and dialogic meaning-making and their critical stances toward their being within a host community and social transformation.

In particular, this dissertation explores the academic socialization of six international undergraduates, including three focal research participants, by (a) examining how they learn literacy skills and negotiate their autobiographical selves in their movements across different contexts and (b) explaining the learning processes and outcomes of their academic socialization (Morita & Kobayashi, 2008) by portraying rich points (Agar, 1996) during their stay at one large U.S. university.

I began my research with the following questions from an a priori theoretical assumption that there are conflicts and tensions in people’s movement across contexts:
1. What happens in each context of learning (e.g., country, disciplines, classrooms, text)?

2. How do L2 students negotiate tensions and conflicts in learning across contexts?

During data collection and analysis, the distinct and idiosyncratic nature of each student’s identity and literacy negotiation trajectory emerged. Each individual student’s identification process, dialogic learning with others, and the awareness of power relationships in literacy as social practice became clearer. Preliminary findings helped me refine my theory-driven research questions into the following:

1. How do L2 students negotiate the tensions and conflicts of writing practices across contexts?

2. How do L2 students accomplish their course writing assignments effectively?

3. What does it mean to be academically literate in L2?

**Conceptual Frameworks: Academic Literacies Model**

I ground my dissertation on the academic literacies model (Lea & Street, 2000), situated learning theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), CoP (Wenger, 1998), and dialogism (Bahktin, 1981; Mercer, 1995). Research on academic literacy in higher education has traditionally followed two trends (Lea & Street, 2000): the study skills model and the socialization approach. Street (1995), however, critiqued this dichotomy, warning against the complete separation of skills and socialization. He argued that the view of literacy as constituted by autonomous skills is embedded in an ideological nature of literacy, which contends that people are socialized into a discourse community through the process of acquiring literacy skills. By highlighting the ideological nature of literacy,
he problematizes identity and power in students’ socialization process to the academy. Lea and Street (2000), therefore, have formulated a third model for teaching and learning literacy practices, the academic literacies model. I locate my study in this conceptual framework due to its focus on identification and empowerment in the socialization process (Table 1.1). This model integrates the skills model and the academic socialization approach with a critical stance on identity negotiation in a power-laden social structure.

I take the view that a person with a critical stance has a critical positioning on epistemology and power relationships. By critical positioning on epistemology, I mean that knowledge is something that cannot only be assimilated, but also contested, extended, and negotiated. People do not necessarily agree to the given frame of knowledge; instead, they create meaning by active negotiation of one’s self to the given knowledge in context. By critical positioning on power relationships, I refer to the person who is aware of his being as an active agent in creating social change against an unequal power structure and unfair status quo. A person and his social structures influence each other and evolve, creating a culture of challenge, contestation, and resistance with others.

The study skills model (Lea & Street, 2000) views writing as a set of discrete skills. Skills can be transferred from context to context and evaluation is based on surface language correctness, grammar, and spelling. Students who cannot produce the academic discourse that meets the community’s expectations for correctness and skills are regarded as deficient and having cognitive problems that need to be fixed. The practice of upholding the norms and conventions of academic skills can be traced to what Scollon and Scollon (1981) term essayist literacy. They explain that the primary goal of communication of essayist literacy is to convey decontextualized information. Meaning is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills model</td>
<td>• Learning is building the decontextualized skills of reading and writing</td>
<td>• Do students have decoding and encoding literacy skills?</td>
<td>• Shaughnessy (1977)</td>
<td>• Shaughnessy (1977)</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traditional cognitive view of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic socialization model</td>
<td>• Learning is accommodating the self in order to become a member of a discourse community</td>
<td>• How do students learn the expectations of a target discourse community?</td>
<td>• Bartholomae (1984)</td>
<td>• Beaufort (2004, 2007)</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Individual in a community</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social view of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic literacies model</td>
<td>• Learning is making an individual meaning by agreeing or contesting with a given knowledge</td>
<td>• How do L2 students negotiate the tensions and conflicts of writing practices across contexts? (RQ 1)</td>
<td>• Bizzell (1986)</td>
<td>• Casanave (1990)</td>
<td>Writing or speaking</td>
<td>Individual in a community</td>
<td>Longitudinal study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning is identity negotiation situated in a power-laden community</td>
<td>• How do L2 students accomplish their course writing assignments effectively? (RQ 2)</td>
<td>• Brooke (1988)</td>
<td>• Chisert-Strater (1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What does it mean to be academically literate in L2? (RQ3)</td>
<td>• Canagarajah (2003)</td>
<td>• Fishman et al. (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gee (1996)</td>
<td>• Ivanic (1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prior (1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Conceptual framework
an abstraction that is removed from personal experience, and authority lies in facts, reason, and logic. Moreover, inherent in this position is that meaning is publicly and explicitly inscribed in texts. The relationship between writer and reader is built on an abstract rationality which can be compared to the situated human rationality in the context.

In contrast, the traditional academic socialization model (Bartholomae, 2001; Lea & Street, 2000) regards writing as the medium by which a student is acculturated to an academic discourse community. Learning is more than building skills; rather, it encompasses the broader process of becoming a member of the community. The academic discourse community is considered a norm-referenced culture (Gee’s [1996] “Discourse”) with conventions that students have to follow. Students are expected to imitate a privileged academic discourse in order to obtain academic success. In this model, the academic discourse community not only denies multiplicity but also controls student writing. Thus, students must accommodate to the norms and conventions of the academic discourse, which ultimately becomes exclusionary and elitist. This model assumes that there is one homogenous academic culture and that writing is a transparent medium of representation.

In both the study skills model and the traditional academic socialization model, academic literacy is defined as a prescribed and patterned way of reading, speaking, writing, and knowing. The active role of a human agent in making individual meaning is not considered. The academic discourse community functions as a gatekeeper, segregating insiders and outsiders according to the criterion of knowledge acquisition. Students are expected to acclimate seamlessly to the academic discourse and must
assimilate or remain “outlanders” (Bizzell, 1986). Ideological tensions, however, are clearly evident in gaps between faculty expectations and student interpretations of writing tasks and feedback (Lea & Street, 2000; Lea 2005). The traditional academic socialization model urges students to accommodate without allowing them to awaken their critical awareness in language-in-use in the process of producing and representing meaning. In this way, control from an authoritarian force is exerted over a student’s writing. Lea and Street (2000) state that “students are seldom given support in conceptualizing the epistemological frameworks within which such documents are constructed or in recognizing that they consist of contestable knowledge claims rather than given truths” (p. 64, italics mine). On the other hand, the academic literacies model values student agency in students’ own meaning-making by challenging and extending the given knowledge and truths.

In addition to Lea and Street (2000), Bizzell (1986), Canagarajah (1997, 2003), Prior (1998), and Zamel (1997) have offered critique of the accommodationist view of academic socialization into a discourse community. First, critics point out that academic discourses differ among disciplines as well as within a discipline (e.g., Carter, 2007). Furthermore, disciplines are not closed and homogeneous systems, but rather in a constant flux (Prior, 1998). Third, the traditional model of academic socialization is regarded as a one-way assimilation process which views students as passive recipients of conventional knowledge rather than active constructors of knowledge in the struggle to create personally meaningful learning. Zamel (1997) argues against teaching the formulaic representation of academic discourse, advocating the encouragement of student endeavors with all the “messiness and [their] struggles of authentic work that begins,
values, and builds on their own ‘ways with words’” (p. 343). Prior (1998) similarly contends that academic writing is the intersection of self and institutional community, disputing the structuralist notion that disciplines represent abstract and uniform knowledge that can be passed from experts to novices.

In response to these three critiques of the academic socialization model, the academic literacies model posits writing and, more broadly, language-in-use as the site of identity struggle. Academic discourse becomes the site of identity contestation and negotiation over the power of authoritarian institutional practices and the broader social network of what counts as knowledge. The academic literacies model acknowledges that where the self is situated is crucial in literacy acquisition and individual meaning-making processes. The fundamental position of the academic literacies model is that there are multiple meanings when people negotiate themselves in the context. Identity becomes the site of where students attempt to make sense of meaning in the academic discipline by bringing in their autobiographical selves.

The academic literacies model views both writing and identity within the larger context of ideological literacy (Street, 1995). Negotiation is necessary between the expected norms and practices of the academic discourse community and student discourse. Students must position themselves through accommodation, resistance, and negotiation within the institution of the academic discourse community. Learning is a dialogical continuum between the self and the discourse community, impacting each other. Such a dialogical continuum assumes a pluralistic nature of meaning. Students’ critical awareness in language-in-use becomes significant in judging what legitimate and meaningful knowledge is. It is particularly true because students negotiate among
multiple sources of knowledge and authority, including the text, the instructor, and their own life experiences (e.g., Bryant, 2005; Chiseri-Strater, 1991; Ivanic, 1998; Herrington & Curtis, 2000).

The academic literacies model focuses on student identity and social meaning because ideological tensions exist between students and their contexts of learning. Lea and Street (2000) argue the following:

Viewing literacy from a cultural and social practice approach, rather than in terms of educational judgments about good and bad writing, and approaching meanings as contested can give us insights into the nature of academic literacy in particular and academic learning in general. (p. 33)

Positioned to resist both the skills model and the academic socialization model, the academic literacies model locates student texts “within institutional practices, power relations and identities” (Lea & Street, 2000, p. 33). Academic discourse becomes the place of identity contestation over what counts as knowledge. Identity and power are embedded in literacy acquisition and individual meaning-making processes. In addition to assimilation to the given knowledge, students are expected to contest and resist the imposed norms by posing questions in the situated context. In this way, the border between the discourses of academy and students becomes the location of a power struggle.

It is important to note, though, that each discourse community is not entirely stable; rather, it evolves and transforms. Beyond the level of the self being enabled and constrained, students invent an alternative their own space in the academic discourse community through merging and hybridizing of discourses. At an individual level,
students reaccentuate their identities through the continual negotiations of the self in authoritarian discourses (Bakhtin, 1986). More importantly, as a social consequence, this monologic reaccentuation process of “authoring the self” is a dialogic process of “authoring the world” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 173) for social transformation. In doing so, people resist the one-way accommodation and subordination to authoritarian forces and bring change to authoritarian social structures. In the space of social transformation, students have a chance to deal with these clashes and conflicts productively. From this perspective, discursive tension is not necessarily an obstacle in students’ socialization process; rather, the discursive tensions can provide students the potential to create a space of productive invention and renovation. Students’ creation of a hybrid space provides multiple possibilities for change and transformation where the micro-interaction of text and language and the macro-interaction of social, historical, and institutional contexts intersect.

As multiple discourses of cultures, languages, nationalities, and identities overlap, disrupt, or contradict one another, self-positioning functions as a process of identification and of becoming. Identification processes are “trajectories of being and becoming” of multiple identities (Jenkins, 1996, p. 75). A person’s identities evolve through dialogical interaction in the context (Bhabha, 1994; Davies & Harre, 1990). Self positioning is more than “smoothing over the tensions [between discourses]”; it is a critical and continual negotiation of the self through the “process of translation and rearticulation, a rewriting or reinscribing [in discourses of conflict and tension]” to take a position (West and Olson, 1999, cited in Bryant, 2005, p. 95).
From an academic literacies perspective, undergraduates’ literacy practices can be understood as an identification process in a situated context. However, within this conceptual framework, little empirical research is available about international undergraduates who represent a particularly important population in the era of globalization. Even less is known about how the community of L2 students collaborates with each other as part of their individual academic socialization. Their education in other academic structures of their country of origin heightens their engagement with or potential resistance to American academic discourse. But, L2 international undergraduates are rarely researched using the three parameters (i.e., symbolic modality, unit of learning, and time) addressed earlier. As the significance of a longitudinal study of academic socialization is covered earlier, in the following section, I explicate the conceptual frameworks for how people learn employing symbolic modality and unit of learning.

**How People Learn: Communities of Practice & Dialogism**

Debate on learning has focused on the relationship between the *acquisition* of decontextualized knowledge and *participation* in the situated community (Sfard, 1998). In cognitive psychology, assessment is grounded on whether students possess knowledge as product. In this school of thought, knowledge is considered abstract and decontextualized, and subsequently, students are perceived as recipients and consumers of knowledge. In terms of knowledge economy, the amount of acquired decontextualized knowledge is the criteria of the learning outcome. However, with the advent of sociocultural theories, researchers began to question the transfer of decontextualized knowledge in real life situations. From a sociocultural perspective, the criteria of learning
assessment are based on whether people participate and function in their real life settings and communities. Knowledge is perceived as concrete and contextualized, and students are considered apprentices training to become experts. Accordingly, while the acquisition metaphor emphasizes the end product, the participation metaphor highlights the process of acquiring knowledge as the product of participation in the learning situation. In both metaphors, different emphases are displayed and foregrounded. In the acquisition metaphor, if students do not possess the end product of knowledge, reification, or a thing, they are academically regarded as deficient or low achievers. In the participation metaphor, how people act in the scene of participation in a real context constitutes what is relevant to the learning process. That is, people’s processes of being and becoming within their community paralleled to their acting and doing are critical for learning. An inherent assumption in this opposition is that the unit of analysis of learning is different. In an acquisition metaphor, learning is an individual activity achieved by using cognition. In contrast, in a participation metaphor, learning is more of a relational activity among people attained by people’s participation and interaction in their communities. Also, in the participation metaphor, “togetherness, solidarity and collaboration” in the community becomes important because the community is in constant flux by “people in action” (Sfard, 1998, p. 8).
Table 1.2: Comparison of acquisition and participation metaphors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical grounding</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive psychology</td>
<td>Sociocultural theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of learning</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Group of people/community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Reification/thing</td>
<td>Acting/doing, practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of learning</td>
<td>Product of abstract, decontextualized knowledge</td>
<td>Process of knowledge construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of learning</td>
<td>Lecture, recitation</td>
<td>Hands-on experience, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic stance</td>
<td>Monologic voice</td>
<td>Dialogic voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, people as beings need both cognitive acquisition and social participation for learning. On the one hand, learning needs individual cognition to allow the acquisition of a concept. On the other hand, people participate in the situated context by bringing their autobiographical self\textsuperscript{14} from one context to another; by participating in activities in context, people formulate situated cognition. In other words, situated learning theory\textsuperscript{15} contends that cognition, grounded on cognitive psychology, and context, grounded on anthropology, are inseparable. Due to their multiple affiliations, people’s transferring knowledge from context to context, negotiation, adjustment, and attunement of abstract knowledge to a specific situation all become important in maintaining cognitive equilibrium in the learning process. Furthermore, in a situated context, people perform a task by collaboration and dialogic thinking through a social network. CoP is a

\textsuperscript{14} By “bringing their autobiographic self,” I mean that people adapt their accumulated knowledge through their life history from one situation to another.

\textsuperscript{15} I view that situated learning theory is one form of sociocultural learning theories. Situated learning theory explains an apprenticeship model of learning.
particularly relevant concept that helps explaining the interactive human practice in the informal setting of learning (Table 1.2).

In the collaborative learning theory, Bruner’s concept of scaffolding is highly important. Vygotskian theorists shifted the paradigm in conceptualizing education. They argue that people internalize knowledge from interpersonal to intrapersonal activity through expert-novice interaction of language use. Nevertheless, Neo-Vygotskian scholars have demonstrated that novice-novice interaction also functions as scaffolding for achieving learning goals. The theoretical developments on the novice-novice interaction as a scaffolding force fit the practice of students’ peer reviewing of writing. I argue that dialogic inquiry\(^\text{16}\) consists of dialogic interaction ("dialogue") for sharing talk, and Bakhtinian dialogic thinking ("dialogism") for sharing ideas. Scholars (e.g., Mercer, Nystrand, Wells, & Wilkinson, cited in Nystrand, 2006) have investigated how dialogic inquiry facilitates students’ learning in an interpersonal setting. More concretely, the current trend in dialogic inquiry focuses on categorizing kinds of talk that are pedagogically effective and lead to higher-level thinking (e.g., Mercer, Nystrand, & Wilkinson, cited in Nystrand, 2006).

Despite the theoretical soundness of the learning-by-participation metaphor and dialogic inquiry for collaborative learning, findings from empirical research on the effectiveness of peer review in the improvement of student writing, for example, are controversial and limited at the higher education level (Paulston et al, 2007). More concretely, little is known regarding what types of register that students use in their peer study group and what knowledge domains they draw on for their comments on peer

\(^{16}\) Wells (1999) coined the term "dialogic inquiry."
writing. Clarifying kinds of talk that students employ can help guiding groups, including pair discussions, in the composition curriculum and further in the content class.

Like written feedback, dialogic interaction is one of the representative mediational tools in learning (Wells, 1999). In contrast to monologic interaction (e.g., lecture), dialogic interaction values multiple and competing voices of others and expects contribution from all participants.\(^\text{17}\) In the act-and-react process of human interaction (Ericsson & Shultz, 1978), dialogism values polyphonic voices, otherness and transformation of the current status quo by one individual’s addressivity and the other’s answerability (Holoquist, 1990). Dialogism is grounded on the reciprocity between human existence and knowledge construction (Holoquist, 1990; Nystrand, 1997). The dialogicality of human interaction, thus, functions as a means for “productive change” (Cheyne & Tarulli, 2005, p. 143) in the status quo of knowledge. As reported in Nystrand’s (2006) comprehensive review on classroom discourse in the U.S, open-ended interaction is important for sharing dialogic voices supported by the empirical evidence that recitation is a predominant mode of teaching in the secondary level of teaching in the U.S. Although Nystrand acknowledges the effectiveness of recitation in terms of learning outcomes, he argues that recitation relies more on banking epistemology that focuses on the delivery of information. In a dialogic interaction, what counts as knowledge is the individual’s interpretation and negotiation of meaning rather than the text itself. Students share different viewpoints in the learning process and construct individualized

\(^{17}\) I use being dialogic as dialogic in the Bakhtinian sense, rather than a dialogue in the conversational sense (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992)
interpretations, which correspond to the larger conceptual framework of this study, the academic literacies model.

Following this line of the conceptual framework of CoP and dialogism, I attempt to demonstrate that writing expertise can be shared and cultivated among people’s interaction (Chapter 2 through 4). Writing expertise is important for L2 undergraduates because writing is an access tool for to academic discourse in their socialization process at large. Joon’s narration (Chapter 2) articulates the significance of dialogic interaction for writing improvement. More concretely, I demonstrate how writing expertise develops through student members’ informal collaborative peer literacy events, rather than privileging the monologic voice of an instructor or a textual authorial voice (Chapter 4). In order to build writing expertise through dialogic inquiry, in Chapter 4, four undergraduate second language (L2) students, as CoP participated in an out-of-classroom study group in addition to their classroom learning. CoP theory argues that knowing and learning takes place through people’s participation in an authentic social context (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wagner, 2004; Wenger, 1998, 2008). CoP theory posits three crucial characteristics in accordance with this study. First, the unit of learning and knowing is a group of people and members of the community that need to have a shared goal. In this study, four students had shared the goal of improving their writing and meet their immediate need of writing their ESL and first-year composition class papers. Second, members need to engage in joint activities and discussions, share information, and grow intellectually together. Students in this study participated in voluntary out-of-classroom study group literacy events in which they engaged in sharing their growing expertise in writing practices. Third, the CoP members need to develop a shared repertoire of
resources. Students in this study co-constructed their expertise in L2 writing skills through critiquing and offering suggestions on one another’s writing at the group literacy events. This group also sought the assistance of native speakers to proofread their peers’ papers and share information on the availability of writing center tutors to broaden their social network of resources.

**Critical Perspective**

Critical theory revolves around how human lives are mediated by power and power relationships. Power is the center of clashes between the interpretative frames or ideologies of people. This interplay of power clarifies why a “critical perspective has been added to the descriptive and interpretive in anthropology, linguistics, applied linguistics, and ethnography and other discipline areas” (Roberts et al, 2001, p. 52). When a dominant group in a culture becomes normal and naturalizes its social practices, the non-dominant group “find[s] society to be unfair, unequal, and both subtly and overtly oppressive” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 7); therefore, people question “the categories and ways of thinking that are presented as natural and universal and [ask] how texts and interactions come to be produced” (Roberts et al, 2001, p. 54), and ultimately, people “want to change it” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 7). In other words, criticalists challenge the reproduction of the dominant social practices and wish to transform the dominant social practices of inequity and injustice into positive social change.

I ground my study in the critical theoretical framework in three ways: using critical theory as a paradigmatic assumption, critical epistemology, and critical researcher position, which are all related with power and power relationships. First, I use Marxian
critical theory to ground my study. Criticalists, in comparison to the adherents of the interpretative perspective, argue that they have distinctive value orientations to challenge oppression (Carspecken, 1996). By value orientations, I mean that the traditional Marxian critical theory has paid attention to the inequity and injustice caused by race, gender, and class issues. In contrast, it does not discuss citizenship\textsuperscript{18} in the area of globalization, which, for instance, arguably promotes inequity and injustice. By adding the category of citizenship, I problematize commercialization of the U.S. schools regarding international students or non-residential aliens, who do not have U.S. citizenship (see IAU report, 2006 and IIE report, 2008 in Chapter 1; Leki, 2007 & Matsuda, 2008 in Chapter 5). My study illustrate the social status of international students who suffer the discourse of the deficient Other and who are not regarded as race, gender, and class minorities, where minority is referred to some of U.S. citizens and permanent residents, and refugees/asylees. In the transnational crossing of international students portray the unraveled discourses of citizenship and commercialization that are mostly ignored in prior literature of academic socialization. In Marxian critical theory tradition, people who have critical positioning on power relationships refer to those who are aware of their being active agents in creating social change against an unequal power structure and unfair status quo caused by race, gender, class, and citizenship.

\textsuperscript{18} My research fills this gap in the study of a strand of oppression force in the context of U.S. citizenship. In this context, minority only refers to U.S. citizens, permanent residents, and refugees/asylees. This definition of the minority was given by the research institution admission office staff (06/15/09, interview), which was an identical definition given by a financial staff for funding purposes (05/07/09, interview). International students or non-resident aliens do not belong to the minority. However, it should be noted that this university Executive Summary of 2007-2008 reports that “some slippage between categories, with some units conflating resident minorities and non-resident aliens” exists (Diversity Plan Analysis, p. 3); upon my request to clarify the term minority, one university assistant provost replied that “the use of the word minority will vary, depending on who writes the report and when it is written” (05/27/09, email).
Secondly, criticalists challenge the reproduction of the dominant social practices of what counts as knowledge and wish to transform its dominant social practices of it. As discussed in Lea and Street’s (2000) academic literacies model where knowledge is not something given, people who have critical positioning on epistemology take positions; they not only assimilate knowledge, but also contest, extend, and negotiate it. People do not necessarily agree to the given frame of knowledge of the dominant group; instead, they create meaning by active negotiation of one’s self to the given knowledge in context. In my study, realizing social positioning as legally not-counted minority in the discourse of citizenship can accelerate international students’ critical social being; in turn, their social identification as international students can affect their reading and writing practices.

Thirdly, my researcher positioning is grounded in the critical perspective of human relationship between the researcher and the researched. In other words, the manner in which research or a researcher is grounded is very important in giving meaning to the social phenomenon. By grounding this study in the critical perspective, I emphasize that I took the researcher positionality in seeking social justice and being fair in conducting my longitudinal research. I tried not to take a privileged position because of differences in age and experience. Although my research participants asked for my opinions on personal and academic issues, I responded with reservation, asking them to seek others’ opinions because mine were interpretive ones. However, when a focal research participant wanted to know confidential issues regarding a school facility that he/she was advised to visit, for example, upon his/her request, I tried to protect this research participant by sending two emails and informing him/her that the two emails are
contradictory in addressing confidentiality. Moreover, when my research participants wanted to use their real names after reading my dissertation drafts, I alerted them to the risk of using real names with respect to their lifelong career track. In other words, my relationship with the research participants was not detached and distant in our longitudinal construction of meaning of their study abroad and literacy negotiation.

Although I ground my study in the critical theoretical perspective of using critical theory as a paradigmatic assumption, critical epistemology, and critical researcher position, it should be noted that interpretive and critical perspectives share a constructed knowledge and multiple realities in the philosophical tradition. In other words, I ground myself in the post-positivist view of what counts as knowledge (i.e., representational epistemology) and realities (i.e., realist ontology). There is blurry boundary in knowledge and reality between interpretive and critical perspectives, except with regard to the value orientations on race, gender, class, and citizenship in the critical perspective. By grounding the study on the shared post-positivist tradition between interpretivist and critical perspectives, I can explain the emic perspective of literacy negotiation of L2 international undergraduates. Particularly, my access to students’ lives in and out-of-school settings during extended periods of time enabled me to access the culture of these young adults from an emic perspective. In turn, this study portrays the rich and complex literacy negotiation of their literate lives, revealing their distinct trajectory of identity and literacy negotiation process which overcomes the ideologies of the Other and language skill deficiency ascribed to the international student population. Indeed, as shown here, literacy development as part of academic socialization in the Inner Circle is more than building English-based literacy skills. These students showed their idiosyncratic
meaning-making process across cultural, disciplinary, and textual boundaries. Their individual and collaborative meaning-making process illustrates how critical, creative, and productive they are, regardless of their background or academic achievement.

Grounding my dissertation in the academic literacies model, situated learning theory, CoP, dialogism, and critical perspective, I investigate L2 undergraduates’ academic socialization in one U.S. university, mapping their monologic coordination and dialogic collaboration. By incorporating a priori theoretical lenses and the empirical findings from students’ own experiences, I propose an academic socialization model that enables the academic field to envision what counts as academic socialization and clarifies how L2 undergraduate students’ academic socialization occurs. My model includes a diachronic dimension of academic socialization (i.e. phases of academic socialization as euphoria, critical academic becoming, and evolution) and three synchronic dimensions of academic socialization: contextual levels, sites, and modes of learning (Table 1.3; see discussion in Chapter 5), what focuses on the critical academic becoming phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Euphoria</th>
<th>Critical Academic Becoming</th>
<th>Evolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual levels of learning</strong></td>
<td>• Intercultural level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intertextual level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sites of Learning</strong></td>
<td>• Classroom setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Out-of-classroom setting (e.g., dorm, lab meeting, study group, writing center, &amp; online)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modes of Learning</strong></td>
<td>• Monologic coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dialogic collaboration (using speaking and writing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3: Academic socialization model

Students’ beginning academic socialization in the American context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Euphoria</strong></th>
<th><strong>Critical Academic Becoming</strong></th>
<th><strong>Evolution</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ beginning academic socialization in the American context.</td>
<td>• Intercultural level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intertextual level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sites of Learning</strong></td>
<td>• Classroom setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Out-of-classroom setting (e.g., dorm, lab meeting, study group, writing center, &amp; online)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evolution</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students’ continued adaptation to different discourse communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Methodological framework

Rationale for Critical Ethnographic Research

In previous sections, I explained why I used the ideological nature of the academic literacies model as a primary conceptual framework and intercontextuality as an analytical framework to investigate L2 undergraduates’ academic socialization. As an analytical framework, intercontextuality enables me to focus on each case study student’s becoming (i.e., identity negotiation) in his movement across time and space. In particular, I employed a critical multi-sited ethnographic approach (Marcus, 1995/1998). Ethnographic study emphasizes understanding on “the whole set of relationships in which a phenomenon is situated” (Watson-Gegeo, 1992, p. 53). Seeking to reveal an explicit and tacit “meaning system,” ethnographic research is the “study of culture” (Agar, 1996; Spradley, 1979, p. iii) in a local context, which distinguishes it from a case study. Ethnographic research focuses on understanding people, as shown in the etymology of the word ethno-people, or a social phenomenon. In the process of discovering the holistic meaning of people or a social phenomenon in relation to culture, ethnographic research concerns “the stream of behavior (activities) carried out by people (actors) in a particular location (place)” (Spradley, 1980, p. 86).

---


20 Ethnography refers to “writing about people” in etymology, more specifically “from ethnos, or race, people or cultural group, and graphia, which is writing or representing in a specific way a specified field” (LeCompte & Pressle, 1993, p. 1, cited in Green et al., 2003, p. 16).

21 When ethnographic research uses a parameter of people, it focuses on people’s personal histories in order to explicate a conflict or storyline of the unfolding event (Marcus, 1995/1998).
In particular, this dissertation uses a multi-sited\textsuperscript{22} approach to overcome the limitations of single-site ethnographic research to search for metaphors that participants carry across contexts. By examining the in-depth meaning of everyday literacy practices in specific contexts, multi-sited ethnographic research captures changes across situated contexts over time. Keeping these principles of ethnographic research in mind, I followed international undergraduates in and out of the classroom contexts, examining how they learn academic literacies and negotiate meaning-making by participating in various learning sites. In my dissertation, I identify a ruling passion for being a poet (Chapter 2), ideological becoming (Chapter 3), and dialogic becoming (Chapter 4) as metaphors that each case study student carried across different levels of context and that explain the emerging pattern of each student’s identity negotiation.

To be critical in ethnographic research means that the philosophical orientation differs from being descriptive and interpretative.\textsuperscript{23} Drawing on Marxian critical theory, critical ethnographic research is more value-oriented, even though there is a view that different orientations of ethnography are interconnected (Canagarajah, 1999). Critical ethnographic research investigates “beneath surface appearances, […] and unsettles both neutrality and taken-for-granted assumptions,” which conceptually enabled me to bring to light of “the voices and experiences of [international undergraduates] whose stories are

\textsuperscript{22} In conducting fieldwork, Marcus (1995/1998) suggests following a \textit{thing} or a \textit{metaphor} in multi-sited ethnographic research. Anderson-Levitt (2006) uses an example of good reading instruction for a \textit{thing} analogy. The \textit{metaphor} analogy, in my view, is well represented in a “ruling passion” as a driving force of a person’s literate life (Barton & Hamilton, 1998). An ethnographic method can be researched from hypothesis generation on people or their activities, as shown in the \textit{thing} analogy, or from grounded theorizing, as shown in the \textit{metaphor} analogy. In other words, research questions can be “predetermined or emerging” in ethnographic research (Anderson-Levitt, 2006, p. 287).

\textsuperscript{23} Critical, descriptive, and interpretative approaches have a common thread in a post-positivist view on knowledge and emphasize the context where people construct values and norms of human action (Cumming, 1994). However, a critical approach to research pays more attention to the power relations grounded on a Maxian ideology that are inscribed in human contexts and cultures.
otherwise restrained and out of research (Madison, 2005, p. 5). Undergraduates with a critical stance do not necessarily agree to a given frame of knowledge; they challenge or extend the given frame of knowledge, generating meaning by an active negotiation of the self in a particular context. Indeed, critical stances on knowledge and power relationships shown in Nana’s talk (Chapter 3) and Hosoo’s text (Chapter 4) reveal the myth of transience, if any, on L2 international students’ silent being in American higher education.

In educational and classroom research, the strength of an ethnographic study is in its ability to portray student experiences from a native’s perspective. Ethnographic research values the emic/insider perspective, but the researcher’s etic/outsider perspective helps understand the tacit culture by making the “invisible visible” (Anderson-Levitt, 2006, p. 285). Gaining etic/outsider insight from other participants further adds richness to the whole phenomenon in local meaning making by adding different perspectives to the same phenomenon. In my dissertation, I focused on students’ own perspectives, but considered others’ perspectives within a rich social network of context. I included interviews with students’ instructors, two writing administrators, and a tutor to create a holistic meaning. In reporting findings, however, I focused primarily on students’ perspectives rather than including all voices of the social network to emphasize the rich and complex literacy negotiation process of focal students. Focusing on the social context to capture holistic meaning where literacy practices occur enabled me to find

---

24 Leki (2007) emphasizes the significance of academic, social, and ideological contexts in literacy experiences, stating that prior “composition studies have added tremendously to our understanding of literacy development among undergraduates, but given that they were all intended to shed light primarily on the development of writing skills, their relentless focus on writing gives the impression that between writing assignments, nothing was happening in these students’ academic lives” (p. 2). Indeed, context is a key term in understanding literacy as social practice. Leki also emphasized the socioacademic relationship in people’s situated context, which is “a category of social interaction with peers and with faculty that
It should be noted, however, that the complex emic-etic relationship and the partial representation between the research participants and the researcher present a challenge in ethnographic research. Despite my endeavors to build rapport over time, due to the bias and partiality of human perspectives, it is debatable whether a researcher from an etic perspective can fully represent the emic perspective of the researched, resulting in the presentation of “partial truths” of meaning (Clifford, cited in Agar, 1996, p. 38).

In attempt to minimize the disjunction between the researcher and the researched, the notion of rich points (Agar, 1996) becomes particularly significant in conducting ethnographic research. Agar argues that the researcher reaches an epiphany of meaning by bridging the researcher’s etic and emic worlds as “the concepts [or researcher’s generated hypothesis] began to change, where new patterns are glimpsed, where the first raw material for building new frames appears” (p. 46). Because data collection took place longer than a calendar year per case, frame clashes were relatively easy to find through changes in participants’ talk (e.g., Joon’s changing perception in Art Education papers) and reactions (e.g., Hosoo’s active attempts to participate in ESL versus his reticence in...
first-year composition class) in the situated context. In a similar vein, a researcher’s “initial impressions” of the research setting from an etic perspective can be “insightful” in capturing the unique quality of the setting (Emerson et al., 1995, p. 26). In my study, because the research participants were undergraduates, classes led by a teaching assistant and an online informal study group (e.g. Hosoo and Ming) were distinct cultural experiences of frame clashes for me as an international graduate student in understanding undergraduates’ learning process in the American context from their own perspectives.

To wholly make meaning about the research participants’ trajectory of academic socialization on their own and in collaboration with other students, I triangulated the data using participant observations, interviews, as well as linguistic interaction (i.e., spoken discourse in the classroom and out of the classroom), and cultural artifact (such as writing samples, online interaction text, and course syllabi) data. Ethnographers emphasize participant observation as a critical tool in ethnographic research to identify what is happening in the local setting (Agar, 1996; Marcus, 1995/1998). Participant observation provides a vital opportunity to check the researcher’s hypotheses and “to complicate and contradict the encyclopedia” of knowledge the researcher brings to the setting, resulting in “[developing] interviews … based on [research] problems” (p. 9). For instance, observation of Hosoo’s classes helped me find the significance of teaching the process of research that is not emphasized in existing literature of learning college-level academic writing. Participant observation still raises the issue of the etic-emic dilemma discussed above. Thus, interviews assist in making meaning of the researched “public and accessible” (Anderson-Levitt, 2006, p. 287) as “interviewees will be encouraged to put words to their points of view on their lives and worlds” and, ultimately, “knowledge [will
be constructed] through the interaction of interviewer and interviewee roles” (Kvale, 1996, p.127). Because “much of any culture is encoded in linguistic form,” ethnographers emphasize the significance of “inferences from what people say” (Spradley, 1979, p. 9). Indeed, my interviews with participants were valuable data sources that allowed me to connect the dots of my observations of their participation in and out of the classroom. On the other hand, despite the strength of interviews as a data source, interview data is perception data, which may differ from reality and truth. Linguistic interaction data can therefore be authentic and rich, crystallizing meaning in situ; spoken linguistic interaction data reveals the invisible culture of the community that is grounded in a social constructionist26 perspective. I strived for “thick description” 27 (Geertz, 1973; Ryle, 1971) for the elaborated description of research contexts and key findings to make “the description rich and thick”; furthermore, I employed micro-level linguistic interaction for “thick explanation” (Watson-Gegeo, 1992, p. 54) regarding how Hosoo (Chapter 4) learned academic literacies in his interaction with others and how his peers bridged his knowledge gap throughout the process of collaboration.

26 Social constructivism and social constructionism are often used interchangeably. Crotty (1998) makes a sensible distinction between the two terms by emphasizing that the unit of analysis is different: “Constructivism … points up the unique experience of each of us. It suggests that each one’s way of making sense of the world is as valid and worthy of respect as any other, thereby tending to scotch any hint of a critical spirit. On the other hand, social constructionism emphasizes the hold our culture has on us: it shapes the way in which we see things (even the way in which we feel things!) and gives us a quite definite view of the world. This shaping of our minds by culture is to be welcomed as what makes us human and endows us with the freedom we enjoy. For all that, there are social constructionists who recognize that it is limiting as well as liberating and warn that, while welcome, it must also be called into question. On these terms, it can be said that constructivism tends to resist the critical spirit, while constructionism tends to foster it” (p. 58). In my view, the notion of community implicit in social constructionism decides the way people think, feel, and judge, which is different across sub-cultural communities of a linguistic group as well as across linguistic communities.

27 Geertz (1973) explains thick description as describing and interpreting people and their acts.
Grounded in an ethnographic orientation, I organized my dissertation using the “cases within a case” (Stake, 2000, p. 447) method, with focal case student participants in Chapters 2, 3, and 4. A case can include “a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group” (Merriam, 1998, p. 9). Here, a “case” refers to a group of undergraduates at a research institution, while “cases” refer to each of three focal case study students. Focal student participants were recruited by maximum variation sampling, a process of selecting “[student] cases that cut across some range of variation” in order to find “common patterns across great variations” of complex social phenomena (Glesne, 1999, p. 29). A case study design has four main features: thick description, heuristic function and inductive reasoning with foci in the research process, context, and discovery (Merriam, 1998). A multi-sited ethnographic case study research method is especially appropriate to capture the insiders’ perspectives, emphasizing the social context, researching individuals across multiple settings, and capturing change over time (Schultz, 2006). As ethnographic research derives from the study of a local setting, statistical generalizations are hard to make. Nonetheless, with careful attention to cross-cultural and cross-contextual comparisons, analytical generalizations (Kvale, 1996) regarding the process and outcome of L2 academic socialization can be, to some extent, interpreted from my findings.

**Current Study**

*Context and data collection.* This study was conducted at various locations at a large Midwestern university in the U.S. Its selection as a site fits my research purposes because the school is one of the top 15 schools in the U.S. to host international students (Bhandari & Chow, 2008). Out of a student population of 61,568, the total number of
international students reaches 3,924, or 6.4% of the total student population. There were 1,349 international undergraduates in AU 2008 (Table 1.4). In this university, the term “international students” is used officially to refer to non-residential aliens, which includes F1 and J1 visa students. According to the official definition of a F1 visa student, “[t]he foreign citizen must have a valid educational purpose for coming to the United States and be a full time student. It is not possible to be a part-time student on an F-1 Visa. The student can stay in the United States for as long as he/she is enrolled in school” (Retrieved May 1, 2009, from http://www.usimmigrationsupport.org/visa_f1.html).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Transfer undergraduates (UGs)</th>
<th>Continuing UGs</th>
<th>Former UGs</th>
<th>Total international (INTL) UGs</th>
<th>Total INTL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004AU</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>4,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008AU</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>276 (190*)</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>3,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transfer students actually number 190 because 86 students were enrolled in American Language Program.

Traditionally following a first-come first-served policy for admitting state residents till the 1990s when it adopted a more selective policy, this university’s acceptance rate for domestic students dropped from 78.2% in 2004 to 61.7% in 2008 for freshmen admission. Correspondingly, international undergraduate acceptance rates currently range from 55.94% (transfer students in 2008) to 84.14% (freshmen in 2004) (Table 1.5). The top numbers of international undergraduates come from Korea (391), China (253) and India (160); the total from these three countries accounts for about 60% of the 1,349 international undergraduates in 2008.

---

28 J1 visa students are short-term exchange students who stay at the research institution for periods ranging from one quarter to one year. At this university, J1 student numbers in AU 2008 reached approximately 240, a number which is included in the international student population.
freshman INTL application completed | freshman INTL admitted | enrolled INTL freshman | ratio from application to admission for INTL freshman | transfer INTL UGs application completed | transfer INTL UGs admitted | enrolled transfer INTL UGs | ratio from application to admission for transfer INTL UGs
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 2004 | 435 | 366 | 101 | 84.14% | 531 | 331 | 191 | 62.34%*
| 2008 | 1,099 | 715 | 234 | 65.06% | 572 | 320 | 190 | 55.94%*

*International students at this research university primarily transfer from local community colleges, followed by other universities in the U.S. In other words, transfer international undergraduates inside the U.S. outnumber those transfer undergraduates coming from other foreign countries (06/15/09, interview with an admissions staff).

Table 1.5: Admission rate

The research university asks international undergraduates to submit English test scores such as the TOEFL to meet a minimum English proficiency requirement by submission of English test scores such as TOEFL. If their language proficiency is below the expectations of the university, students can enroll in the university's American Language Proficiency Program\(^{29}\) instead of submitting English test scores. Joon (Chapter 2) took a two-quarter APL program in order to be a transfer student at the research institution where he was a full-time student with a F1 visa. Nana and Hosoo were above the university English requirement, but they chose to attend language programs at other universities for financial reasons.

Among the six visa students from China, Korea, Japan, Macao, and Malaysia,\(^{30}\) Joon and Quan chose the university because their siblings were attending the same research institution, which meant that they were able to reduce their living expenses; they

\(^{29}\) In general, students enroll for 2 to 3 quarters before they either transfer or meet the English requirement for admission to the research institution (05/29/09, email correspondence with ALP program staff).

\(^{30}\) Four students (i.e., Hosoo, Ming, Quan, and Sisley) out of six appear in the study group data. However, it should be noted that there were three other international students from Japan, Indonesia, and Argentina who officially participated in the study group and interviews. The Japanese student transferred from a community college in Iowa; the Indonesian student transferred from a community college in the city where the research institution is located; and the Argentinean student transferred from school in Argentina. In other words, the number of the study group reaches seven. The seven students’ nationalities include Argentina, China, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Macao, and Malaysia.
did not apply for other schools. Hosoo, Nana, Ming chose the research institution because a study abroad agency\textsuperscript{31} in their countries recommended the research institution. Sisley, who graduated from a high school in New Jersey, responded that she chose the research institution for the formal reason that it is a large institution with a relatively high U.S. ranking in Business, but also, informally, because being far away from New Jersey meant that she was able to be away from her relatives’ house. Hosoo was the only new freshmen, while the other four students were transfer students (Table 1.6).

\textsuperscript{31}An interview with the admissions office staff confirmed that the university identifies three reasons for a successful recruitment of international students, even though there are some variations between different nationalities: a good rank in Business and Engineering, study abroad agencies, and the university’s recruitment efforts (06/15/09). The staff’s account coincides with the students’ statements that a study abroad agency is the primary reason for their application to the university.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Joon (#2)</th>
<th>Nana (#3)</th>
<th>Hosoo (#4)</th>
<th>Ming (#4)</th>
<th>Quan (#4)</th>
<th>Sisley (#4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Transfer student</td>
<td>Transfer student who graduated in pharmacy in Japan</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Transfer student</td>
<td>Transfer student</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of research school</td>
<td>His sister was enrolling in the same school.</td>
<td>A study abroad agency recommended the university; there were few schools left when she started applying in 2007 to start in the autumn of the same year.</td>
<td>A study abroad agency recommended the university; of the two schools that offered him admission the research university was the larger one.</td>
<td>A study abroad agency recommended the university; of the schools she applied to, the research university gave her the first admission offer.</td>
<td>His sister was enrolling in the same school.</td>
<td>It is a large school with a relatively high U.S. ranking in Business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>U$2,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.6: Research participant

Quan gave two reasons why international students come to the research institution. The first reason is that the academic requirement for an international transfer student was low (GPA over 3.0) in comparison to other universities in the similar ranking range, while in practice it also accepts a transfer student whose GPA is below 3.0. The second reason is that it provided the first admission offer among the schools that his Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Malaysian friends applied to (06/16/09).

This university began to provide a U$ 6,600 fund for some first-year international freshmen starting from 2006, which proved to be an effective recruitment strategy; this university initiated recruitment travels in 2005 to foreign countries for the sole purpose of attracting a high quality student body and diversifying international students and all numbers warrant that recruitment travel to foreign countries is effective (06/15/09, interview with an admissions office staff). On the other hand, another staff informed that there is no merit-based scholarship for international undergraduates in the research institution, which supports Joon’s self-report that his assistantship is need-based. From the 1,202 international undergraduates enrolled in the academic year 2005-2006, this school may have earned an estimate of U$22,954,737/year from tuition revenues, while it provides U$249,873 funding. This tuition figure is based on the AAU Public University tuition and fees reports. The university’s financial office did not confirm the estimated figure despite my continuous request to confirm tuition and funding figures.
Data were collected between August 2006 to June 2009 (Table 1.7), which overlapped periods of data collection, analysis, and write-up. Data collection was divided into three phases: (a) pre-data collection; (b) observation of students in the classroom, tutoring sessions with course instructors, writing center, and study group sessions, as well as individual formal interviews with three focal research participants at a minimum of once a quarter; and (c) and post-data collection as a follow-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Pre-Data Collection</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Post-Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>• Informal interaction • IRB application</td>
<td>• Observations • Interviews • Writing samples • Course document • Field notes • Spoken linguistic interaction data</td>
<td>• Member checking • Peer debriefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.7: Data collection timeline

Pre-data collection lasted from August 2006 to January 2007. I met Joon (Chapter 2) and Nana (Chapter 3) at an international students’ gathering during August 2006 and we met informally as a group once a month. Later, these two students were recruited by snowball sampling (Patton, 1990) by the recommendation of a core member of the international students’ gathering. The strength of snowball sampling is in “its ability to locate informants who have attributes that are central to the research problem and are also involved in an active social network” (Parameswaran, 1999, p. 88). Through snowball sampling and informal interactions, I came to understand the significance of the social
network of international students as a mediator in academic success. For example, these international students shared both academic and organizational information to achieve academic success; they shared content knowledge and played the role of mediators by connecting peers in need to other students who have content expertise or who have relatively high proficiency in English to proofread peers’ papers.

During the second phase of my research, which took place from February 2007 to August 2008, I collected data from Nana and Joon. I chose to report on Nana and Joon not only because they were very supportive of longitudinal data collection but also because they gave me permission to cite parts of their writing samples and online interactions. Due to the possibility of a discrepancy between their perception and reality, their writing samples helped me triangulate their interview data, which allowed me to discover undergraduates’ challenges in learning academic literacy from their perspectives. Interviews were intriguing data in capturing meaning; in addition, triangulation through writing samples was helpful to warrant my assertions.

In contrast, I recruited Hosoo (Chapter 4) in February 2008 from a classroom setting. He was one of the four focal students who participated in a seven-month study group with me. The classroom was the ideal place for me to develop an understanding of how undergraduates build academic literacy. From January to May 2008, I observed Hosoo’s ESL classroom twice a week and his first-year composition class five times, during which I audio- and video-recorded the classroom interactions. I also observed and audio-recorded his tutorial sessions with the course instructors. Moreover, I observed Hosoo’s interaction with a writing tutor in two sessions. In addition, I conducted informal interviews with students and instructors as there were “many occasions when something
is happening that you wonder about” (Glesen, 1999, p. 68) such as times when Hosoo attempted to verbally participate or speak English in ESL class. During fieldwork, I paid attention to contextual factors and conceptually significant literacy events that emerged from the research contexts. The final phase of data collection involved member checking with students and conducting follow-up interviews.

In ethnographic studies, “the more sources tapped for understanding, the richer the data and the more believable the findings” (Glesne, 1999, p. 31). I conducted fieldwork as much as I could to secure data in situ because I strived to assemble a view of each context that was as saturated as possible in order to substantiate my evidentiary and interpretative assertions.

**Data corpus.** The data sources used for the three focal case students include: (a) video/audio-recorded interactions in classrooms, tutorials, writing center, and study groups; (b) audio-recorded interviews with course instructors, two ESL and first-year writing program administrators, and one tutor; (c) offline and online student cultural artifacts; and (d) field notes. All recorded data were digitized, which I selectively transcribed after I identified key literacy events. A detailed data corpus appears in each chapter.

My data corpus consists of audio and video recordings of interviews and spoken interactions. Audio-recording is effective in capturing “complex, fast-moving events” such as classroom and study group interactions, whereas video recordings add another benefit of capturing the context of interaction including paralinguistic behaviors (Purcell-Gates, 2004, p. 104). Audio/video recordings allowed me to document “social life as process, as emergent meaning established in and through social interaction…. [which]
enhances the possibilities for the researcher to see beyond fixed, static entities, to grasp the active ‘doing’ of social life” (Emerson et al., 1995, p. 14, italics mine). In my research, digitized data helped me vividly capture the students’ process of building their academic literacy repertoire over time (Prior, 2004). In particular, my access to Hosoo’s in- and out-of-classroom participation enabled me to revisit how he learned academic literacies in his use of language in situ “from a variety of attentional foci and analytic perspectives” (Erickson, 1986, p. 145). Moreover, revisiting the digitized data also allowed me to capture how he negotiated his asserted identity with his assigned identity in the U.S. with the mediation of peer talk (Chapter 4). Indeed, learning literacies intersected with identity negotiation, which was shifted over time.

I wrote field notes employing a double-entry journal (Frank, 1999, cited in Anderson-Levitt, 2006). The double-entry journal consists of description on the left side and interpretation on the right side, providing “subtle and complex understandings of these others’ lives, routines, and meanings” (Emerson et al., 1995, p. 13) (see a field note example in Appendix A). Ethnographers emphasize the significance of interpretation in the process of turning fieldwork into a meaningful whole. Central to this process is to build codes for data reduction. Codes, labels, or categorization enable a researcher to reduce a large amount of data to a manageable and meaningful chunk. I wrote my codes on my double-entry journal to facilitate data analysis and reduction, using colors and italics as visual heuristics for effective representation of evidentiary warrants and interpretations for my theorization. The following are codes I developed for this study.

(a) Conceptual Theme (CT): This code indicates a heuristic construct that I identified from earlier literature. I used these constructs as conceptual threads
in my description and interpretation of the double-entry note (e.g., writing development; identity negotiation).

(b) Emerging Pattern (EP): During fieldwork, specific patterns emerged such as characteristics of students as writers and students’ habitual use of pronouns (e.g., Nana’s negotiation of conflicts in the various demands in learning and writing developed into the notion of Nana’s ideological becoming; the use of a pronoun “we” in the study group represents solidarity of a group membership among Asian international students).

(c) Example (EX) of literacy events: This code represents a specific example of a literacy event (e.g., direct quote or indirect quote) that corresponds with either my conceptual framework or an emerging pattern.

(d) Teaching Implication (TI): This code describes the literacy event or my interpretation of it that fits the students’ needs or challenges in their learning processes and learning outcomes (e.g., students’ generalization of writing rules).

Data analysis. Traditional qualitative research methods emphasize inductive reasoning, constructing a grounded theory based on the continuous comparison and contrast of emerging patterns from data sources. For grounded theorizing, researchers typically use a constant comparison method, identifying emergent patterns (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Researchers use different terms for qualitative analytic coding (e.g., Emerson et al., 1995; Gleson, 1999; Strauss & Corbin, 1998); however, the common process is to make open coding to saturate conceptual framework and to develop “core”
themes as well as focused coding\textsuperscript{34} for “building up and elaborating analytically interesting themes” (Emerson et al, 1995, p. 160). Both coding processes enabled “analytic induction” by linking assertions and exemplary data (Erickson, 1986, p. 81). For example, in my analytic induction of Nana’s case (Chapter 3, Figure 1.1), I started with open coding from Nana’s identity as a scientist. As a scientist, Nana struggled with the different epistemology and research method of citation practices in the humanities. From her identification with the Japanese ki-seung-chon-kyon model and its equivalent American five-paragraph essayist tradition, Nana resisted the composition pedagogy of a cultural prototype. From the resistance in her talk, I developed a focused coding on ideological becoming, my theorization of a generalizable pattern (i.e., “conceptual theme” [CF] in my coding scheme) that was “illustrated in particular description” (i.e., “emergent pattern” [EP] in my coding scheme) (Erickson, 1986, p. 151). By relating her writing across the cultures and curriculum using codes, I created an evolving identity negotiation trajectory of Nana. My theorization may symbolize the typical L2 international students in the U.S.

\textsuperscript{34} Emerson et al. (1995) explain that we can do focused coding by “connecting data that initially may not have appeared to go together and by delineating sub-themes and subtopics that distinguish differences and variations within the broader topic” (p. 160). In my study, focused coding includes the example of “time” for writing development. Strauss and Corbin (1998) explain that we can code by “asking questions and making comparisons” (p. 163).
However, rather than solely relying on inductive reasoning, I recursively connected the emergent themes to the conceptual framework of identification in a power-laden discourse and analytical framework of different levels of intercontextuality. That is, my data analysis employed abductive reasoning by integrating an a priori conceptual orientation and a grounded theory from the data sources (Agar, 1996; Atkinson et al., 2003). By a priori conceptual orientation, I understood that “[d]ifferent theories will lead to different emphasis on such phenomena” (Kvale, 1996, p. 96) and ultimately different conceptual approaches “highlight different aspects of the meaning of teasing” (p.97) and complement each other. For example, Lea and Street’s (2000) academic literacies model encompasses social literacy theory, multiple identities, and critical theory, all of which provide a conceptual orientation for my study. That is, social literacy theory helps explain how Nana’s meaning is situated and negotiated (e.g., Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Brant, 2000; Ivanic, 1998). Multiple identity
theory helps explain how Nana’s identities are incessantly evolving by merging, disrupting, and overlapping across contexts. Further, critical theory sheds light on the resistance of Asian undergraduate students where critical orientation enabled me to reconceptualize culture as *hybridity* (Nana’s chapter) and power as *collaboration* (Hosoo’s chapter) for social change. Therefore, not only are comparison and contrast among data sources involved in grounded theorizing about L2 academic socialization, but also the comparison and contrast of conceptual orientation and data sources are essential to challenge pre-existing notions (e.g., culture as a static artifact; power as an absolute, imposing, and monolithic product) and extend the current understanding of the academic socialization of international L2 students in the U.S. Although current theories and concepts provide frames of reference that help our understanding of L2 socialization, offering different conceptual (e.g., ruling passion, ideological becoming, and dialogical becoming) and analytical frames (e.g., intercontextuality) of reference becomes more important, subsequently enabling invisible social phenomenon (e.g., Asian international students’ resistance) to become visible and articulated. The level of intercontextuality is different for each case because of the saliency of identity negotiation in student learning process. In my dissertation, I compared and contrasted my emergent findings to multiple identities embedded in Lea and Street’s (2000) academic literacies model, resulting in a distinct portrait of identity negotiations of three focal participants. The data analysis process, therefore, became important for my rich engagement in matching my *a priori* conceptual orientation to the grounded theory.
To summarize, my data collection and data analysis processes were highly recursive. The specific data analysis procedures of each chapter followed eight phases:

(a) writing field notes while listening to the audio-recorded data and roughly transcribing them; (b) reading data and raising questions based on the data collected; (c) creating a codebook; (d) comparing and contrasting by clustering codes; (e) linking codes about major assertions related to the research questions (initial codes were changed, deleted, or refined during the process of finding evidentiary warrants); (f) linking codes that emerged during the process of finding evidentiary warrants.

I propose three analytical framework of intercontextuality: intercultural, interdisciplinary, and intertextual levels as a default for analyzing undergraduates’ common writing across the curriculum. Nana’s case is exemplary in applying my analytical framework. Because Nana negotiated the different writing/literacy practices of Japan and the U.S, by creating her own theory, Nana’s negotiation of culturally distinct literacy practices can be referred to as an intercultural context. However, I used the default analytical framework, intercontextuality, differently to the saliency of each case. In Joon’s case, because he carried over his ruling passion on creative writing across national context, I used the term, transnational context; I also emphasized his professional context through his learning and writing across his major classes. In Hosoo’s case, I used the term intercontextuality across nations because Hosoo’s international student identity becomes a cosmopolitan one in Korea, especially since the term “international” is regarded as a racial minority in the U.S.
from data to *a priori* theory to confirm the match between data findings and the conceptual framework; (g) searching for negative cases\(^{36}\) that may not fit my codes to show limitations of my initial assertions; and (h) selectively transcribing interview and interaction data. This data analysis process appears in detail in each chapter.

**Assuring trustworthiness.** In my analysis of data on the academic socialization of international undergraduates, I triangulated the data at three levels in order to establish trustworthiness. Triangulation is the process of “corroborating evidence from different [data] sources to shed light on a theme or perspective (Creswell, 1998, p. 202). One level of triangulation was the calibration of the students’ emic perspectives and the etic perspectives of others including course instructors, administrators, and a tutor. I also conducted periodical member checking through interview sessions or emails to confirm my findings. Furthermore, the trustworthiness of coding was achieved by peer debriefing. Nana’s chapter was peer-read by a Research One faculty in the English Department in the summer of 2007. The trustworthiness of coding in Joon’s chapter underwent peer debriefing through my 2008 American Association for Applied Linguistics presentation.

Another level of triangulation was among multiple data sets. Rather than rely on a narrow data source such as observations, interviews, linguistic interaction analysis, or cultural artifact analysis, I used multiple datasets as described in the data corpus section to warrant my evidentiary and interpretative assertions.

---

\(^{36}\) Emerson et al. (1995) put an emphasis on negative cases for a researcher “to change, elaborate, or deepen her earlier understanding of the setting.” By doing this, she can “consider and explore possible causes or conditions that would account for difference or variation” (p. 29). In my study, examples of negative evidence across the case study students enabled me to find a pattern of the idiosyncratic nature of academic socialization. That is, negative evidence added richness and depth to the findings.
The final level of triangulation was to understand the context holistically from multiple layers of time and space. Time triangulation involved comparing and contrasting literacy events over time; therefore, I conducted a longitudinal engagement with the three focal students of this study. Space triangulation involved data triangulation across micro-levels of linguistic interaction (e.g., comparison of Hosoo’s participation in and out of the classroom), meso-levels of the classroom setting (e.g., Nana’s identification of different epistemologies across the curriculum), and macro-levels of the school curriculum (e.g., cross-case comparison of Nana, Joon, and Hosoo’s conceptualization of American writing); in- and out-of-classroom settings (e.g., Hosoo’s learning), and online and offline spaces (e.g., Hosoo and Ming’s collaborative learning). Where prolonged engagement offered “scope” to my findings, “persistent observation” provided “depth” for my analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 304, italics mine).

Assuring trustworthiness after a write-up phase. After completing all chapters of this dissertation, I performed another finding-based triangulation with two doctoral candidates who have teaching experiences in the research institution and one researcher from the University of Michigan. I recruited the first doctoral candidate because he taught undergraduate classes for five years at the research institution and he also had working experience at the studying abroad agency in Korea. He also reported that he had close relationship with four Korean students through his club activity over more than five years. He confirmed my study findings in four ways. First, all four students who majored in Business and Computer Engineering were eventually successful at securing decent

---

37 I got permission to cite the well-known researcher from the University of Michigan (06/15/09, email); however, due to the complexity of the findings, I decided not to reveal this researcher’s name and gender.
jobs; however, these students reported to him that there is no special merit in graduating from the state-level university in the U.S. with regard to securing jobs in Korea. According to this doctoral candidate, these students could obtain this caliber of jobs without a study abroad experience. This triangulation can support Joon’s statement regarding job placement after his study abroad experience (see details in Chapter 2).

Second, two out of four students are from a highly privileged social background in terms of their parents’ social positions in Korean society. This can support the general view that international students have high social status in their home countries (e.g., Fox, 1994) and Hosoo’s account that study abroad students come from affluent families (see Chapter 4).

Third, this doctoral candidate confirmed that the study abroad agency where he worked recommended specific schools that have high admission rates, which supports my research participants’ accounts that they chose the research institution because a study abroad agency recommended the research institution (see Table 1.5). He added that international students apply to American public universities because they and their parents do not have accurate information about American universities and that study abroad agencies do not report the realities of American universities for marketing purposes. According to this doctoral candidate, even though it is a large financial investment for international students, the learning outcome of study abroad students at state-level American universities can be meager; he asserted his view that international students should attend a private school where undergraduate classes are taught by teaching faculty where students can learn English while interacting with native speakers—a conclusion that he reached when he held a teaching position in an
undergraduate class, where a much small number of international students are enrolled. His teaching and observation of international undergraduates at both public and private institutions may reveal the caveats of state-level American universities in terms of students’ failure to increase their language proficiency and the drawback of their being taught by graduate teaching assistants. This doctoral candidate also informed me of the commercialization of the research institution which organized a recruitment travel to foreign counties (see Footnote 33). On the other hand, grounded on his working for a study abroad agency, he added that there are some international students who think of the research institution as their dream schools.

The reasons I recruited the other doctoral candidate are threefold: he had lived with undergraduate students; he had taught undergraduate classes in the research institution; and he had also built relationships with Korean undergraduates through his seven-year club activities. This doctoral candidate also confirmed the findings of my study. First, given his observation of his two undergraduate roommates and two club juniors, he confirmed that studying abroad in the U.S. itself is not beneficial to get a job in Korea. Secondly, he confirmed the culture of blaming themselves in international students. According to him, although his two undergraduate roommates, after graduation, blamed themselves for not being able to secure jobs in both the U.S., because they are foreigners, and Korea, because the Korean economy is in recession—an insight which overlaps with my analysis of self-blame (see Chapter 5). On the other hand, this doctoral candidate added for the reason of studying abroad that two undergraduates out of four
with whom he built close relationship over seven years chose to study in the U.S. undergraduate because they enjoyed their language training experience.

While two doctoral candidates helped me triangulate my findings about the research institution, a well-known L2 composition researcher at the University of Michigan helped me analytically generalize my findings to other universities in the U.S. After presentation of my findings about Hosoo (Chapter 5) in an international conference in June 2009, the researcher addressed that international students in the University of Michigan maintain an “optimistic” attitude which I named a “euphoria” phase, while they become “realistic” in their graduating year when they seek internships and job opportunities, which I called “critical academic becoming” (see Chapter 5). Secondly, this researcher also confirmed the practices of study abroad agencies and the commercialization aspects of American higher education, while reflecting on his/her teaching and researching ESL composition for the last 25 years in the University of Michigan and traveling to other universities for his/her data collection.

Due to the characteristics of case-based findings, it would still be hard to statistically generalize my findings; however, along with the IIE report (Bhandari & Chow, 2008), IAU report (2006), triangulation with two doctoral candidates at the research institution and a researcher at the University of Michigan increases the trustworthiness of my findings and analytical generalizability (Kvale, 1996) of my findings to other school at least in the U.S..
Overview of Chapters

In the academic literacies model (Lea & Street, 2000), learning skills, socialization, identification, and empowerment intersect in a student’s negotiation of meaning. Grounded in this conceptual model, this dissertation examines L2 undergraduates’ academic socialization processes and outcomes on their own and in collaboration with others. Using intercontextuality as an analytical framework, Chapters 2, 3, and 4 conceptualize identity negotiation as a missing link in understanding the process and product of academic socialization across contexts.

Chapter 2 examines the academic socialization of Joon, an international Korean undergraduate, into the U.S. during college and beyond. Joon’s development of academic literacies was impeded by a “ruling passion” (Barton & Hamilton, 1998) for creative writing. Data analysis portrays how Joon’s academic literacy was impeded because he locked himself in the genre of creative writing, unaware of the various genres of writing. However, dialogic interactions with peers and instructors allowed Joon to broaden his identity as both a creative and academic writer who mediates the social and individual aspects of writing. Findings illustrate the cultural clash between the self and the discourse community in academic socialization, the significance of multiple sources of feedback, and specify how feedback contributes to the improvement of one’s writing.

Chapter 3 examines the conflicting academic literacy demands across intercultural, interdisciplinary, and intertextual spaces of Nana, a Japanese undergraduate student, throughout her college years. Findings suggest that learning literacy involves complex negotiations between agents and contexts. As a high-achieving “scientist,” as Nana
describes herself, she found common ground between Japanese and American scientific literacy, but struggled with the different epistemological ways of writing in the humanities. Ultimately, she found culture-specific and culture-universal ways of writing in the humanities in Japan and the U.S. This chapter focuses on her critical stance in adopting the literacy of an American essayist. Following Bakhtin (1981), I term her active contestation of literacies for her own meaning-making as “ideological becoming” (p. 341) and simultaneously analyze her linguistic action for sociocultural change.

In Chapters 2 and 3, I use a zoom-out lens to longitudinally capture critical incidents of academic socialization. In contrast, Chapter 4 portrays the vivid academic socialization process of Hosoo, a Korean first-year undergraduate, in developing his academic literacies on his own and in collaboration with others using a zoom-in lens. I begin with how Hosoo’s learning process and identity negotiation intersect as an identification process. I use intercontextual connection as an analytical framework, as in Chapters 2 and 3, to discuss how Hosoo’s asserted identity as a cosmopolitan diverges from his assigned identity as an “other” in the U.S (Cornell & Hartman, 2005). As a first-year international undergraduate, Hosoo did not initially see himself as belonging to a minority population until he became accustomed to American academic discourse. The authorial voice of Hosoo negotiated his growing awareness of his assigned identity as a racial minority and as a foreigner when he wrote about affirmative action. Intertextual analysis (Leander & Prior, 2004) across the first and final drafts of his writing confirms the argument that writing and literacy are ideological acts, where a text is interpreted in context with the author's intention (Bakhtin, 1981). Even though Hosoo maintained his
cosmopolitan identity, he also tactically repositioned his assigned identity in relation to the mainstream American audience. Viewing power in his critical consciousness as dynamic, enabling, and fluid, he strived for equal opportunities across races. Rather than be constrained by power as absolute, imposing, and monolithic, he sought social transformation through linguistic action. The findings show that the identification process of becoming is relational, social, and situated, shifting L2 reading and writing practices from being comprehensive, to being critical, and toward being creative. I argue that identity is a central link for learning the conventions of the academic discourse community and participating in the community effectively and legitimately.

In Hosoo’s identity negotiation process, his knowledge base that he built during composition classes was vital for Hosoo to write an undergraduate humanities research paper was pivotal. By tracing Hosoo through two quarters during in- and out-of-classroom settings, I identified eight domains of genre knowledge which fall within four meta-domains: writing skills, information literacy, language use, and subject matter knowledge (Figure 1.2). Discourse and artifact analyses reveal that (a) initiating declarative knowledge and its transfer into procedural knowledge are “interpretative frames” (Tannen, 1993) that undergraduates need to know in order to participate in the culture of academic discourse and (b) the notion of research is as important as the notion of academic writing for incoming undergraduates. This suggests that information literacy should be taught explicitly in learning to write an undergraduate humanities research paper.
As collaboration in a study group with other three members was crucial for Hosoo’s learning to write, I further analyze students’ language-in-use through discursive function and genre knowledge domains. The findings show how students co-construct the context of peer review by (a) comprehending and (b) assessing peers’ work, in addition to (c) creating their own personal learning opportunities, while drawing their talk on (a) writing knowledge, information literacy, language use, subject matter, and meta-cognitive knowledge domains. By portraying the process how Hosoo built his writing knowledge and deconstruct the term minority with study group members, Chapter 4 illustrates L2 literacy practices are inexorably linked with an identification process in the situated world. For Hosoo, reading, writing, and learning the words were reading the world (i.e., Gee’s [1996] “Discourse”).

In Chapter 5, I discuss my proposition for an academic socialization process model, the culture of case study students in the research context, and my theorization of discourse hybridization. I end with the implications of L2 academic socialization on the theory, method, and practice.
CHAPTER 2
Joon’s Ruling Passion for Creative Writing

Introduction

Identity is a vital notion that links literacy practices across the contexts of home, school, community, and nation. As a matter of fact, undergraduates bring their multiple group memberships such as ethnicity, class, race, gender, and linguistic backgrounds to school as they struggle between in- and out-of-school literacy practices (e.g., Bryant, 2005; Chiseri-Strater, 1991; Herrington & Curtis, 2000).

It is important to consider the identity negotiation process because of its impact on students’ achievement of academic literacy (Heath, 2001). Lea and Street’s (2000) academic literacies model views writing as a site of identity negotiation and focuses on student identity and social meaning. In contrast to the term academic literacy, the term academic literacies\(^1\) is used in the plural to emphasize the negotiated nature of meaning-making in a student’s learning processes. Therefore, student agency becomes critical in

\(^1\) The term academic literacies is used in the plural form because of the negotiated nature of a person’s meaning-making. A person constantly negotiates meaning of academic text in relation to his situated context and other people; in contrast, academic literacy in the singular form refers to decontextualized knowledge and skills that can be transferable from context to context.
judging which knowledge is legitimate and meaningful, especially since the student is constantly negotiating multiple sources of knowledge and authority.

In general, international students’ identity negotiation is particularly rich and complex because they move across transnational settings. However, little is known about international ESL (English as a Second Language) undergraduates’ socialization process across Inner Circle contexts in learning academic literacies (Grabe, 2001; Tardy, 2006). Socialization is a process through which a person becomes a member of a discourse community and comes to embody the values and norms of their community through the use of language (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). In higher education, academic socialization encompasses the cognitive strategies that lead to the improvement of the skills of reading and writing, in addition to the influences of beliefs, practices, and social relationships in specific academic communities. More importantly, the academic socialization process involves students’ trajectories of acceptance, contestation, and negotiation (Brooke, 1991) of various literacy practices in their meaning-making process across contexts.

The notion of “ruling passions” (Barton & Hamilton, 1998, p. 84) is a driving force behind people’s ways of thinking, acting, or belief system which is particularly helpful in conceptualizing international students’ movement across contexts because it provides a frame of reference to understand their evolving worldviews while moving across contexts. The notion of ruling passions posits that dominant values inscribed in

\[\text{\footnotesize{Inner Circle refers to English-medium countries such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the U.K., and the U.S. (Kachru, 2005).}}\]
people’s autobiographical selves (Ivanic, 1998) are crucial to people’s connecting gestures across contexts with respect to their acts of assimilation, contestation, and negotiation.

Drawing on my academic socialization model proposed in Chapter 1, I investigate in the present chapter (a) the identity negotiation of an international undergraduate as he moves across his time in an American college and beyond, (b) examine student voices and perspectives about literacy learning through the medium of academic writing (e.g., Cumming, 2006; Leki, 2007; Spack, 1997), and (c) attempts to understand how identity changes over time (Casanave, 2002; Ricento, 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Euphoria</strong></th>
<th><strong>Critical Academic Becoming</strong></th>
<th><strong>Evolution</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual levels of learning</strong></td>
<td>• Transnational level • Interdisciplinary level • Intertextual level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sites of Learning</strong></td>
<td>• Classroom setting • Out-of-classroom setting (e.g., home, study group, and writing center)</td>
<td>Students’ continued adaptation to different discourse communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modes of Learning</strong></td>
<td>• Monologic coordination • Dialogic collaboration (using speaking and writing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Joon’s Academic socialization

---

3 Ivanic (1998) describes the autobiographical self as “the identity which a writer brings to an act of writing, shaped as it is by their prior social and discoursal history” (p. 24) and “which she develops over time” from her sociocultural context (p. 182). I equate ruling passions to dominant literacies values that are ascribed in the autobiographical self.
**Intercontextuality as an Analytical Framework**

The transnational level includes the autobiographical literate experiences that the student brings into the American learning context and centers on the participant’s past literacy experiences and beliefs from his home country. The interdisciplinary level refers to the contexts of the participant’s English composition and disciplinary classes. The third context comprises his college major and professional experience in business after college (see Table 2.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Context</th>
<th>Examples of Context</th>
<th>Identity Emerged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transnational level</td>
<td>Cross country</td>
<td>Poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary level</td>
<td>Composition &amp; academic disciplines</td>
<td>Academic writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional level</td>
<td>College major &amp; professional field of business</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Levels of context
Research Participant

The research participant, Joon, is a 23-year old Korean male who was a pre-business major when a research institution recruited him and eventually graduated with a specialization in Logistics. In Korea, he attended four semesters of college at a third-tier university and transferred to a research institution in the United States to improve his English proficiency and enhance his intercultural communicative experience as part of his career preparation. Thus, Joon was globalizing his educational readiness as an “investment” (Norton, 1995, 2001) toward becoming a qualified candidate in the Korean job market by bridging the gap between his current “actual identity” and his future “designated identity” (Sfard & Prusak, 2005) as a successful job candidate. The following section reports his rich points at three levels of context: in his autobiographical literacy

---

4 Joon was recruited for this study by convenient sampling (Patton, 1990) among volunteers who responded to an undergraduate survey. Data was collected during the 2006-2008 academic years. The main data sources were Joon’s five writing samples and seven formal interviews followed with debriefing sessions through four emails and three electronic chats which provided me with an emic/insider perspective. These data were triangulated with an etic/outsider perspective through interviews with six of Joon’s course instructors (i.e., literature lecturer, Art Education instructor & teaching assistant [TA], logistics professor, Plant Biology TA, and second-year composition TA), field notes of in- and out-of-class observations, document analysis of instructor feedback on his writing, and course artifacts such as syllabus and course handouts. Formal interviews were arranged at least once a quarter, each session lasting for about two hours and were semi-structured in nature (Hatch, 2002). ESL and first-year composition directors and the writing center coordinator, in an attempt to strengthen the research design, were also interviewed to clarify the instructional focus and policy of each program.

Data were analyzed using abductive reasoning which integrates grounded themes from the data with an a priori theoretical orientation of the academic literacies model (Agar, 1996; Atkinson et al., 2003). Data analysis was cyclical and recursive wherein I used a constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to report critical incidents of literacy learning as the student moved across contextual boundaries. To identify these critical incidents, I coded field notes and interview scripts in two ways; first, I preliminarily open-coded conceptual themes such as the notion of Joon’s ruling passion for creative writing (Barton & Hamilton, 1998) during data collection, and then I coded specific examples of Joon’s ruling passion across spaces (Emerson et al.; 1995). Data collection, which spanned for over two years, captured critical literacy events in which rich points of Joon’s identity negotiations are depicted (Agar, 1996). These rich points are critical moments to a student’s awareness of the tensions and conflicts across multiple spaces.
experiences in Korea (transnational level), in his composition and GEC classes (interdisciplinary level), and in his major and professional field (professional level).

**Literacy Practices across Learning Contexts**

**Autobiographical Literacy Experiences: Transnational Level**

Joon’s literacy values were framed by his ruling passion for creative writing. In his childhood, Joon read, in Korean, an extensive range of literary genres, from poetry, essays, science fiction, to novels. In K-12, his favorite course was Korean Language Arts. He believed that literature was a form of story-telling and that Korean writing is rhetorically inductive. He enjoyed his Korean classes the most although he was not good at Korean spelling and grammar. In high school, his Korean Language Arts instructor was a poet. Under the instructor’s influence, Joon enjoyed writing poetry and was complimented for being creative. His sense of achievement in writing poetry was strengthened when he took part in a poetry writing event during his military service. In his screening interview, Joon defined creativity as “novel, original, and [exhibiting] an unexpected perspective from others.” He described good writing as “connotative, not light in meaning, with a nice choice of figurative and descriptive vocabulary and expressions.” He also described good writing as creative, not stale, written fluidly “as the water flows,” and expressed with an inspirational spirit. However, Joon had few memories of authentic writing experiences during his K-12 schooling in other genres of writing. Prior to coming to the U.S., his writing experiences were limited to poetry and papers in college business classes, where he was assessed based on content knowledge.
College Classes in the U.S: Interdisciplinary Level

Composition classes. Building on his ruling passion for creative writing, Joon started to negotiate his literacy values in the situated context of the American higher education where creative and academic writing overlapped. Joon took two pre-college English training classes in which his instructor emphasized the essayist tradition of English writing. In addition to one reflection paper per week, he wrote one or two-page essays four times a week in response to general topics such as “What did you do last weekend?” or “What will you do if your friends visit the U.S.?” He appreciated his instructor’s feedback on aspects of essayist forms, clarity of content, and sentence construction, such as relative pronouns and vocabulary use. After transferring to the aforementioned research institution, Joon was placed in an advanced level ESL composition class while most of his peers were placed in beginner or intermediate classes. Joon felt that his past training on the five-paragraph essayist writing with a thesis statement in the introduction was instrumental to his high placement. After completing four university composition courses, Joon still felt that his pre-college ESL writing instructions were the most helpful in learning how to write English essays. He easily adapted to the advanced ESL composition class because it focused on English “writing as forms” that reinforced his command of the five-paragraph essayist tradition. Writing training at ESL level made Joon aware of his writing errors and “internalize what deductive writing is” as opposed to the culturally and rhetorically distinct “inductive Korean writing.” While his adaptation to the deductive “structure” of American writing was smooth, his belief that good writing is creative remained solid in his heart:
In my opinion, American instructors focused on the forms of writing. The thesis statement should be mentioned in the introduction. The thesis should be backed up in the main body with a conclusion. They were not harsh in grading English expressions and grammatical mistakes. As long as the content of my writing is comprehensible, they focused on the structure of writing [rather than linguistic errors] (03/03/07).

In contrast, Joon considered his following first-year composition class more difficult because his instructor wanted him to focus on content and analysis, challenging Joon’s ruling passion regarding the worth of creative writing. This class triggered a shift from his passion for creative writing to a writing that is logical and based on claims and evidence. He learned that his ideas about creativity were not effective in academic writing. For example, the instructor told Joon that a creative idea was only a subjective and imaginative thought and that a claim should be warranted with corresponding evidence through textual and rhetorical analysis. This was a critical incident in Joon’s perception of how to write academically. As he explained: “It is not my subjective idea. [...] In order to write a good analytical paper, I have to support my claims with textual evidence, which, in turn, will make the content of my paper stronger” (03/10/07). Thus, he began to conceptualize the dichotomy between creative and academic writing.

This increased sense of the value of objective support, rather than subjective interpretation, was reinforced by the instructor’s written feedback on his paper. “Your use of data makes what you have very interesting, but you need to push further into the ways this body image problem has arisen, and more importantly, specifically how it is used
"Joon realized the need to be specific in the process of proving his claims. He began to comprehend that a strong thesis in academic writing requires reading-based textual analysis and argumentative support. Contrary to creative writing, it was not his subjective interpretations but rather citations or some other author’s words that strengthened his claims.

His first-year composition instructor also recommended that Joon should seek additional feedback from the writing counselors at the university writing center. The writing center tutors commented on his weak argumentation skills and advised him to make his writing more “explicit and specific.” This feedback from others led him to feel insecure about his competence as a writer and, gradually, his confidence in his poetry writing ability faded. Joon sought further help from a Korean friend who reported that even Joon’s Korean writing was problematic and incomprehensible. This shocked Joon because he believed that his English writing problems were rooted in his low proficiency in English, his small repertoire of vocabulary, his obtuse sentence construction, and his erratic use of relative pronouns. Furthermore, his younger sister who was studying at the same research institution proofread his writing and advised him to choose easier and more accessible topics instead of Joon’s more difficult and “creative” topics. The feedback from these multiple sources was valuable in helping Joon realize that he had difficulty constructing arguments even in his Korean writing and that his readers generally had problems identifying his central arguments in his writing. Joon maintained his self-identity as a good writer of ESL; however, he became uncertain of his development as a writer in general, stating that “I thought that my English limited ability
hinders the expression of my ideas in English. But, if it is not a language issue, I am not sure what is problematic in my writing. […] Writing irritates and scares me.” (03/10/07).

Despite his adaptation to the deductive American writing across cross-cultural rhetoric, Joon felt that his self-identity as a competent writer was challenged by multiple people like his instructor, tutors, and peers during his first-year composition class challenged. Joon seemed to be forced to a paradigm shift in his understanding of what counts as academic writing in his first-year composition class. He was in a transitional space of ambiguity and uncertainty between creative and academic writing. For this reason, the negotiation of his literacy values between creative and academic writing would not be a seamless process.

Writing across the curriculum. Joon became aware of the importance of objective and well-developed arguments in academic writing through his first-year composition classes; furthermore, his experience of academic writing began to diverge through his writing opportunities across the curriculum. However, Joon’s ruling passion for creative writing still affected his discernment of writing contexts. During his first year, Joon’s writing assignments were limited to Plant Biology and Art Education classes because the primary means of assessment was achieved through multiple-choice tests. Plant Biology lab reports were easy to write because he followed the structural sequence of introduction, method, result, and discussion section that usually define a scientific paper. In contrast, Joon struggled with comprehending the content of the Plant Biology course while preparing for his multiple-choice tests. His translation of specific English language biology terms into the Korean language often did not make sense to him (see Appendix
Writing Plant Biology papers was a relatively easy task for Joon because he participated in informal group work with other Korean students. His group covered several topics of the discipline and discussed how to write scientific papers for the class. Joon described the student-initiated study group as a means to build a “win & win strategy” for successful learning outcomes through collaboration and collective growth. According to Joon’s Plant Biology teaching assistant (TA), students’ writing difficulties typically included a poor understanding of the purpose of the scientific papers and their inability to separate the results section from the discussion section. Students tended to combine “information” and “inference” for the results section and “interpretation of inference” for the discussion section. Joon avoided these scientific-writing problems through his adaptation of discussions from model papers. Moreover, information shared in his study group discussions helped him deconstruct the model papers. The model papers that he obtained in the study group offered guidelines to imitate the “sentence construction and coherence” of scientific papers. In this way, the study group provided him with an alternative space of learning how to write genre-specific papers and ultimately, to develop his scientific literacy.

5 Appendix B was given to Joon by his study group member. I got permission to cite Appendix B.
6 Using examples of plant growth, the TA explained the difference in these three terms. “Information” is fact and data such as “there was one-inch growth”; “inference” involves an interpretation on why “sudden” growth occurred; an example of “interpretation of inference” is that “the hormone treatment made the sudden growth.”
In addition to the first-year composition classes, writing in Plant Biology involved following the conventions of a scientific paper. Joon did not explicitly state the non-creative element of a scientific paper in our interview sessions but his awareness of the possibility of an absolute and objective truth was sparked by an experiment which involved planting a seed and measuring its growth. Notwithstanding, his ruling passion for creative writing still guided him during his first year. In the subsequent quarter which followed his first-year composition and Plant Biology classes, Joon found writing in his Art Education 160 class relatively straightforward because he associated the writing context of art as being creative. Writing creatively supported his notion of good writing where “logic is not that important.” Joon described that art papers need “description as support” where “[t]here are different ways of support for interpretation (see Appendix C). Citations are not a support for Art Education which needs an essay with description instead. I wrote as my mind flowed.” In fact, both Joon’s course instructor and TA confirmed that citations are not required as evidential support in a basic Art Education class. Instead, the instructional focus is to initiate students into art-related analysis like description, interpretation, and judgment.

Joon sought feedback through tutorial sessions from the TA on each of his four writing assignment drafts so he could improve his writing. Although the comments on his first drafts were not always positive, Joon received satisfactory grades on his revised papers and was confident he was now doing well because he was writing “what the TA wants.” Yet, the questions that his first-year composition instructor, tutors, and peers
raised in the previous quarter lingered on and consequently, he continued to doubt his writing ability.

The Art Education TA commented that Joon’s “[g]rammar isn’t good at all. I don’t know how to read his papers. I search for words, very specific words in order to read his content.” The TA also noted that Joon tended to “write too many run-on sentences” and insert the phrase “I think” (05/30/07). In addition, he wrote in chunks of ideas, using his “stream of consciousness,” which are “compartamentalized” and therefore, lack cohesiveness. In other words, Joon’s writing was a mosaic representation of his ideas without contextualization or advanced organizing, which allotted the reader the responsibility of comprehension. Accordingly, the TA recommended Joon to provide concrete contexts and use specific examples in his papers. From Joon’s point of view, his papers were specifically designed to fit the grading rubric, which focused on description, interpretation, judgment, and the mechanics of writing (e.g., spelling & grammar). He did not write introductions and conclusions to his papers because “there is no guideline for the structure and forms of writing.” However, the TA wondered why Joon did not provide an advanced organizing paragraph for contextualizing and justifying his writing topic choice. The TA assumed that writing an organizer in advance, like an introduction paragraph, was the student’s responsibility; however, Joon only followed the guiding rubric and revised his papers according to the TA’s recommendations. Thus, the dialogic space of feedback for revision bridged the gap between the TA’s writing assumptions and Joon’s attempts to fulfill the TA’s expectations of students' responsibilities.
In his first academic year, Joon transitioned from a creative writer to one adapting to the values and conventions of academic writing; however, the transition process was rather recursive between creative and academic writing, as shown in Joon’s output in Art Education. Nevertheless, it is important to bear in mind that he was adapting to the distinct academic discourses where the nature of knowledge is different and the way to warrant multiple opportunities for disciplinary knowledge, such as the feedback and scaffolding from TAs, his study group, and other social resources in higher education, are provided.

**Major Field: Professional Level**

**Writing in his major.** While familiarizing with the distinct expectations of various academic discourses, Joon realized the importance of feedback from social resources (i.e., sister, study group, peers, TAs, and writing center) in the improvement of his writing throughout his first year. Joon chose a Logistics specialization in Business in his second year in order to pursue his “designated identity” (Sfard & Prusak, 2005) as a successful job candidate in the business field. An analysis of the nine course's syllabi of his Logistics major indicates that only two of these courses contained strong writing components. His Business (BUS) 499 course required weekly self-reflective journal entries on students' learning processes and BUS 751, which Joon took during his final quarter, was the only course that included individual reports asking the students to “describe and analyze aspects of [each] organization’s marketing strategy” (course syllabus) by incorporating textbook readings. By completing these tasks and fulfilling the
courses' expectations, Joon seemed to become a legitimate member of the academic discourse.

In the BUS 751 course, Joon chose “Samsung’s Global Strategy” (Appendix D) as the topic of his final five-page report and recalled: “I read a model paper to identify the form requested and how personal experience and textual theme are incorporated” (12/20/08, chatting). Joon’s text imitated the macro-moves of an introduction and discussed the five marketing strategies (i.e., “global innovation,” “global brand management,” “creating cross-country synergy,” “delivering brilliance in brand strategy implementation,” & “strategic alliance”) in the main body of the paper. He primarily employed a summary technique by describing each marketing strategy with corresponding examples and also partially provided his own interpretation (e.g., “It was natural for consumers to leave older models and try Samsung products, which offered additional yet more affordable features;” “Strategic alliances play an important role in global strategies because it is common for a firm to lack a key success factor for a market”).

Although Joon followed the macro-structural expectations of the model paper and provided a clear summary, I noted two significant differences when comparing the model paper to Joon’s paper. First, the model paper that analyzed the author’s family-owned businesses employed the author’s own analysis, which employed the author’s experience as evidence to their claims. In comparison, Joon included a bibliography of works he used in summarizing and interpreting Samsung’s global strategy, but he did not use in-text citations. Second, Joon’s imitation of the model paper is less sophisticated than the
model paper itself. For example, although Joon successfully duplicated the macro-moves of the sample paper, the micro-move analysis of his introductory section sentence by sentence shows a superficial understanding of what micro-moves, which are essential steps in an introduction, are (see Table 2.3). Despite this, Joon’s failure to follow the micro-moves of the model paper was not assessed by the course instructor and Joon believed that he did an excellent job based on the A grade he obtained. To put it differently, the grade he received replaced the feedback he got in the content class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; ST: <strong>Definition of a marketing concept</strong></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; ST: Contextualization of a marketing concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; ST: Objective of using the concept</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; ST: <strong>Definition of the marketing concept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; ST: Significance of using the concept</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; ST: Introduction of the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; ST: Another significance</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; ST: Source material’s evaluation of the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; ST: Advanced organizer of the main body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Micro-move analysis of the model paper and Joon’s paper

Joon’s final writing assignment in college was explicit in content and well-structured in format. Further, he noted the need for citation practices in academic writing to support his thesis and show his expertise on the topic. In his first year, Joon’s transition into the academic discourse was ambiguous, as shown in his quotes during first-year composition and Art Education classes. In contrast, Joon in his final quarter appeared to have successfully transitioned on to the disciplinary culture of business writing. On the other hand, as shown in the comparative analysis of the model paper and his final writing in college, his sophisticated improvement in writing might need more insight, signifying that progress in writing takes time and is a painstaking process. However, it is worth noting that by synthesizing content knowledge and its academic presentation, Joon
adapted to the disciplinary academic discourses and built a professional identity throughout his writing in his major. Due to the situated nature of literacy practices and its impact on the formation of identity, academic literacy practices helped Joon negotiate his ruling passion for creative writing and establish a professional identity grounded on academic representations.

**Professional field.** Throughout his undergraduate experience in the U.S., Joon embodied an understanding of deductive writing and explicit argumentation with disciplinary warrants. This developmental process was convincingly demonstrated in an authentic writing situation when he applied for a position at a Korean company after he graduated. In this situation, Joon faced a writing prompt that stated, “Discuss the strategies that enable [Bada] Logistics to come into the global market in an era of global economic crisis” (12/20/08, chat). He delineated his thesis using the five-paragraph essayist format. His thesis was that Bada Logistics has great potential to be a winner in the global economy crisis. Joon supported his thesis by depicting three strengths of Bada Logistics and concluded that he would be happy to work for a company with such great potential.

The academic preparation Joon received in college was important in forming his professional business identity. The writing skills he developed helped him encounter this writing task in business. According to Joon, “without content knowledge on the marketing strategy [from BUS 751] and the company information about [Bada]” that he collected with a group of job seekers, it would have been impossible for him to respond effectively to such a prompt. More fundamentally, Joon was aware that Bada Logistics
would only hire a candidate who researched the company and identified the strengths of the company. This significant improvement in his writing was evident in his awareness of the purpose and the target audience of the writing prompt, the selection and use of the five-paragraph essayist writing form, and the employment of an outline strategy. Joon’s rhetorical awareness, consciousness of the writing process, and ability to choose among multiple strategies to answer the job writing prompt were qualities he had never demonstrated during his initial stage in college, when he preferred to write creatively in Korean and subsequently translate his output into English. In contrast, writing a professional essay which allowed him to link form, content and rhetorical persuasiveness boosted his confidence. Joon stated, “I felt rewarded. The foundation to write an essay about [Bada’s] marketing strategy came from all the writing experiences that I went through and all the sleepless nights I spent. The endeavor was not a mirage” (12/18/08, chat, italics mine). Joon’s invisible transition from creative writing to academic writing may have occurred during all his undergraduate years. This confidence at the authentic writing situation starkly contrasts with how he felt after completing his first-year composition course, during which he was questioned about his weak argumentation in Korean and English. Not only Joon transited from the dichotomy of creative and academic discourses but also he became sensitized to the distinct demand of each writing situation. Joon’s writing improvement occurred slowly throughout college where he acknowledged that he primarily learned how to write by analyzing and imitating sample papers. Beyond his individual endeavor of textual imitation, the collaborative interaction opportunity with multiple others, such as course instructors, peers, and tutors mediated
his successful socialization in the American college. The authentic professional writing experience in applying for a position at Bada Logistics in particular illustrates the extent to which he embodied the practices of academic writing and applied his writing knowledge to a new context. As Joon embarked on his professional identity as a Logistics major, his writerly identity would further evolve with his participation in the professional literacy field. That is, his transition from his ruling passion for creative writing to a wider understanding of other genres, including academic writing, would be incomplete.

**Transforming a Ruling Passion through a Dialogic Space**

This analysis at three levels of context (transnational, interdisciplinary, and professional) follows Joon as a developmental writer whose beliefs about writing gradually transformed as he encountered new discourses and contexts. At the transnational level, Joon’s belief about writing was formulated through his ruling passion for creative writing, leading him to characterize good writing as creative writing. At the interdisciplinary level in his college writing, Joon had no problems identifying the different ways by which claims are supported in other fields, like in sciences and English, where he was aware of the hidden epistemological differences in research methods such as absolute truth in scientific experiments and various ways of warranting claims in the humanities field. However, deep in his heart, his sense of self was one of a poet and his value for creative writing prevented him from comprehending open-ended worldviews within academic discourse, making him approach Art Education writing as creative writing in his first year. Eventually, Joon’s steady and evolving development as an
academic writer is evident from his emphasis on the communicability of his writing and
rhetorical awareness in his major and professional field.

This study illustrated how a ruling passion in literacy values framed Joon’s
worldview on what is considered good writing, impeding his smooth transition into the
academic discourse, and how he fine-tuned himself to a different writing situation. Joon’s
transitional process from creative writing to academic writing and further to professional
writing illustrates how writer identity grounded in a ruling passion can complicate a
student’s transition into the academic discourse. Gradually shedding his identity as a poet,
Joon’s process of learning academic literacies was a negotiation of his creative ideal and
the norms of the academic discourse communities, where his writing efforts were situated
and evaluated. Joon negotiated his conceptualization of what constitutes good writing in
his first year when he discovered that writing considered most effective in the university
context is support-based argumentative writing rather than creative writing. He came to
an increasingly nuanced understanding of the conventions of disciplinary academic
discourses through collaboration with and feedback from multiple voices. As an
undergraduate, these dialogic voices of others helped Joon overcome his struggles (e.g.,
weak arguments, lack of specificity, lack of evidential support, and linguistic
inappropriateness) with common conventions of American academic discourse.
Furthermore, Joon’s dialogic interaction with others prompted his identity negotiation,
enabling him to fine-tune his worldview to various disciplinary academic discourses. The
expectations of academic discourse initially seemed elusive, intangible, and unseen
through his creative-writing-based limited worldview; but, he began to re-invent himself
as an academic writer through the mediation of others’ voices, participating in disciplinary academic discourses and consequently expanding his worldviews on writing and literacies.

On the other hand, the improvement of Joon’s writing production was not a linear, seamless, and singular trajectory, but rather idiosyncratic. Despite his forced awareness of what counts as academic writing in first-year composition, he reverted back to his belief that good writing is essentially creative, and his view of himself as a poet strongly influenced his judgment of the writing situation in his Art Education class. This example shows how students can resort to their ruling passions when similar writing contexts, in their judgment, emerge. Without knowing Joon’s initial beliefs about literacy at large and creative writing in particular, his Art Education TA anticipated that Joon would be unsuccessful in the future based on his four pieces of writing that tended to be structured creatively in Joon’s perception or loosely in the TA’s perception, and that his readers would need to link his compartmentalized representations. Contrary to the TA’s prediction, Joon’s subsequent writing samples were presented in an academic fashion and not in a creative one.

This research suggests that developmental writers, especially ESL writers, can experience difficulties while transitioning to discourse communities because their writing practices are grounded on different belief systems (e.g., creative writing). Therefore, it is utterly important to implement pedagogical strategies that produce writers who are knowledgeable about writing and literacy skills; however, it is also essential to reach a critical understanding about how the social nature of students’ belief systems shapes their
literacy values and acts of writing. By using the notion of a ruling passion to understand students’ emic worldviews, instructors can access and reach out for students like Joon during their first year courses while avoiding negative assessments based on their writing deficiencies.

A ruling passion is central to unpacking people’s literacy portraits and their worldviews and negotiating new academic literacy demands. Factors that evoke individual ruling passion are situated and cultural. In fact, “particular historical periods, cultural milieus, and material conditions” intersect with “people’s acquisition of the literacies” (Selfe & Hawisher, 2004, p. 7). In Joon’s case, as shown from his confession that he was not good at grammar and spelling in Korean Language Arts, the societal categorization assigned to him as a low academic achiever throughout his K-12 to college in Korea seemed to lead him to resort to his instructor’s positive comment that he was creative, leading him to generalize the creative genre of writing as the generalizable value to every writing context.

Joon’s belief system, rooted in his ruling passion on what is good writing, created a number of uncertainties during his first year. A fundamental tension or a cultural clash existed between his belief of how good writing should look like and that of the disciplinary discourse communities in the U.S. Joon’s struggle to “locate [himself] in the academic culture” (Sommers & Saltz, 2004, p. 131) by learning academic literacies highlights the pedagogical significance of mediation that links the self and the academic discourse communities in order to produce the expected learning outcomes. Joon developed as an academic writer through dialogic interaction with others who facilitated
his meta-learning of academic literacy practices. As outlined in Joon’s case, the dialogic space of written and oral feedback can be a compelling medium that facilitates the process of students’ awareness of their writing problems and their writing belief systems rooted in their ruling passions (Figure 2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locked in Creative Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediated by a Dialogic Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Aware of Different Genres of Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1: Joon’s identity negotiation

**Rethinking Feedback in a Dialogic Space**

Feedback is “a central part of … instructional repertoire” in developing “writing and language and use” and in helping students to learn academic literacies (Hyland & Hyland, 2006, p. 15). However, the longitudinal and short-term effects of feedback on students’ writing achievement remain unsolved (Nelson & Carson, 2006). Thus, the empirical case study of Joon compellingly fills the research gap by supporting the longitudinal effectiveness of feedback in general as well as the sources and specificity of feedback in particular.

In Joon’s process of learning academic literacies over a span of two years, the multiple voices he faced during his first-year composition classes created a critical incident, breaking his perception that he was a competent writer and that creative writing is one representative way of good writing. Feedback from multiple sources allows for a wider audience to provide various perspectives (Shepherd, 1992; Cho, Shunn, & Charney, 2006). Similar oral and written feedback from multiple people helped Joon understand
that his writing difficulty was not due to his low English proficiency. It is noteworthy that his self-perception as a strong, creative writer was questioned and revised not through introspection but mediation in an interactional space.

This study suggests that students may greatly benefit from receiving *specific and substantive* feedback from multiple sources in a dialogic interactional space rather than simply receiving a grade or feedback composed of just general comments such as “good,” “excellent,” or “interesting.” In particular, there were two memorable feedback moments that provoked Joon to contemplate his writing style: one was when his first-year composition instructor asked him to think through a problem in-depth, and the other one was when his Art Education TA’s advised him to contextualize his papers. These examples of specific comments from a dialogic space helped Joon realize his writing problems and change his habitual ways of writing.

**Concluding Remarks**

By extending the academic literacies model to the transnational setting, this study demonstrated that learning literacy involves a fundamental identity negotiation process, especially when it takes place across distinct values systems of what counts as good writing. In particular, this study reconceptualizes the academic literacies model by theorizing that a ruling passion, students’ belief system in literacies, can be a driving force for their transition to academic discourses. Joon is a compelling example of how a ruling passion grounded on the literary tradition can hinder the transition into the

---

7 Although Joon’s ruling passion is grounded on his belief that good writing is in essence creative poetic writing, it may be analytically generalizable to other students in that some
academic discourse community that is inextricably linked to the power structure implicit as to what counts as literacy in different contexts. Joon’s self-awareness as a competent writer was complicated by the fact that he mistook his struggles with the academic discourse primarily for second language difficulties during his first year in college. In acquiring academic literacies, Joon negotiated his identity as a poet and invented an academic identity by fine-tuning himself to different learning contexts. The process was not just a cognitive transition, but also a transition from a pre-existing worldview to a new one.

The added value of this study to the academic literacies model is in its explication of L2 undergraduate’s non-linear and idiosyncratic trajectory of identity negotiation over time. Joon’s initiation into the academic discourse was not seamless; rather, it was a back-and-forth shuttling process where he assimilated the discursive expectations across learning contexts and within each learning context, contested the process by questioning whether he was a good writer, and finally negotiated his old identity as a poet with his new one as an academic writer. However, through his back-and-forth academic socialization process, it is hard to conclude that Joon ever fully reached the phase of knowledge appropriation8 “with his own accent” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 294). To make his undergraduates’ transition to academic discourse is impeded due to their educational background in the literary tradition.

---

8 Bakhtin (1981) views appropriation as the ownership of knowledge rather than simply approximating others’ voices: “The word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes ‘one’s own’ only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language . . . but rather it exists in other people’s mouths, in other people’s contexts, serving other people’s intentions: it is from there that one must take the word, and make it one’s own (p. 294,
own voice heard, Joon would need *further negotiation* with himself in order to develop his scholarly self in his future professional context. Joon’s identity transition from an academic to a professional setting illustrates that learning literacies is, indeed, a life lifelong evolving trajectory of identity negotiation.

Furthermore, by investigating a person in context beyond textual examination and by extending the dyadic relations of a student and a tutor (e.g., Ivanic, 1998) to a social network system of learning in a discourse community, this study extends the academic literacies model by demonstrating the significance of others in student’s identity negotiation and scaffolding literacy learning. Joon’s transformation of self identity as a poet occurred not from introspection but from multiple sources of feedback, where his writing improved through feedback from his social network in the community.

italics mine). I view the Bakhtinian appropriation differently from Bartholomae’s (2001) interpretation in terms of student’s ownership of knowledge. Bartholomae viewed undergraduates’ academic socialization as a three phase process: *presence (being)* in the academic discourse community, *imitation*, and *interpretation* of authoritarian academic discourse.
CHAPTER 3

Nana’s Ideological Becoming in an Intercultural Space

Introduction

Learning across contexts represents a critical research agenda in academic literacy studies. As people position themselves within various situations by inhabiting their social roles, multiple identities\(^1\) are “constructed and reconstructed” (Ball & Ellis, 2008, p. 500). Therefore, identification links people’s multiple and competing literacy practices to their varied contexts. For example, students bring their multiple identities such as linguistic identities and cultural identities to school and the negotiation of these identities becomes vital to understanding their academic literacy achievement in school.

\(^1\) The scholarly debate on identity contains two primary threads (i.e., Ivanic, 1998; Jenkins, 1996): a single unitary self in the tradition of conventional psychology and multiple selves/identities in the tradition of sociology, social psychology, and post-structuralism. This dichotomy between a single self and multiple selves can also be applied to the understanding of self in expressionist and social constructionist approaches in composition studies. Expressionism identifies the self as a determiner of discourse who seeks a unique personal voice to represent its own individual identity in writing, whereas social constructionism approaches the self as a result of interactive relations with affiliated discourse communities. In brief, expressionism sees an individual, intrapsychic self while social constructionism focuses on the selves constructed in relation with communities.
Given the significance of identity negotiation in the learning process, James Paul Gee proposes identity as an analytical tool in literacy research. Drawing on the theoretical frameworks of social literacy in general (Gee, 2000; Street, 1984, 1995), academic literacies in particular (Lea & Street, 2000), and a dynamic view of identity (Ball & Ellis, 2008), this case study explores the transition of a Japanese female undergraduate student in American academic discourse as “an experience of identity... a process of becoming or avoiding becoming a certain person” (Wenger, 1998). Borrowing from Bakhtin (1981), I refer to a person’s negotiation of cultural, disciplinary, and textual literacies as “ideological becoming” (p. 341).

Undergraduates struggle to negotiate identity between in- and out-of-school literacy spaces (Bryant, 2005; Chiseri-Strater, 1991; Ivanic, 1998; Herrington and Curtis, 2000). Lea and Street’s (2000) academic literacies model specifically posits writing as the site of identity negotiation, focusing on student identity construction and meaning-making processes in light of ideological conflicts between students and their educational institutions. They argue that

[v]iewing literacy from a cultural and social practice approach, rather than in terms of educational judgments about good and bad writing, and approaching

---

2 The term academic literacies is used in the plural because of the negotiated nature of a person's meaning-making. A person constantly negotiates meaning of academic text in relation to his situated context and other people; in contrast, academic literacy in the singular refers to decontextualized knowledge and skills that can be transferable from context to context (cf. Zamel and Spack [1998] used academic literacies to refer to multiple “ways of knowing” and “multiple approaches to knowledge” and academic literacy as “the ability to read and write college-level texts” [ix]).

3 Researchers began to use the term literacy in place of writing due to the socially embedded nature of writing practices and the interconnectedness of reading, writing, talk, and multimodalities (Schultz, 2006).
meanings as contested can give us insights into the nature of academic literacy in particular and academic learning in general. (p. 33)

Countering both the skills model and the traditional academic socialization model, the academic literacies model locates student texts within broader social structures of power. Academic discourse becomes a site of contestation between the power of institutional practices and student identity. Student agency becomes integral in judging what legitimate and meaningful knowledge is, particularly when negotiating among multiple sources of knowledge and authority that embrace the text, the instructor, and the student’s own life experiences.

Despite its emphasis on interdisciplinary and intertextual spaces of learning, the academic literacies model is grounded in a single-country setting and overlooks the broader context of a transnational multiple-country setting (e.g., Ivanc, 1998). With the increasing globalization of education, however, international English as a Second Language (ESL) undergraduates represent a significant and increasing population in American college settings. Their identity negotiation is more rich and complicated because they move across intercultural spaces with interlanguage abilities. In this chapter, the academic literacies model expands to a multiple-country setting where

---

4 Johns (2001) pointed out the distinct linguistic and cultural needs of the college-level international ESL students and 1.5-generation and second-generation immigrants. Grabe and Tardy further showed that prior research regarding ESL students’ socialization focuses on students in the ESL-only classroom or the post-undergraduate population in Inner Circle countries. Most research on the undergraduate ESL population is conducted on immigrant and 1.5 generation undergraduates (e.g., Harklau, Losey, & Seigal, 1999; Herrington and Curtis, 2000; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008; Roberge, Siegal, & Harklau, 2009; Wurr, 2004) while little research exists on the international ESL undergraduate population beyond the ESL classroom (cf. Spack, 1997; Sternglass, 2004).

5 Selinker coined the term interlanguage for the systematic knowledge of a target language learner which is independent of that learner’s native and target languages. In the popular sense, interlanguage means the non-native language use that belongs to neither the native language system nor the target language system.
identity is considered a missing link in negotiating the literacy practices of international students.

The present chapter investigates how a Japanese student forges her own voice and stance about literacy learning (e.g., Cumming, 2006; Leki, 1992; Spack, 1997) by concentrating on identity shifts that take place over time and across contexts (Casanave, 2002; Ricento, 2005). Data collected over a two-year period allowed me to capture critical literacy events in which the student participant’s negotiation of identity became salient in depicting *rich points* in the data (Agar). Rich points are critical moments when tensions and conflicts created by discrepancies in literacy practices across intercontextual spaces become prominent to the student across distinct cultural literacy spaces.

**Ideological Becoming as a Theoretical Framework**

The act of writing course assignments involves performing particular identities and negotiating various literacies. Through multiple relationships and memberships between the self and various conflicting literacy demands, people invoke their autobiographical selves and reposition themselves moment by moment. Using the traditional academic initiation and socialization metaphor (Bartholomae, 2001; Lea & Street, 2000), people are passive and acquiescent, move seamlessly across the boundaries of contexts, and are enabled and constrained by relationships within a community. The academic literacies model, in contrast, posits that people actively construct their own meanings by specific positionings and repositionings through discursive practices such as acceptance, rejection, and transformation (Brooke, 1991). Learning academic literacies, therefore, is not only a matter of accumulating skills but also a matter of negotiating multifarious interactions between agents and contexts, that is, being and becoming.
through acting and reacting to changing contextual demands. By extending the Bakhtinian notion of ideological becoming in the relationship between the text and the reader to *people in context*, I conceptualize this identity negotiation process of ideological becoming as people’s active repositioning of meaning making in intercultural, interdisciplinary, and intertextual contexts. In other words, people “reaccentuate” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 91) their being and becoming within American academic discourse as they struggle “for hegemony among various available verbal and ideological points of view, approaches, directions, and values” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 346). It is through language-in-use that people deliberately choose how they position themselves in their written texts and conversational talk.

In people’s ideological becoming, I problematize this *in-between space* of home and host cultures that they navigate, distinguishing intercultural space from cross-cultural space (see Figure 3.1). *Cross-cultural space* in a multi-country setting postulates that literacy practices in people’s home cultures and native languages diverge from those of the host country and its languages. Being literate stipulates particular literacies in each cultural space assuming a static single literacy within a single culture. Culture, in this sense, is located in concrete geographies and physical locations, which entails static and essentialist assumptions about how literacy operates. People comply in a distinct cultural way of being literate in their movement across cultures, excluding the possibilities of cultural similarities. If people do not perform the dominant view of literacy in the host culture, they are not regarded as literate in that culture. In navigating borders, their

---

6 De Certeau distinguishes space and place. I view *place* as a geographic and physical location, whereas *space* is the discursive context of cultural practice.
agency in the fluid negotiation of literacies is not underscored in locating themselves between two disconnected cultural zones, as dominant discourse serves a uni-accentual norm for them. In the cross-cultural zone, people passively position themselves by discarding their primary discourse and consequently accommodating and acculturating to the dominant discourse, allowing it a privileged position in their process of autonomous becoming (e.g., Bartholomae, 2001).

*Intercultural space,* in contrast, is a dynamic space of hybridity and transformation where people’s agency becomes critical to their ideological becoming in the in-between space of cultures. Culture, in this sense, is an animated, anti-essential, and dynamic space in which people are incessantly consuming and constructing discourse. Culture is performed, stabilized, and altered by the actions of people in the social world. People ceaselessly position and reposition themselves by negotiating and appropriating various literacy practices in their ongoing transformation. In doing so, people transform their identities in multi-accentual ways, creating a dynamic hybrid culture by acting in the world. Culture becomes “a process, a set of practices” with “the production and the exchange of meanings” by people (Hall, 1997). Absolute power simply does not exist in the intercultural space. Rather, the power relations between cultures are constantly negotiated as people’s actions construct a hybrid culture.
Cultural differences and similarities overlap\(^7\) in the intercultural space and do not necessarily result in tension and conflict. Intercultural space, with its disconnects and overlaps between two cultural systems, characterizes people’s rich engagement with their own meaning-making processes as well as their potential resistance to the host culture by negotiating their own autobiographical literate values. The intercultural space that people-in-progress create is an alternative, productive, and transformative space where people are “a purely socioideological phenomenon” (Voloshinov, 1973, p. 34). Being literate is not only an internalization of decontextualized abstract knowledge-building or reading alphabetic words. Rather, it involves an ideological process of negotiating literacy practices and acting on their meanings in the situated context.

![Model 1. Cross-Cultural Space](image)

**Figure 3.1: Cross-cultural vs. intercultural space**

\(^7\) Cultural differences and similarities exist in both comparative-cultural space and intercultural space. However, I take the view that the role of people is not sufficiently emphasized in the comparative-cultural space. The notion of intercultural space highlights people’s transformation between cultures and their contribution to the creation of a dynamic hybrid culture through participation in the world with their dialogic actions.
Intercontextuality as an Analytical Framework

Context is pivotal in accessing the current notion of literacy and I view culture as having many potential levels of contexts. Rather than by or through a text, both talk and text are embedded in an interactive discursive context and meaning is constructed through the social interaction of people in context. In the American ethnographic and sociolinguistic research tradition, the level of context involves both a sociocultural activity system and an interactional context (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992; Lave, 1993). In contrast to this dichotomized understanding of context, I operationally divide context into three nested levels – the macro, meso, and micro levels, as proposed in Chapter 1. In exploring one student’s transition across learning contexts, I accentuate her movement among the in-between spaces in this three-level context (see Table 3.1 & Table 3.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Euphoria</th>
<th>Critical Academic Becoming</th>
<th>Evolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Contextual levels of learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intercultural level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intertextual level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ beginning academic socialization in the American context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sites of Learning</strong></td>
<td>Students’ continued adaptation to different discourse communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classroom setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Out-of-classroom setting (e.g., lab, study group, and writing center)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Modes of Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monologic coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dialogic collaboration (using speaking and writing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Nana’s Academic Socialization
The macro context is the student’s home country and her situated context in the host country, the meso context is the discipline in college, and the micro context is the textual space. I contend that the process of moving among these contexts generates conflicts in students’ identities. In the macro context, students bring their autobiographical selves and literacy practices of their home countries into their new contexts. In the meso context, they are forced to negotiate their identities through diverse ways of knowing. In the micro context, students perform their identities in textual spaces. Although the layers of context result in conflict, they also provoke undergraduates to question their identities and enact who they are. In an endeavor to particularize the links among identity, literacy, and context, I investigate a Japanese undergraduate’s identity.

---

8 By autobiographic self, Ivanic means “the identity which a writer brings to an act of writing, shaped as it is by their prior social and discoursal history” (p. 24) and “which she develops over time” from her sociocultural context (p. 182).

9 I first introduced this analytical framework at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (2007, March) in New York.
negotiation at an American college using intercontextuality as the analytical framework for data analysis and interpretation.

**Research Participant**

This study describes the meaning-making process of Nana (pseudonym), a 29-year old woman, during her two-year stay at this particular research institution. Prior to coming to the U.S., she graduated from a pharmaceutical department in Japan and worked for five years at a research institute in Japan where she contributed in obtaining four international patents. Nana transferred to the research institution to raise her GPA and apply to graduate school, eventually being accepted into the highly regarded International Health graduate program during her final quarter as an undergraduate.

10 Collected during the 2006-2008 academic years, the core data sources are interview transcripts with Nana and her 15 writing samples. These data were triangulated with transcripts from four interviews with two course instructors, field notes taken during in- and out-of-classroom observations, document analysis of instructor feedback on her writing, and two course syllabi. While informal interviews were conducted during fieldwork, individual formal interview sessions occurred once per quarter with each approximately two hours in length. Formal interview sessions were semi-structured in format (Hatch, 2002) and asked questions regarding Nana’s self-sponsored and academic literacy practices. Her broader cultural worlds was accessed by my attending monthly informal gatherings of an international student group she was involved with and by observing and participating in her interactions on Facebook, a social networking site. The rapport formed during formal and informal fieldwork helped facilitate the interview sessions. Nana’s accounts of her literacy autobiographies and her ongoing reflections epitomize her emic/insider perspective, whereas my observations and instructor interviews present an etic/outsider perspective. Weaving through both etic and emic perspectives enabled us to find definite meaning in context.

Data analysis was conducted using abductive reasoning (Agar, 1996; Atkinson et al., 2004) that integrates grounded themes from the data with the *a priori* theoretical orientation of multiple identities and multiple literacies across contexts. Data analysis was cyclic and recursive, utilizing a constant comparative method of data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to pinpoint critical incidents of identity negotiation. These critical incidents are concrete examples of literacy events in Nana’s literacy learning process, which represent rich points in her experiences (Agar, 1996). To uncover these critical incidents, two coding systems were employed for the interview scripts and Nana’s writing samples: (a) a preliminary stage of open coding for recurring themes of identity negotiation during data collection; and (b) analytic coding of ideological becoming as a conceptual theme which emerged from the open coding (Emerson et al.). In reporting the rich points, Nana’s negotiation of literacies and identities is understood at three levels of context with her autobiographical literacy experiences in Japan as the macro context, her composition and disciplinary content classes as the meso contexts, and her revisions across writing drafts as the micro context.
Nana’s academic literacy education in Japan centered on literary text analysis and argumentative writing using the ki-sung–chon–kyul model. Her writing opportunities, however, were negligible until high school where her writing education ended. While composition is not offered in Japanese colleges, she had few opportunities to write at the college level. Nana explained that “not only was I a pharmacy major, but general Japanese students do not learn academic writing either in high school or college. We also do not take rigid TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) essay training in Japan.” As such, Nana’s college writing experience was limited to lab reports and scientific research papers.

Nana assessed herself as “poor” in writing about Japanese literary texts due to her rudimentary and limited K-12 writing education. In contrast, she read literary texts and argumentative writing extensively outside of school. Through her self-sponsored literacy practices, she expanded the fixed pedagogy of the Japanese rhetorical prototype and became aware of inventive writing styles of contemporary Japanese writers. Nana

Contrastive rhetoric is a major controversy in second language writing research (Casanave, 2004). For example, using the same Chinese representations but different pronunciations, the ki (beginning)-sung (development)–chon (change)–kyul (end) model is an often-cited rhetorical structure of East Asian writing such as Chinese, Japanese, and Korean that is analogous to the five-paragraph essayist tradition in English. Researchers criticize the textual ki-sung-chon-kyul model as a static and fixed rhetorical model (Kubota & Lehner, 2004), resulting in two schools of thought, critical contrastive rhetoric (Kubota & Lehner, 2004) and intercultural rhetoric (Connor, 2008). The traditional contrastive rhetoric lacks awareness of linguistic and cultural changes through people’s diaspora in the globalization area. Assumptions about language and culture are so ingrained as to be deterministic and essentializing; nevertheless, the relativist view of the traditional contrastive rhetoric, grounded on the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis on the cultural prototype of textual structure is an “area of research in second language acquisition that identifies problems in composition encountered by second language writers, and attempts to explain them by referring to the rhetorical strategies of the first language” (Connor, 1996, p.5).
conceived Japanese writing as “fluid,” arguing against a static view of Asian inductive writing and contending that Japanese writers craft a “new style through experimenting with vocabularies and phrases.” Her conception of the fluidity of Japanese writing and her lack of TOEFL essay training in Japan led Nana to criticize the five-paragraph essayist tradition once she began taking ESL composition classes in the United States.

**College Classes in the U.S: Interdisciplinary Level**

**Composition classes.** Prior to her undergraduate education at the research institution, Nana enrolled in a pre-college language program at another American university. She then took two ESL classes and a first-year composition class during her first year at the research institution. These classes revolved around “structure construction,” Nana's term for American essayist practice. In her four ESL writing samples, Nana complied with the course guidelines, placing her thesis at the end of the first paragraph, presented three main body paragraphs starting with the words “At first,” “Another,” “The third” and plainly indicated the ending by using the phrase “In conclusion.”

Nana also conformed to this structural pattern in her first-year composition class. Her instructor, however, encouraged her to deviate from the five-paragraph essayist tradition and cultivate alternative ways of writing, recommending that Nana analyze a topic in-depth and convince her readers. In Nana’s words, “[c]ontent becomes important.” In her first paper, “Analytical Summary of ‘Conveying Atrocity in Image,’” her instructor commented,
Your summary is good, but the paper lacks depth and analysis. You can accomplish this by focusing your essay on a specific compositional practice. Choose one and explore it in detail. Provide examples from the text and analyze them. Tell me how [the author] makes her claims and what the significance of the claims is.

At the end of her first year, Nana acknowledged her appreciation for her first-year composition class, commenting that it was “efficient.” The particular macro rhetorical strategies of logos, pathos, and ethos helped her develop audience awareness. She noted:

I was a self-confident, stubborn writer. I did not thought [sic] of different readers. Scientific writing needs logic; but, logic, logos is not the only analysis tool in writing. In scientific writing, there is definitely no pathos. But, to attract the reader’s attention in art, using ethos or pathos could be effective.

Nana stated that her theory of good writing is “helping readers to easily understand my opinion. I have to make readers understand well.” She felt more assured in her first-year composition class than in previous composition classes because she did not have to accommodate her writing to the five-paragraph essayist tradition. This self-assurance helped her choose a second-year composition course offered by the English Department rather than one through her major department of Nutrition.

In her second-year composition class, Nana referred to the term “comparison and contrast” as a synthesis of her analytical claims about a topic, whereas in her ESL composition papers, she used this term structurally to refer to two paragraphs of comparison and one paragraph of contrast. Although acknowledging that she was still
learning to write in English, Nana doubted the pedagogical effectiveness of the one-size-fits-all approach to ESL composition. She noticed she was revising the writing rules she acquired in ESL throughout her writing across her first- and second-year composition and disciplinary content classes.

**Disciplinary content classes.** Along with four composition classes, Nana took 16 disciplinary content classes during her undergraduate stay at the research institution. Although she was primarily assessed with multiple-choice exams in GEC classes, Nana had writing assignments in Art History, Japanese Literature, and Nutrition. For instance, Nana completed five paper assignments for Human Nutrition 313 and 761. She commented,

> In Human Nutrition, there is fact and data. Human Nutrition is like biochemistry. It deals with very basic stuff. I write certain facts or analysis. For my first 761 paper, the professor gave journal articles. I just have to point out problems in statistics, research method, and conclusion. Human Nutrition papers test my content knowledge.

Given her college major and work experience in Japan, Nana found it easy to analyze experimental data. In contrast, she noted,

> [The first-year composition class] was the biggest problem for me. It needed my opinion. Opinion needs different ways of thinking. So, for me it was very difficult. There are different facts and different ways of analysis. Literature writing is based on opinion. As a science major, I could not understand what is important in the background [of literature writing]. In science, we use facts, data, and formula. In Art History, there is art style and something [else]. There are
different ways of facts. Every class needs analysis but the ways of analysis are
different. What is important becomes vaguer in composition classes. There are
different ways of thinking across classes.

Nana observed that composition classes placed “value in language,” whereas content
classes like Art Education and Human Nutrition focused on content knowledge. More
significantly, Nana wrestled with switching from a scientific epistemology mindset to
that of a humanities approach in which epistemology operates through multiple and
relative truths. Although reporting and analyzing scientific fact was simple for Nana, she
needed to transition from seeking the one right answer hidden in scientific ways of
knowing to more open-ended ways of knowing in the humanities. It was through writing
opportunities in her composition and disciplinary classes that she became aware of
epistemological heterogeneities implied in the disconnected ways of knowing across
disciplines, distinct criteria of what counts as knowledge and evidence across disciplines,
and diverse procedures about how she should mirror disciplinary knowledge and
evidence in her writing.

**Revision across Writing Drafts: Intertextual Level**

Nana sought instructor feedback via email in all of her writing assignments before
submitting her final versions (Appendices F & G). Her composition instructors noted her
linguistic errors and partially corrected them within her drafts. During these two years,
Nana felt inhibited because of anxiety and doubt in her English proficiency, commenting
that her academic writing did not improve in either word choice or sophistication of
language-in-use. In his third interview, Nana’s first-year composition instructor assessed
her as a sophisticated thinker who was open to thesis development, demonstrating
insightful arguments in comparison to typical 18-year-old freshmen. Nana’s instructor, however, had difficulty comprehending her essays because of her grammatical errors and frequent misuse of vocabulary. Her interlanguage problems even included global errors (Ferris, 2003) which hindered comprehension. Consequently, halfway into the quarter, Nana’s instructor advised her to find a native speaker to proofread her third and fourth assignments.

Nana did not have any native-speaking friends to correct her language usage errors and the writing center told her that it “does not proofread papers” so “there [was] no place ... to go.” Thus, she stopped visiting the writing center and asked her 1.5-generation friend who had a better written accent to correct her composition assignments. Nana’s linguistic exclusion became apparent, leaving her to wonder if she would ever attain intuitive grammar. Nana felt helpless because grammatical correctness and idiomatic expressions were areas of writing where her endeavors rarely paid off. On the other hand, she could polish her “childish” vocabulary of academic terms with additional “time investment.” Her apprehension about permanent linguistic exclusion as an adult non-native speaker of English strikingly contrasts her efficient transition in disciplinary knowing and writing.

Nana’s Ideological Becoming

Nana’s case illustrates that identity is crucial in negotiating literacy demands and formulating one’s own meaning. Her identity negotiation as a non-native English-speaking Japanese scientist was inevitable at three levels (macro, meso, and micro) of analysis. More distinctly, her identity negotiation was pronounced at the macro level. By
bringing her autobiographical literacy values from Japanese literature, argumentative writing, and scientific writing into her American composition classes, Nana located herself between the dichotomized worlds of fluid Japanese writing and the American five-paragraph essayist writing during ESL classes. Reflecting on the border clashes between Japanese and American writing, she repositioned her stance instead of simply assimilating to the essayist tradition. For instance, she continued to use the five-paragraph essay structure advocated by the ESL composition instructors even though she noticed its shortcomings, rationalizing to herself that abiding by the essayist tradition would lead to a good grade. For her, “good writing” is defined as communicatively effective writing, whereas “writing for a good grade” equated to “writing what the instructor wants.” Aware that she lacked linguistic and cultural competency as a non-native speaker and resisting accommodation, Nana preferred to question the efficacy of the five-paragraph essayist rhetoric. She resorted to the strategies of appropriation and transposition (Canagarajah, 2002) rather than directly confront the expectations of her ESL composition courses.

Because of the power differential between the student and the instructor, Nana revealed her resistance to embrace the American five-paragraph essay in her interviews and not in her course writing. This is not to insinuate that Nana’s text is objective and transparent, but rather, her evolving self in the process of academic socialization became

12 In comparison to avoidance and accommodation, transposition refers to “adopting a voice that defines itself dialectically by working against the conflicting discourses” (Canagarajah, 2002, p. 113). In comparison to opposition, appropriation refers to “a more synnthetic and dialogical strategy of negotiating a space for one’s vernacular-based voice in the established mainstream discourses” (p. 114).
more explicit in an interview conducted during the time she was taking an advanced ESL composition class.

American writing is very strict. There is no other choice because I do not know the reality of American education. I have to obey, obey the beliefs of this system of deductive writing. I have no confidence in English. Even if I have confidence, I have to follow what the instructor says. I have no other choice.

Based on her extensive self-sponsored reading, Nana perceived that there is no preferred location for a thesis statement in Japanese writing. Her appreciation of Japanese cultural ways of writing reflects her dynamic view of language and culture in change (Atkinson, 2004; Leki, 1992; Matsuda, 1997; Street, 1993). Nana discerned that she is a contemporary person, that language use evolves over time, and that contemporary Japanese literary writers are increasingly more engrossed in experimenting with style. Her insight echoes Leki’s (1992) dynamic theory of culture where “[c]ultures evolve writing styles appropriate to their own histories and the needs of their societies” (p. 90).

Cultural ways of thinking, writing, and the social practice of language evolve over time by the actions of people. Culture, nevertheless, is difficult to alter in a short span of time. Instead, the acts of people forge sub-cultures toward sociocultural change just as culture structures people’s thoughts and actions. The agency of people becomes critical in the construction of shifting culture. Cultural writing, in particular, is, in Nana’s words, “changing,” dynamic, and fluid by the actions of people. Nana’s attentiveness to evolving Japanese literary writing across time and distinction between literary and scientific writing illustrate her rich engagement in writing practices across time and contexts,
resulting in her challenge of the five-paragraph essayist tradition in building her situated knowledge. As pointed out by Sternglass (2004), “[b]ecause of the particular backgrounds second language learners bring to higher education, [students like Nana are] distinctly qualified to question societal norms and practices” (p. 58).

Nana maintained a critical stance by remaining vividly aware of who she was and what she believed, resisting the deductive five-paragraph essayist tradition in her mind and incessantly reconstructing her identity-in-practice (Holland et al., 1998). At the cross-cultural border of Japanese and American rhetorical prototypes, Nana employed transcultural positioning by “select[ing] and invent[ing] from materials transmitted by a dominant and metropolitan culture” (Pratt, 1998, p. 178; Zamel, 1997) and reaccentuating herself in the intercultural space. Nana defied uni-directional adaptation to disciplinary and classroom norms in learning and, instead, crafted her own theory of good writing and expanded her repertoire of writing by identifying culture-specific and culture-general writing. Her identity negotiation was an evolving shuttling process between two competing languages and cultures rather than a simple boundary crossing (Canagarajah, 2002).

In her first-year composition class at the end of her first year, Nana activated her cross-cultural space in writing, easing her doubt about the fixed five-paragraph essay. She came to recognize that the communicative effectiveness of all writing lies in the rhetorical triangle – text, audience, writer – and viewed it as the frame of analysis. She further employed it to distinguish macro genres of writing in disciplines where the rhetorical strategies of logos, pathos, and ethos could be applied alone or simultaneously.
Adapting to a situated literacy practice, Nana’s writing repertoire extended beyond two cultural prototypes of writing. More importantly, she discovered that the frames of the rhetorical triangle and rhetorical strategies could be applied to analyze diverse genres of writing in each culture. Through writing opportunities in the two cultures, Nana forged her theory of good writing as communicatively effective writing by bearing in mind the audience in various cultures and disciplines, along with discerning multiple discourses, and, consequently, fine-tuning herself to multiple literacies within and across cultures.

Nana’s case bolsters the notion that learning literacies is a rich and complex process of identity negotiation. Learning literacies is “becoming a certain type of person” (Ivanic, 1998, p. 67) which denotes more than just a product of good and bad writing and the pedagogy of a “fix-this-essay approach” (p. 338). The cognitive skills necessary for the act of reading and writing are leveraged by beliefs, practices, and social relationships in specific contexts. Consequently, initiating students to certain norms, values, and practices of literacy is a social practice. Being literate purports to read the “world” in which people are situated with the “word” (Freire, 1987, p. 35) and act in the world. Nana unveiled a nonlinear and idiosyncratic trajectory in her negotiation of multiple academic literacy demands in learning academic skills and socialization into American academic discourse. Bringing her agency, differences in cultural ways of writing, and learning were not obstacles, but rather, were stimulating resources in negotiating her own meaning and inventing a space of becoming. By “selectively assimilating the words of others”
(Bakhtin, 1981, p. 341), Nana’s process of *ideologically becoming multiliterate* suggests an on-going path of “actively choosing [her] orientation” (p. 296), transforming herself and, more importantly, creating a hybrid culture through her actions in the world.

**Identity as a Pedagogical Tool**

The richness of Nana’s experience illustrates the inextricable link between literacy practices and identity negotiation, addressing the significance of college composition in influencing student identity construction. Theoretically grounded in social literacy, academic literacies, and a dynamic view of identity, I argue that reading and writing are not solitary literacy events; rather, that “literacy is essentially social” (Barton & Hamilton, p. 3) through people’s active meaning-making of text in their situated context. As an integral part in learning and performing literacies, identity becomes a pedagogical tool that allows students to be aware of distinct literacy practices across a culture and sub-cultures and to build ownership in their literacies.

This chapter highlighted the identity negotiation of an international student who crossed the cultural boundaries in a multi-country setting, filling a theoretical gap in the academic literacies model. The findings also extend to the identity negotiation of all students who traverse the subcultures of home, school, and communities within each country (Connor, 2008; Flower, 2003; Heath, 1983; Matsuda & Atkinson, 2008). Students are constructors of dynamic sub-cultures using text and talk. They generate a

---

13 Drawing on multiple literacies or multiliteracies, being *multiliterate* refers to the various ways people function in the world and their ability to make meaning utilizing various resources of human life such as language, literacy, and culture. For a heuristic purpose, these terms are used discretely in the manuscript; however, language, literacy, and culture are seen as inextricably linked. The plural nature of meaning in academic literacies is consistent with the notion of multiliteracies (New London Group, 2000).
hybrid culture through their vigorous meaning-making process that motivates them beyond being passive consumers of subcultures and receptive initiators in college academic discourse. Because students participate within and across subcultures in each country, pedagogy that pays close attention to identity positions can be beneficial. Students become keen negotiators of meaning and constructors of situated knowledge by their instructors’ encouragement to draw judiciously on their autobiographic literacy experiences and to negotiate new college literacy demands. In doing so, they augment their awareness of sub-cultural differences and build tactics in managing tension and conflict in everyday literacy practices across sub-cultures. Therefore, learning is not internalizing the given knowledge of academic discourse; rather, it is fundamentally ideological by students’ process of appropriation of their multiple literacies across subcultures. In turn, instructors need to be conscious of the diverse backgrounds students bring with their autobiographical selves.

Students construct their discursive identity through written text; moreover, they perform their identities through dialogic interactions with others in the process of composing and learning. In Nana’s situation, her identity appeared absent, distant, and detached in her text, where I could not determine how she negotiated the relationships between her home and host country’s literacy practices because she deliberately did not portray her contesting position and avoided writing about controversial topics. Instead, her active meaning-making was best illuminated through interviews. Evidence of Nana’s contesting position can shatter the predominant assumption that Asian students’ compliance with textual demands and silent participation in class epitomize their
autonomous acceptance of American academic discourse. It is imperative to consider that students’ use of text and talk portrays their creation of identity positions. Performing literacy and performing identity can function as people’s action for sociocultural change as well, consequently enabling culture and sub-cultures to be dynamic, fluid, and transformational.
CHAPTER 4

Hosoo’s Dialogic Becoming
in Formulating His Authorial Voice and Learning to Write

Introduction

Identification is vital in people’s socialization to a target community. By socialization I am referring to the processes by which people become legitimate members of the community through their acquisition and use of the target language. Current understandings of literacy center particularly on people’s active meaning-making processes within and across particular discourse communities (Heath, 1983; Street, 1984, 2005). The adoption of a critical theoretical stance enables us to reinterpret academic literacy socialization in higher education to better understand how people make meaning in their movement across contexts.

Prior literature on academic literacy socialization often presumes an idealized and equalized community of practice and describes a seemingly seamless transition from the periphery to the center where learners become fully functioning members of the community (e.g., Bartholomae, 2001). However, recent scholars agree that the learning process of becoming an expert within a particular community of discourse cannot be simply assumed as a linear move from the community’s periphery to its center because of unequal power structures, which lead to people’s inevitable identity negotiation (Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Haneda, 2006; Ivanic, 1998; Morita, 2004; Lea & Street, 2000; Street,
In particular, the academic literacies model (Lea & Street, 2000) posits that learning to write is an ideological activity that uncovers the latent power structures and identity issues in literacy socialization. In this model, becoming a legitimate member of a discourse community is a dynamic process. By a dynamic process of literacy socialization, I mean that learners constantly evolve by assimilating, resisting, and appropriating language use in reference to the norms and values of the discourse community and bring possible change to the community. Thus, literacy socialization is not unidirectional but rather a bi-directional process between learners and the community. By unidirectional learning, I put an emphasis on that learners are socialized to the norms and values of the community by acquiring the implicit and explicit rules of their host community. Unidirectional learning can be equivalent with students’ adaptation to the gatekeeping function of the higher education and getting credentials. In bi-directional learning, however, I put an emphasis on that learners are not only socialized into their host community but also bring change to the community through their actions in the world.

Taking a critical stance and countering the traditional notion of literacy as cognitive skills of decoding and encoding (e.g., Olson, 1977), this chapter focuses on an international student who crosses communicative boundaries of nationality and language. Although international undergraduates are uniquely positioned not only to challenge the traditional assumptions about literacy but also to extend current models of academic literacy socialization by their crossing of communicative boundaries, scanty has been examined about their particular literacy experiences from a critical perspective and their own emic perspectives. By extending the academic literacies model (Lea & Street, 2000)
to a transnational setting and tracing an international student’s change in authorial voice, this chapter articulates constructs about ideological literacy not just in theory, but also in empirical practice of learning and pedagogy.

Focusing on the bi-directional learning experience of international undergraduates, this chapter problematizes four traditional assumptions of literacy socialization (Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Haneda, 2006). First, the notion of community is traditionally assumed to be homogeneous. In contrast, this chapter perceives communities as existing in a multilingual setting with multiple sub-communities of different languages and norms. Another assumption is that the culture of a discourse community is stable and determined. In contrast, this chapter conceptualizes culture as dynamic and in flux and ultimately invented by people’s social actions. Third, in traditional literacy socialization research and theories (e.g., Bartholomae, 2001), people move seamlessly and linearly from the community’s periphery to its center, directly assimilating to the dominant discourse. On the contrary, this chapter considers literacy socialization as a negotiation process between the self and community, leading to mutual changes in the self and the community. Fourth, earlier work often fails to consider undergraduate’s contributions as knowledge creators by posing a unidirectional model of learning for comprehension. This chapter, instead, highlights international undergraduates’ critical and creative potential as knowledge creators who bring their own voice to their host community.

Breaking these four assumptions and conceptualizing L2 literacy socialization as ideological, I employ the notion of identification across a transnational setting to examine the shift of an undergraduate’s authorial voice across two course papers. Identification refers to how the case study student, Hosoo, negotiated his institutional identity from his
and others’ perspectives. I trace how Hosoo developed his authorial voice and negotiated his multiple identities in relation to other members of the academic community in which his reading, writing, and learning occurred.

In first language (L1) composition field, a major issue in the presentation of authorial voice is the self in- and out-of-text (Harris, 1995). In comparison, in second language (L2) studies, voice is more complicated because L2 proficiency can be seen as a threshold for the transfer of writing skills across languages in order for authorial voice to be adequately represented. Moreover, the context of L2 learners can vary between English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) setting. The focus of instruction and research has been on cognitive development of L2 proficiency and writing skills. Thus, scarce is reported about how college-level international L2 developmental writers formulate their critical authorial voices in their writing.

In this chapter, I argue that authorial voice is a social construct in which context shifts the identification of a person in relation to other people. This is especially true for incoming international L2 students as they cross communicative boundaries of language and nationality. Because the communicative boundaries across languages and nationalities are larger than those present in a single country, language instruction usually tends to stress on the improvement of language skills. L2 skills become highly important for students to perform well in writing; however, language skills do not provide an

---

1 By authorial voice, I mean the ideational argument of “authorial self” which is a part of the “autobiographical self” (Ivanic, 1998). I assume that the authorial self exists in the text.
understanding of “interpretative frames” (Tannen, 1993) that are inscribed in language use and writing performance in a particular context.

In particular, I examine how Hosoo has undergone the identification process through writing that is represented in his shift of authorial voice in an Inner Circle² setting. I also investigate how this shift is related to his developmental process of reading, writing, and learning from the cognitive toward ideological terrain. By closely analyzing two writing assignments that Hosoo wrote in his first-year composition class and his peer talk, this chapter illustrates how the authorial voice is a social construct situated within the larger ideological literacy socialization processes into the academic discourse community.

To move to ideological terrain of thought, Hosoo’s understanding writing knowledge domains was crucial for him to meet the discourse expectation of American higher education. By tracing the process of Hosoo’s learning to write in two composition classroom and out-of-classroom study group settings, this chapter further clarify the genre knowledge domains that Hosoo needed to write successfully in the widely utilized humanities research papers. As Hosoo found that peer talk in the group study was one of the significant learning moments in his first year in the U.S., I also analyzed eight excerpts of Hosoo’s interactions with his peers from when he was taking ESL and first-year composition.³ To clarify meaning in *situ*, I also used two interviews with Hosoo

---

² Inner Circle refers to countries such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, U.K., and U.S. that employ the English Language as a communicative medium (Kachuru, 1982)
³ Students took the same ESL composition class. In the subsequent quarter, however, based on the time frame student prefer, the students scattered to four sections of the first-year composition. Three TAs out of the four TAs were interviewed. As a continuum of the ESL curriculum, the common thread of the goal of the first-year composition class was to teach analytical skills in writing a research paper. In the peer
regarding his perceived experience of the study group in general and peer review of the study group in particular. In sum, the present chapter traces Hosoo’s identity negotiation and learning experience across contexts of national and classroom boundaries.

**Methodology**

**Research Participants and Context of Learning**

The focus of this chapter is on Hosoo, a 19 year-old Korean student who was in his first year at a Midwestern university in the U.S. during the 2007-2008 academic year. His small-town high school offered intensive writing classes to enhance the chances of admission to top-tier Korean colleges; however, Hosoo did not take these classes because he was preparing to enroll in an American college. Therefore, he received very little writing instruction in his home country prior to his admission to an American college. Hosoo was one of four focal students who were recruited for this study from their ESL class and became regular participants in a weekly study group. The other group members, Quan (a Malaysian transfer student), Ming (a Chinese transfer student), and Sisley (a student from Macao who graduated from high school in New Jersey), also appear in the spoken data corpus.

These four students attended the same ESL class. The goal of the advanced ESL composition curriculum is to teach students how to write “a research paper” (03/08, ESL composition director interview). The course instructor, Eve, particularly aimed to “develop students’ academic writing skills and prepare them for content classes” (03/08, discussion). Hosoo’s two writing samples were chosen from ESL and the first-year composition class. The first one was regarding technology development on mountain climbing and the second one was regarding affirmative action. Because each student chose their own topic, they did not have to share their readings.
interview). The first-year composition class centered around rhetorical analysis of texts. One of the mandatory thematic readings for the course was D’Souza’s (1991) depiction of race issue in American higher education from which Hosoo learned that African Americans receive preferential treatments in admission decisions and scholarship opportunities. Hosoo wrote two papers related to affirmative action. I traced Hosoo’s shift of authorial voice regarding affirmative action across two assignments.

**Data Collection**

I collected the data over a period of twelve-months during the year of 2008. From January to March 2008, I observed Hosoo twenty times in his ESL composition classroom to capture his emic/insider perspective in building the conventions of writing a humanities research paper. From March to May 2008, I observed the four students enrolled in different sections of an inclusive first-year composition class, where Hosoo was also observed six times. The students’ relative marginalization in their first-year composition classes made the study group’s literacy events more cohesive and alive as they actively sought help from each other to improve their writing productions. Group interaction data was audio or video recorded.

The data sources reported here include two samples of Hosoo’s writing in his first-year composition class, the transcripts of peer literacy events during the group

---

4 Data included class observations, study group sessions, three tutorials were audio/video recorded, and field notes. Together with 40 emails, Hosoo’s five writing samples and course syllabi were also collected. Along with email exchanges, a two-hour interview with Eve (ESL instructor) and three one-hour interviews with Dan (first-year composition teacher) were conducted in addition to speaking with them informally to clarify their instructional foci. Hosoo participated in five individual interviews; emails were exchanged to clarify his statements in context.

5 Data regarding Hosoo’s learning across the curriculum was not reported here. Reported here are member-checking data through online communications and interviews till March 2009.

6 “Literacy events” (Heath, 1982) refer to the way of people’s use of reading and writing at a particular context.
session, the transcripts of five interviews, and 40 electronic mail correspondence with Hosoo.

Data Analysis

Intercontextuality as an analytical framework. I used Gee’s (2000) institutional identity, the identity of an international student in the research institution for data analysis. Further, by drawing on the sociological notions of the “claim” and “assignment” of identity (Cornell & Hartman, 2005), I used that these constructs of asserted and assigned identities for analyzing the term “international student” across countries (Table 4.1 [highlighted in grey] & Figure 4.1). In this analysis, intercontextuality means crossing a national boundary. Changes in Hosoo’s authorial voice in two course assignments are explored through his shifts in “footing” (Goffman, 1981) between his asserted and assigned identities. I depict shifts of “footing” through intertextual connections (Leander & Prior, 2004) between text and talk and between texts. Based on this intertextual analysis, the following section underscores how shifts in Hosoo’s identity impacted his authorial voice and his reading, writing, and learning activities.

7 Assertion refers to the process by which a self asserts its own identity, whereas assignment is the process by which others ascribe identity to an individual.
8 In literacy studies, “asserted identity” of self is equivalent to “projected identity” (Lemke, 2003), whereas assigned identity is equivalent to “ascribed identity” which Morita (2004) used to explain the ascribed nature of identity given to Japanese female graduate students from Canadian instructors.
9 Footing refers to “the stance or alignment taken by participants to each other” (Goffman, 1981, p. 128). In this study, footing through assigned versus asserted identities captures the change in relationships of Hosoo to an American audience. Identity is a social construct, where, “in order for an identity to be established, it has to be recognized by others” (Blommaert, 2005, p. 205) and macro social relationships have to be reflected in the text.
Table 4.1: Hosoo’s academic socialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites of Learning</th>
<th>Modes of Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom setting</td>
<td>Monologic coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-classroom setting (e.g., dorm, study group, writing center, and online)</td>
<td>Dialogic collaboration (using speaking and writing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ beginning academic socialization in the American context.

International student in Korea:
Asserted identity as a cosmopolitan

Hosoo’s Identity Negotiation Space

International student in America:
Assigned identity as a foreign minority

Figure 4.1: Identity negotiation space across countries

**Analysis for Hosoo’s building writing knowledge.** With an emphasis on sites of learning across classroom and out of classroom (see Table 4.1 [highlighted in green]), I conducted macro- and micro-level spoken and written discourse analyses to identify the genre knowledge domains Hosoo learned. Through macro-level discourse analysis, I identified primary literacy events, or rich points (Agar, 1996) in Hosoo’s process of
learning knowledge domains indispensable for writing a humanities research paper over time and in multiple settings. First, I focused on the field notes from interviews, observation of oral interactions in the classroom and study group sessions, and electronic-mail correspondence to find genre knowledge domains. Second, I wrote genre knowledge domains at the margins of field notes using open coding. Third, by tracing Hosoo’s research paper, composition processes, I was able to gather the genre knowledge domains that emerged in a chronological order. I subsequently compared the genre knowledge domains to those grounded in prior literature models of writing knowledge at the college level (i.e., Beaufort, 2007; Outcome Statement for First-Year Composition, 2000) which enabled me to identify eight knowledge domains (Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2: Genre knowledge domains based on chronological data collection

Because the categories of initiating declarative, procedural, discourse pattern, rhetorical, and writing process knowledge can also be classified as knowledge in writing skills, I was able to compress eight knowledge domains into four meta-domains: a) writing skills, b) information literacy, c) language use, and c) subject matter knowledge (Figure 4.3).

---

10 Open coding refers to themes that occurred saliently and repeatedly in relation to the research goals.
11 The genre knowledge domains with * can also be categorized as knowledge in writing skills. In the applied linguistic tradition of L2 studies, language use knowledge does not count as a writing skill within the rhetoric and composition focus.
After identifying eight knowledge domains, I conducted micro-level spoken and written data analysis. First, I listened to audio recordings of interviews and spoken interaction to find specific examples of rich points. In fact, I selected three focal literacy events for micro-level group discourse analysis to capture the fine-grained process of how Hosoo learned the eight knowledge domains. The excerpts used in this chapter are taken from a classroom interaction in March 2008 and two study group sessions in February and April 2008. Second, in listening to audio recordings of interviews and spoken interactions, I identified eleven specific segments from interaction data that capture representative examples of critical learning moments for four knowledge domains. The selected eleven segments center on *talk for learning* rather than *talk for communication* (Barnes, 1972).\(^\text{12}\) Third, I developed rough transcripts of

---

\(^{12}\) *Talk for learning* refers to discourse functions such as exploratory, cumulative, and disputational talk (Mercer, 1995). In this study, I also identified informational, interpretative, intertextual, and reflective talk
interview and spoken interaction data. Fourth, using domain analysis (Spradley, 1979), I categorized the eleven segments into four knowledge domains—initiating declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, discourse pattern knowledge, and language use knowledge. Fifth, I developed detailed line-by-line transcripts of these eleven segments (see Appendix H for transcription conventions). Sixth, I found examples of critical learning moments for the remaining other four domains of genre knowledge—information literacy knowledge, subject matter knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, and writing process knowledge—in Hosoo's individual interview scripts and emails, as well as in his writing samples. Lastly, I expanded detailed line-by-line transcripts for selected interview data.

**Discourse analysis of peer talk in the study group.** By tracing Hosoo’s learning across classroom and out-of-classroom settings, this study reveals that dialogic collaboration can be significant in learning (see Table 4.1 [highlighted in yellow]). To investigate how a study group at large or peer review in particular enhanced Hosoo’s writing improvement, I adapted and extended Mercer’s (1995) model of the guided construction of knowledge (Table 4.2). Mercer distinguishes the categories of explanatory, cumulative, and disputational talk by analyzing primary students’ data and emphasizes the importance of explanatory talk in construction of knowledge. Mercer stresses the significance of exploratory talk among three “distinct social mode[s] of thinking” for learning (p. 104). However, Mercer’s data is based on children and elementary school students learning and talking in a particular content area. Therefore, from student interaction, as shown in the excerpts. *Talk for communication* refers to the discourse functions for phatic communication and procedural display (Heath, 1978). Phatic communication is communicative action to manage social relationships such as small talk. Procedural display is viewed as phatic communication in the classroom setting as opposed to substantive engagement.
given that the target population of this study is college students, the kinds of talk that are used in learning may differ. More elaboration on kinds of talk will explicate fully how students create the learning context of peer review. In extending Mercer’s model, I coded data based on analytic induction. The criteria was (a) what kinds of talk students use in a peer review event and (b) what kinds of knowledge students draw from in peer commenting (Figure 4.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mercer's Kinds of Talk</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Elaboration in My Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory talk</td>
<td>Speakers make “statements and suggestions” with justification and alternative hypothesis (Mercer, 1995, p. 104)</td>
<td>Diagnostic talk, Critical talk, Informational talk, Inquisitive talk, Interpretative talk, Intertextual talk, Invitational talk, Private talk, Reflective talk, Suggestive talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative talk</td>
<td>Speakers build common knowledge “by accumulation” such as “repetitions, confirmations and elaborations” (ditto)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputational talk</td>
<td>Speakers make “claims” and “counter-claims,” leading to “individualized decision-making” (ditto)</td>
<td>Resistant talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Mercer’s talk
Using open coding (Emerson et al., 1995), I coded types of talk according to student statements or questions, as shown in Table 4.3. Next, I divided student talk into three categories according to discursive function in the learning process: comprehension and assessment of peer work, and personal involvement to create personal learning opportunities. Table 4.4 displays three categories of discursive function that encompasses specific types of talk. Further, I analyzed each type of talk that students used in the study group, drawing on the four genre knowledge meta-domains that were proposed earlier. These domains of students’ knowledge played the role of a frame of reference as functional resources when students comprehend, assess, and get personally involved in the interaction: writing skills knowledge, information literacy knowledge, language use knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and meta-cognitive knowledge (Figure 4.4). Due to the nature of the learning process in situ where cognitive conflict occurs, I included a
category for meta-cognitive knowledge to which students resorted for their making sense of cognitive conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Talk</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Talk &amp; Frame of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical talk</td>
<td>Speakers make critical evaluative comment on writing.</td>
<td>EXPT 6, line 1</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>Hosoo, you really did not paraphrase much. WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 6, line 6</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>After a topic sentence, you can’t just bring in your sources. WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 10, line 6</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>Try to say “real” and “same” at the same time? Hu:h.↑ LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 11, line 1</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>You {Hosoo} be careful with your sentence structures. ( ) For me, I would never use/LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 11, line 2</td>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>Oh, you can’t write this, “what I am saying is...” LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational talk</td>
<td>Speakers ask explanation of terms.</td>
<td>EXPT 2, line 1</td>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>Hosoo, what is pre: preferential treatment? SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 3, line 3</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>Can I ask you what preferential treatment is? SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 9, line 1</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>U:m I have a question about your paper. Is it like ( ) what was it, a summary or what? WK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Kinds of talk in the study group (continued)
Table 4.3: Kinds of talk in the study group (continuing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic talk</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>EXPT 6, line 5</th>
<th>Sisley</th>
<th>Right now, I think you are more concerned about the number of pages. WK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 6, line 7</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>How can you fit this into six pages? ↑ WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 6, line 11</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>I know students try to fill the number of pages first. You {Hosoo} know what I am saying. WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 7, line 4</td>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>Sometimes Americans don’t understand what we say. LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 7, line 7</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>It’s probably the way you say it. We probably can understand you better because we are all Asian {laugh}, you know, ( ) but, I don’t know. LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitive talk</td>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>EXPT 7, Line 7</td>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>I don’t know why. ↓ MK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretative talk</td>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>EXPT 7, line 1</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>Oh, I think he {Dan} meant that he can’t understand what you are trying to write. WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 7, line 13</td>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>That is, you can’t say something like, “I am going to talk about”, “x is interesting.” You can’t say ( ) something that’s not direct. ( ) You just need to get directly to the point. WK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Kinds of talk in the study group (continued)
Table 4.3: Kinds of talk in the study group (continuing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intertextual talk</th>
<th>Speakers make connection between writing and other text or prior learning-based talk.</th>
<th>EXPT 1, line 6</th>
<th>Hosoo</th>
<th>If so, an interesting part will be deleted. The textbook says personal experience is needed. She {Sisley} followed it. WK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 2, line 10</td>
<td>EXPT 3, line 3</td>
<td>Hosoo</td>
<td>He {Dan} said. He said. [Showing his note] See: //We should write inductively. He {Dan} wrote that. WK But, the instructor says, don’t explain thi: these terms because ( ) he knows everything. WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 3, line 14</td>
<td>EXPT 6, line 1</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>You spoke in our last discussion so I understand that minority means black people. But it is not here. WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 8, line 5</td>
<td>EXPT 9, line 6</td>
<td>Hosoo</td>
<td>As Eve said, you {Hosoo} have to explain your topic sentence more before we get your source\textsuperscript{13} into your paragraph. WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitational talk</td>
<td>Speakers invite others to think together.</td>
<td>EXPT 6, line 1</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>Don’t you {Hyechong} think it is too short? ↑ WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private talk</td>
<td>Speakers do self-directed talk, which may be indication of confusion of knowledge.</td>
<td>EXPT 9, line 6</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>‘But the instructor criticized me when I did not summarize.’ (with a murmuring tone in Korean) MK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective talk</td>
<td>Speakers analyze their writing problem by critiquing others’ writing.</td>
<td>EXPT 3, line 3</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>I didn’t do that either. So: I will probably change it tonight, too. MK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{13} By source, Sisley means citation materials to warrant a claim.
Table 4.3: Kinds of talk in the study group (continuing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of talk</th>
<th>Speakers make counter-claims to others.</th>
<th>EXPT 3, line 7</th>
<th>Sisley</th>
<th>I will DEFINITELY define the terms. WK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestive talk</td>
<td>Speakers identify writing problems and suggest solutions.</td>
<td>EXPT 3, Line 7</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>I mean, if your instructor does not want that much, but write one or two sentences. WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 6, line 6, &amp; line 9</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>You have to explain more, you know. Then you do not have to worry about the number of pages. Try: try. Talk more, then you won’t worry about the number of pages. // Try to explain a little more. Your sentences are too short. WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 10, line 2</td>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>Maybe, equal rights for students.†LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPT 11, line 4</td>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>If you are TALKING, maybe. LK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LK: Language use knowledge, SK: Subject matter knowledge, MK: Meta-cognitive knowledge, WK: Writing skills knowledge.

Table 4.3: Kinds of talk in the study group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive Function</th>
<th>Comprehension Category</th>
<th>Assessment Category</th>
<th>Personal Involvement Category</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinds of talk</td>
<td>Informational talk</td>
<td>Critical talk</td>
<td>Inquisitive talk</td>
<td>Invitational talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretative talk</td>
<td>Diagnostic talk</td>
<td>Private talk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intertextual talk</td>
<td>Resistant talk</td>
<td>Reflective talk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestive talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome</td>
<td>Confirming knowledge</td>
<td>Applying knowledge</td>
<td>Expanding knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Category of talk
Changes from First to Final Papers

*Negotiating Asserted versus Assigned Identities*

Hosoo had multidimensional identities. Hosoo’s institutional identity in the U.S. as an international student was first formulated in Korea. He also maintained his *asserted identity* (i.e., the way a self asserts himself) as a cosmopolitan citizen who exists internationally.\(^\text{14}\) He was first exposed to the term “international student” in preparing for the college entrance to the aforementioned research institution. Hosoo viewed international students as those who are exploring opportunities in the globalized world and are breaking from the geographic boundary of Korea and the typical life trajectory there. However, identity came into contact with other language ideologies\(^\text{15}\) ascribed in his assigned identity as a foreign minority. Hosoo stated:

In Korea, people think that *international students* are those who are from an affluent family or who are a little special. When I was preparing to study in the U.S., I thought in that way, too. However, *regardless of whether it is good or bad*, I’ve got to know during the preparation process that the *university* separates international students on its *website*. I did not know what that means before I came to the U.S. Living in the U.S. has made me rethink what it means to be an international student which is somewhat contrary to the *good* image inscribed in

\(^{\text{14}}\) Hosoo studied abroad to “learn how the sports-marketing system works in other countries” because “professional sports leagues are not really popular in Korea” (02/09/09, email). Hosoo’s *asserted identity* as a cosmopolitan individual was closely aligned with his *designated identity* (Sfard & Prusak, 2005), which is his projected identity in the future as a sports marketing agent who works in a global setting.

\(^{\text{15}}\) Language ideologies are “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979, p.193), which Duranti (2003) terms as a third paradigm in approaching language and culture in the U.S. The third paradigm emphasizes the material context where text is embedded. Blommaert (2005) states that “Ideas themselves do not define ideologies: they need to be inserted in material practices of modulation and reproduction” (p.164).
the term that I formulated back in my home country. (03/17/09, written communication, italics written in English by Hosoo)

A critical moment in Hosoo’s evolution of identity occurred when his study group challenged his use of the definition of minority for African Americans (see Excerpt 3 [p. 146]). Hosoo realized that for others, the institutional identity of an international student denotes both a national identity as a foreigner as well as an institutional identity which affects scholarship and admission opportunities. He further realized that he himself belonged to the category of racial minorities in a U.S. Midwestern institution wherein Caucasians (81 %) are the racial majority.16

In contrast to his already asserted identities as an international cosmopolitan student, there was a distinct gap in his marginalized assigned identity as a foreign minority that he wasn't aware of. Hosoo stated:

In my first assignment, I argued against affirmative action to African Americans. However, Sisley’s comment on my paper that we Asians are also minorities like African Americans was a “wow” moment that led me to an epiphany. I had thought before that international students receive a lot of rather unfavorable (?) treatment. However, I had never thought of it specifically until Sisley mentioned it. I began to think about what unfavorable treatments international students experienced in the U.S. and applied it to my final paper. Her comment helped me a lot in developing my idea about my final paper. (03/17/09, written communication, italics written in English by Hosoo)

16 The research institution website illustrates undergraduate racial data based on 2007 student enrollment. Whereas 81% is Caucasians, 9% is African Americans, and the remaining 10% constitutes other races and those who decided not to declare.
Peer talk about this topic awakened his awareness of the multidimensionality of identity which shifts across time and space through the lens of text in situated lives. This new awareness gave him an opportunity to read both worlds while shifting his footing. The conflicting ideologies between his asserted and assigned identities shifted Hosoo’s footing in his final paper. Hosoo began to see himself through the lens of his assigned identity in the larger social structure beyond his institutional identity and related it to his off-campus experience as a foreign minority in the U.S (see Appendix J: Hosoo’s final writing). Because the term, international student, is viewed differently in American and Korean contexts, Hosoo’s identification of himself in the U.S. gave him an opportunity to redefine himself in a new environment by negotiating how others perceived him. Inspired by Sisley’s comment, he thought of what it means to be an international student and a racial minority:

Take one example: An IS pays a tuition ratio of more than 2.5 times the in state tuition ratio. Out of state domestic students have a lot of scholarship opportunities. International students seem to exist to strengthen school finances.\(^\text{17}\) As another example, wherever you go on campus, many staffs in service are not kind to Asians. Whenever it happened, I questioned how they would have treated me had I looked Caucasian. (03/17/09, written communication, italics written in English by Hosoo)

This awareness of being an international and a racial minority shifted his authorial voice across first and final assignment (Table 4.5). In his first paper which he

\(^{17}\) Sisley, after hearing from her international peers of Business, informed it to the study group members (From my field note in April 2008).
grounded on his asserted identity, Hosoo argued that equal opportunities should be available across races and, as a result, took a position against affirmative action for African Americans. He argued against preferential treatment for African Americans by criticizing the inequality of opportunities for African Americans and international students. However, in his final paper, this time grounded on his assigned identity as a foreign minority, Hosoo took a nuanced position, arguing for the extension of affirmative action to Asians. Realizing that his initial logic about equality in a logical sense would not work within the context of the hegemony of citizenship discourse, Hosoo changed his tactics and advocated extending affirmative action to Asian minorities. Hosoo acknowledged the needs of African American minorities by considering the historical nature of racial discrimination in the U.S. Subsequently, he changed his initial argument about affirmative action based on the realization that he also belonged to a minority population. Peer talk (Excerpt 3) enabled him to bring an additional perspective to his argument and to his own identification in the American academic discourse. In Hosoo’s case, the two papers played the role of identity negotiation across contexts between his asserted and assigned identities. By reading his situated reality, Hosoo’s footing and his authorial voice in his final paper represent how he negotiated his being and becoming into the American academic discourse (Table 4.6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis in First Writing Assignment</th>
<th>Thesis in Final Writing Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Universities should not give an exclusive right to minorities for the fact that they are minorities [as African Americans]. Non-minorities who are qualified should not lose their chance. We should always remember that every student should get the same rights in universities. Universities must think through which way can give real equality.”</td>
<td>“Affirmative action in university means to give preferential treatments to African American students in getting admission or getting scholarship. […] Even though the preferential treatment gives better opportunities to African American, it is not enough to relieve other minority student such as Asian. Many Asians have played a great role in American Society. Some Asians who studied in the United States brought development in every area in American society. Until Asians make the achievements, Asians should put up with a lot of discrimination and prejudice in their life. Even though they should be considered minority in the United States, Americans do not offer preferential treatments to them. Asian students should be able to get advantages from preferential treatment in American universities as minority students.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Thesis statement across writing samples
Table 4.6: Tracing intertextuality in first-year composition class papers

**Phases of Reading: From Finding toward Making Meaning**

Hosoo’s negotiation of his ascribed and assigned identities clarified the idea behind what it means to be an international student and ultimately accelerated his reading,
writing, and learning processes to affect social change. Traditional literacy socialization research focuses on cognitive learning in each discourse community (e.g., Bartholomae, 2001). In Hosoo case, however, due to his evolving identification with his context, his literacy practices shifted from passively finding meaning by comprehending the author toward actively making meaning by incorporating himself into the words and ideas generated by the author. This process evolved from a cognitive comprehension of an English text as a problem solving task to become a critical problem solving and problem posing task, and ultimately, to allow creativity in problem solving (Table 4.7). In this case, critical engagement means both being cognitively analytical in problem solving and being critically conscious in problem posing.¹⁸

The first phase in Hosoo’s reading and writing was reading for comprehension which he accomplished by accumulating information and intertextual links across text and talk. In the assigned reading for his first-year composition class, Hosoo read about affirmative action wherein African Americans are favored for admission into American universities and the reception of scholarship opportunities (D’Souza, 1991). This knowledge led him toward a process of critical reading as analytical reading. In his first paper, Hosoo reacted against what he saw as preferential treatment of African Americans at the expense of international students. Hosoo’s reading was a cognitive act that was not linked with the socio-historical context of racial conflict in the U.S. Rather, his argument was grounded in a logic as a logician’s sense (Odlin, 2002). Hosoo argued: “In

¹⁸ Canagarajah (2002) distinguishes between critical thinking and critical practice. He views analytical thinking as critical thinking, and being critically conscious as critical practice. Citing Atkinson (1997), he further divides critical thinking as culture-specific and culture-universal; however, he did not elaborate on this distinction.
my first writing assignment, I did not think of how Americans treat international students like me. I read D’Souza and wrote about affirmative action” (03/17/09, written communication). Recognizing the fact that preferential treatment is given to African Americans (D’Souza, 1991) lead Hosoo to resist to affirmative action and argued for equal opportunities across race: “What I want to say is that we need to think about the diversity in the universities carefully. If there is a student who wants to study in a university, the student should get the same opportunity, regardless of their race or gender” (Appendix I: First writing assignment).

However, peer talk enabled Hosoo to realize his own institutional identity as a foreign minority. Sisley’s comment directed him toward the process of critical reading as critical consciousness, by which I mean that people realize their being in the world through their relationship with and reaction to power and inequality. According to Freire (2000), critical reading as critical consciousness refers to reflective action, meaning that “[students] are increasingly posed with problems relating to themselves in the world and with the world, will feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge” (p. 81) and taking an action. Hosoo began to see D’Souza’s (1991) text in relation to his assigned identity as a foreign minority, where reading became an active negotiation of textual meaning in context. Reading was not a decontextualized cognitive act of finding meaning but rather a construction of meaning realized through Hosoo’s viewing of himself through the lens of a foreigner and minority. By doing so, he repositioned himself in regard to others and the power-laden world in terms of his race, foreign nationality, and ethnicity. His authorial voice shifted as reading became an act that encompassed something more than comprehension and analytical assessment. Hosoo
said: “I have felt the unfavorable treatment of international students. However, Sisley urged me to think explicitly about the discrimination against international students” which led him “adjust to the U.S. where the social status of international students is different from Korea.” Different contexts enabled him to see the divergent meaning inscribed in international students. Furthermore, social resources such as “peers’ help, instructor’s feedback, and readings” allowed him to “rethink how international students should be treated in the U.S” (03/17/09, written communication, italics written by Hosoo in English).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Paper</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>Final Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reading     | • Critical reading as analytical reading  
             • Critical reading as critical consciousness | Creative reading |
| Knowledge use | Knowledge reproduction | • Knowledge creator  
                  • Knowledge transformation |
| Learning voice | • Informative voice  
                          • Intertextual voice | • Extensive voice  
                                 • Resistant voice  
                                 • Negotiating voice | Persuasive voice |
| Authoring voice | Approximation (Interim stage) | Appropriation |
| Self in the discourse community | Initiation | Conflict in multiple voices  
                                 • (Re)positioning of self  
                                 • Creating an alternative space for social transformation |
Most importantly, as Hosoo explored how to be persuasive in presenting his argument, his reading and thinking became *creative*, allowing him to activate his agency to seek an alternative discourse. After peer talk, Hosoo questioned the unfavorable treatment and discrimination against international students in the U.S. institution. However, in his final writing assignment, he hoped to “create a space where Asians and Americans reciprocally help and interact with each other. [...] In my final writing, I wanted Americans’ attitude toward Asians to be changed. For example, equalizing tuition fees, broadening scholarship opportunities…. Most of all, I wanted my voice to *appeal* to Americans so we construct a mutually beneficial society” (03/17/09, written communication, italics written by Hosoo in English) by “infusing the world with [his] creative presence by means of the transformation (Freire, 2000, p. 98). Hosoo saw the hegemony of citizenship, but at the same time, he was aware that his tentative argument for equal opportunities for international students could face resistance from American citizens which might be similar to his feelings of unease toward the preferential treatment of African Americans (08/05/08, interview). Accordingly, rather than directly confronting his American audience by arguing against affirmative action, Hosoo brought his “tactful [...] creativity” (De Certeau, 1984, p. xiv) by highlighting Asian American contributions to the U.S. and arguing for the extension of affirmative action to include Asian Americans as well. He also introduced globalization as one of the immigrants’ reasons for coming to the U.S. which he discovered during his endeavor to “make this argument strong by talking to my instructor” (03/17/09, written communication), Hosoo identified himself as an Asian foreigner who can be an immigrant and benefit from the discourse of citizenship. In other words, Hosoo tactfully used the notions of globalization and
immigration to persuade his American audience of the benefits of extending affirmative action to Asian Americans, and ultimately positioned international Asians as candidates for inclusion into the category of Asian Americans.

Creative reading is reported to a lesser extent in the literature on international undergraduates’ socialization in Inner Circle settings. Emphasis on academic success inevitably portrays learners with developmental L2 proficiency as struggling to receive a good grade (cf. Leki, 2007). However, in Hosoo’s case, the meaning of D’Souza (1991) words can not only be cognitively found. The meaning of D’Souza words was interpreted in Hosoo’s situated world and socially made by Hosoo’s sensitization to the norms and values of the community which ultimately lead him to aspire for the creation of an alternative discourse. Key for Hosoo in tactfully inventing himself in the U.S. was his self-reflexivity which he achieved by problem posing to his community’s status quo (i.e., contesting the need to extend affirmative action to Asians and international students). That is, the creative potential of people’s use of language (i.e., providing rationale for extending affirmative action to Asians) can add heterogeneity to the community’s discourse without provoking confrontation with others.

Use of Knowledge

Language use is critical for people to build knowledge and to position themselves in the socialization process. Reported less in the traditional model of literacy socialization is the critical and creative resistance of Asian undergraduates’ linguistic action⁹⁹ and its

---

⁹⁹ By the term linguistic action, I mean that language is one of people’s actions that is grounded in the social structure. That is, linguistic action is one of people’s social actions. Language use can “enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society” (van Dijk, 2003, p. 353).
possible impact on the community as popularized by the stereotype of the silent Asian international students. As novices to the academic discourse community in higher education, undergraduates are primarily regarded as consumers and reproducers of given knowledge (e.g., Bartholomae, 2001; Lea, 2005). By consumers of knowledge, I mean that learners comprehend and accumulate pre-existing generalizable theories (i.e. reading for comprehension). Here, theories refer to decontextualized textual knowledge that is detached from reality. By reproducers of knowledge, I mean that learners use theories for comprehension and further apply them to real-life contexts (i.e. critical reading as analytical reading).

In my view, the existence of self-reflexivity (i.e., “reflexive monitoring” of Giddens, 1979/2007, p. 233) distinguishes consumers from reproducers of knowledge. Self-reflexivity entails that the self is incorporated in reading texts and posing problems. That is, knowledge is not a set of decontextualized skills, or a decoding of prescribed words, or a mechanical training for comprehension. Rather, knowledge implies that learners read the lives of others in relation to their own lives by making meaning of text in context. Readers (e.g., Hosoo) do not just master text by finding the author’s (e.g., D’Souza [1991]) intention; rather, readers construct the meaning of texts by incorporating the reader’s intention and applying a text to its situated context. On the other hand, the notion of knowledge reproducers is different from that of knowledge creators because the role of theory is limited to only helping in making sense of the social phenomenon. People do not contribute novel knowledge to the academic discourse community by challenging or extending available theories; people use knowledge for the purpose of reproduction to maintain the status quo and to make sense of their lives in the community.
With the notion of reproducers, the contestation of theories is less underscored and the role of people as agents of social change is not fully emphasized.

However, incoming first-year international learners can read texts with a challenging perspective. Hosoo’s case shows his endeavor to negotiate the tension between his asserted and assigned identity. Hosoo demonstrated how some learners use knowledge for the purpose of resistance. This notion of resistance allows me to assert that people may question any given knowledge and that their distinct voices of heterogeneous knowledge may contribute to social mobility. As an Asian foreigner in a marginalized position, Hosoo formulated his own argument through active individual reflection about his experience and group dialogue, instead of feeling disrupted, incompetent, or paralyzed by the social reality in his situated context. In terms of social consequence, Hosoo’s creation of a critically conscious voice to extend affirmative action to Asians may be a small linguistic action. Yet, Hosoo’s act can be amplified with the chances he created for others to address the same issue through different linguistic actions—an act which may lead to social transformation. In terms of individual consequence, writing opportunities enabled his voice to be legitimately formulated and persuasively presented in an academic way. Further, Hosoo seemed to become a social activist by being aware of unequal opportunities and performing the power of words for producing social transformation. He stated: “Writing is not just about voicing my thoughts [about affirmative action]. I realized that writing is a good starting point to inform others of my cause” (03/17/09, written communication, italics written by Hosoo in English). Even though scanty is known about first-year L2 undergraduate writers, Hosoo,
in this particular instance, illustrated the agent’s creative potential for social change in
terms of the social consequence of literacy education.

**Rethinking Power in Dialogic Becoming**

Central to the notion of consumption of, reproduction, and resistance to given
knowledge is related to how one conceptualizes the notion of power. Power, which
resides wherever human relationships exist, is usually approached in two ways. On the
one hand, power is coercion, dominance, or repression which connotes individual’s
obedience and conformity to the norms set by the more powerful. The hidden assumption
underlying this view is that power is conceptualized as a static product and used to
sustain the status quo. On the other hand, the post-structuralists approach power as a
process exists in tandem with people’s resistance. Foucault (1980) in particular argues
that “there are no relations of power without resistances” (p. 142). Power and resistance,
in my view, are different interpretations of the same social phenomenon that people face.
Power is dynamic, enabling, and in flux, rather than absolute, imposing, and monolithic.
Power is as “process, as transformation, rather than as a static entity” for “the continuing
humanization of men” (Freire, 2000, p.92). People and their situated community
dialectically influence each other, leading to change in people and the community.

With respect to people’s language use, linguistic resistance contrasts linguistic
submission. When people use language as a mode of resistance, they become the creators
and transformers of the given knowledge. When people use of language as mode of
submission, they become consumers and reproducers of the given knowledge. Linguistic
resistance aspires for social change by contesting the current status quo and creating
alternative discourse. Linguistic resistance is significant because it can lead to social
mobility. Freire (2000) emphasized the inseparability of “reflection and action … to transform the world” (p. 87). In the classroom, students’ resistance to dominant discourses is referred to as an underlife (Brooke, 1987; Canagarajah, 1997; Goffman, 1962). However, an underlife is not an explicit resistance that sets up an alternative discourse. Rather, it is a hidden script that sheds light on the subtle resistant position of a critically conscious person. Instead of being marginalized or paralyzed by his status, Hosoo created his space of being through negotiation of self between asserted and assigned identities, active reading, and linguistic action. In other words, Hosoo was actively taking hold of literacy instead of remaining a spectator of or an antagonist to the hegemony of citizenship and racial discernment. As revealed in his words, he wanted to create an alternative space for mutual benefits between Americans and internationals. Hosoo became tactfully creative in addressing his personal issues because he was aware that change in the local environment does not take place without “dialogical action” (Freire, 2000, p. 177) with others. His case illustrates creative resistance in adult literacy socialization.

Tactful creativity in the use of language through reading and writing enables people to find ways “to make and remake, to create and re-create” power in the local community (Freire, 1972, p. 63-64). By rejecting the marginalized position, activating their agency, and setting up alternative discourses to reposition themselves, people create new possibilities for the future. Language use is an ideological act. By being critical aware of their language use, people become dialogical activists rather than passive recipients of knowledge and power. By being aware of and choosing language use, people set up their orientation in the world and alternative discourse. Dialogic interaction
is significant when considering audience as social actors in the local context (e.g., Bahktin, 1981, 1986; Freire, 2000). Power, in Hosoo’s case, is reconceptualized as collaborative with the dialogical action of people for “mutual benefits” in his words. People are in a constant dialogic becoming with changing power relationships.

**Authoring Voice**

Tracing Hosoo’s identification of himself with the community through his own reading and writing activities as well as social interactions (i.e., peers & instructor) illustrates the three phases that learners undergo in ways of reading texts and formulating their own voices. These phases include layers of comprehending, being critical, and being creative. However, they are not necessarily chronological; instead, they can be recursive and overlapping. Hosoo reached comprehensive reading by reading D’Souza (1991), linking texts (e.g., *intertextual voice* such as D’Souza and an instructor’s lecture) and seeking information (e.g., *informative voice* for the definition of minority). Hosoo underwent critical reading by extending, resisting given frames of reference, or negotiating multiple voices of others with learners’ own intent. For example, Hosoo resisted the reality given to him as a minority and became a critical thinker by negotiating the gap between his asserted and assigned identities. He read the world from his own perspective and conceptualized his persuasive voice by extending the notion of Asian Americans to Asians (i.e., *extensive voice*), resisting the social phenomenon of unequal opportunities (i.e., *resistant voice*) and negotiating his asserted identity to an American audience (i.e., *negotiating voice*). Ultimately, Hosoo reached creative reading by formulating a *persuasive voice* for an alternative space.
Hosoo’s case also suggests that learner’s processes of reading texts and voice formulation interact. Attention should be paid to the reflexive voice to make sense of reading and voice formulation. To build a reflexive voice, instructors emphasize active reading where text is interpreted in the context of reader agency. Even at the graduate school level, Persian learners in the U.S. do patchwriting, where learners not only cite source materials legitimately in order to avoid plagiarism but also use them for summarizing rather than developing original arguments (Abasi & Akbari, 2008). From this perspective, reading and writing are just a synthesis of information without the author’s intention which I call approximation in learning. In this chapter, Hosoo absorbed various primary resources (i.e., texts, peers, and instructor’s comments as addressed in his own words) and “appropriated” them with his agency to formulate his original voice (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 62). His authorship was mediated by social forces wherein he built ownership of words and knowledge by appropriating others’ words with his intent (Bakhtin, 1981).

Authorship in an academic discourse community is typically based on other textual authorities through the practice of citation. Moreover, the reader’s/writer’s active meaning-making is achieved by linking the self with context that proves to be vital in the formulation of an original authorial voice. Original voice is rooted in how one uses textual authorities with his own intent and active meaning-making, which distinguishes appropriation from simple approximation of multiple voices. Hosoo’s argument did not just approximate and internalize multiple resource voices; he reaccentuated his voice by appropriating multiple voices from artifacts, social forces, and himself with his own intention. Therefore, meaning is constructed through the active negotiation of the self
with the given words and the world. Through the identification of self in relation to others, 
“[w]hat is given is completely transformed in what is created” for his purpose (Bakhtin, 
1986, p. 119-120), signifies that the reader’s/writer’s distinct meaning is constructed. 
Essential in expressing an original voice is the reaccentuation of the self in relationship 
with others in the community, rather than the synthesis of each others’ texts.

Applying intercontextuality to a transnational setting, I analyzed Hosoo’s identity 
negotiation process in the U.S. context. Hosoo’s evolving stances to the world 
paralleled with his comprehensive, critical, and creative reading. Following Freire (2000) 
and Wertsch (1991), I call Hosoo’s academic socialization process as dialogic becoming. 
In the next section, by tracing Hosoo’s process of learning to write humanities research 
papers for ESL and first-year composition classes, I elaborate the writing knowledge 
domains that Hosoo developed. Building writing knowledge domains was crucial for 
Hosoo to write an academically legitimate text. I present eight knowledge domains that 
Hosoo built.

**Hosoo’s Genre Knowledge Domains**

*Initiating Declarative Knowledge*

Declarative knowledge in research writing refers to the knowledge of 
understanding the metalinguistic terms that are associated with writing a research paper. 
In this chapter, I propose a notion of *initiating declarative knowledge*, i.e., a set of 
knowledge regarding metalinguistic terms that plays a grounding rule for students to 
write a research paper and to participate effectively in the academic discourse community. 
The initiating declarative knowledge is significant for L2 students because it plays the
role of “interpretative frames”\textsuperscript{20} of reference (Tannen, 1993) in the culture of academic writing. The following excerpts illustrate examples of initiating declarative knowledge and how Hosoo, a novice to both academic writing and the research process, constructed his interpretative frames for his research paper. Initiating declarative knowledge includes the understanding of what constitutes an introduction (Excerpt 1), where a thesis is located (Excerpt 2), and if the definition of terms is necessary (Excerpt 3). Essentially, Hosoo’s acquisition and use of metalinguistic terms indicate that building these terms is an initial step to effectively participate in the culture of academic discourse (Excerpt 4). The group interaction data demonstrates specific instances of Hosoo’s initiating declarative knowledge for writing a research paper in addition to his process of learning how to write effectively. The group interaction data clarifies the reasons behind students’ difficulties in learning knowledge domains that are needed in writing.

Excerpt 1 shows Hosoo’s rigid understanding of what counts as an introduction.

In this segment, Hosoo and I critiqued Sisley’s draft regarding extreme sports.

**Excerpt 1. “Introduction should be one paragraph.”**

(2/25/08, 44:20, pair work in study group, translated from Korean by myself)

1 Hyechong How do these two parts seem different?

2 Hosoo The first part is a personal experience. The second part is ( ) an introduction to extreme sports.

3 Hyechong Would it be better to split these into two paragraphs?

\textsuperscript{20} Interpretative frames (Tannen, 1993) describe the fact that people draw on different language- and culture-specific understandings to make sense of what is happening in a context. In this study, interpretative frames are understood to be the baseline knowledge that students draw on to access academic writing in general and research papers specifically.
Hosoo argued that an introduction should be one paragraph (line 4), consisting of a thesis and an example from personal experience. His declarative knowledge was grounded on authoritarian voices of the textbook, the instructor’s guidelines, as well as student samples, where an introduction was always one paragraph in length. As shown in his intertextual talk (“The textbook says…” [line 6]), Hosoo, a novice to the culture of academic writing in a higher education setting, generalized the textbook’s information and the instructor’s lectures into a single set of writing rules that he felt he needed to abide by. It should be noted, however, that this declarative knowledge base of content (i.e., use of personal experience and thesis) and form (i.e., one paragraph in length) as a formula for what counts as an introduction provided him with an interpretative frame which he could follow. Hosoo’s rigid belief system about an introduction illustrates the significant impact of an initial curriculum on L2 students’ conceptualization of research papers.

Excerpt 2 reveals how Hosoo generalizes his declarative knowledge of how to locate an inductive thesis from deductive topic sentences. This example implies that students generalize declarative knowledge into a set of writing conventions.
Excerpt 2. “Induction is more likely in an introduction.”

(4/21/08, 49:32, study group)

1. Quan: Hosoo, What is pre: preferential treatment?
2. Sisley: Is it like ( ) how minorities get into college?↑ And they receive more advantages.
3. Hosoo: Oh yeah.
4. Sisley: And they get into college much easier than those who are not minorities.
6. Ming: I think the last sentence is a topic.
7. Hyechong: Why don’t you put your topic sentence at the beginning of the paragraph?
8. Ming: YA, like, we need a clear clue of what we are going to say.
10. Hosoo: You know what inductive writing is? ↑ [Confident voice]
12. Hosoo: What is opposite to it?
13. Hyechong: = Deductive.
15. Hyechong: Deductive means that the thesis comes first. For inductive writing, the thesis goes at the end.
16. Hosoo: = We should write inductively, right?↑
17. Hyechong: = Deductive.
18. Hosoo: = Deductive.↑ UH.
19. Sisley: Say that again. What is inductive and deductive?↑
20. Hyechong: American writing is deductive. What you want to say should come earlier.
Sisley What you want to say should come earlier.

Hosoo It should be inductive.

Hyechong = No.

Hosoo = Inductive.

Hyechong = No.

Hosoo WHAT. He {Dan} said. He said. [Showing his note] See: //We should write inductively. He {Dan} wrote that.

All [laugh]

Sisley No, no, you were wrong.

Quan This {first paragraph; introduction} is different.

Hyechong = Uh, in terms of the first paragraph, the thesis comes at the end. But usually the topic sentence comes at the beginning of the paragraph.

Sisley = Yeh.

Ming Except the induction part {in the introduction}. ↑

Quan Induction is more likely in an introduction.

In Excerpt 2, Hosoo understands the proper location of an inductive topic sentence in the main body of a text. Ming raised concerns about Hosoo’s inductive topic sentence (line 6), and after deliberating with each other, they eventually concluded that induction is more likely in the introduction (line 33). Hosoo, however, generalized what the course instructor wrote on the blackboard about the location of an inductive thesis (line 26), applying it to the location of the topic sentence in each of his paragraphs. His peers refuted his misconceptualization, explaining that an inductive thesis only applies in an introduction (lines 32 & 33), but Hosoo argued for inductive writing and displayed his notes from a previous classroom session. This excerpt demonstrates that comments by the
course instructor can strongly impact students’ initial declarative knowledge building. Students may absorb new academic language (e.g., induction, thesis statement, topic sentence) and their understanding of this knowledge base becomes an infinitely generalizable rule, making it difficult for them to learn how to write a research paper. Through shared cumulative talk among the group members, Hosoo eventually learned to distinguish locating a thesis statement in an introduction from topic sentences in the main body. The cumulative talk also confirmed and reinforced the other members’ existing declarative knowledge.

Excerpt 3 illustrates how Hosoo learned to define terms in his paper. In his first research paper, “Real Same Rights for Asians,” written during his first-year composition class, Hosoo argued that affirmative action for African Americans violates the notion of equal opportunity. In this excerpt, Hosoo explained his thesis to the study group members and Sisley initiated informative talk about how to define preferential treatment.

**Excerpt 3. “Explain terms.”**

(04/21, 41: 25, study group)

1. Hosoo: So: basically preferential treatment for black people ( ) is not fair.
2. Ming: =is not fair.
3. Sisley: Can I ask you what preferential treatment is?
4. Hosoo: It is like ( ) it helps () minorities ge:t into university easily ( ) or get more advantage or scholarships.
5. Sisley: But I think you have to say this in the paper. Explain the terms. So READERS can understand you.
6. Hosoo: But, the instructor says, don’t explain thi: these terms because ( ) he knows everything.
7. Sisley: I mean, if your instructor does not want that much, but write one or two sentences. I will DEFINITELY define the terms.
Quan: me, too. I will define them because not everyone will know.

Sisley: Cause, like ( ) I can see females, males. But ( ) the whole paper talks about minorities. ( ) So you have to determine the term.

Hosoo: = Yeh.

Ming: I agree it is not clear.

Sisley: You are XXXX. I don’t know if you’re talking about Asians, about blacks, or others? You’re talking about all minorities in general.

Hosoo: =Ya.

Ming: You spoke in our last discussion so I understand that minority means black people. But it is not here.

This excerpt also shows how Hosoo generalized the instructor’s localized comments, and at the same time ignored the larger cultural conventions of a research paper beyond the same localized comments. Hosoo insisted that the instructor did not want terms to be defined in the paper (line 6), but Sisley (line 5) and Quan (line 8) advised him to include the definition of “minority” to help in readers’ comprehension. It was through peer talk that Hosoo became aware of the need to define terms for audience’s comprehension of the subject matter. In a member checking session six months later, Hosoo stated that he learned to express his thoughts “explicitly” in writing for the audience because of Sisley’s comments (12/26/08).

Excerpt 4, which was derived from the final week of the ESL composition class, shows that students need to build a repertoire of metalinguistic terms so they can participate in the academic discourse. Metalinguistic terms refer to academic language that makes up a research paper, such as transition, topic sentence, or connector (line 6).
Excerpt 4. Learning metalinguistic terms

(03/05/08, 1:43, classroom, “all” refers to Hosoo, Ming, and two other students.)

1  Hosoo  First page of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.

2  Ming  Hosoo, YOU need this.

3  All  [laugh]

4  Eve  He {Hosoo} is better at asking questions. He knows what words to use when describing a problem.

5  Hosoo  = Yeah.

6  Eve  When you {Hosoo} were asking me questions, you probably were not sure of what words to use. Transition, topic sentence, or connectors, and words like that. Now you are asking me.

7  Ming  = Oh.

8  Eve  Now he {Hosoo} knows.

9  Ming  = Really.

10  Eve  I was able to follow what he was asking.

11  All  Ah.

12  Eve  You are well prepared.

13  All  [laugh]

14  Hosoo  = That could work. ( ) 뭐라고 하는 거여요?

15  Hyechong  아: 저 선생님이 말하는 거는

meo-ra-ko ha-nun keo-yeo-yo?
‘What did the teacher say?’

‘Ah: What the teacher meant was that you are socialized into academic writing. You are using content knowledge. You know the topic.

16  Eve  = You use the same language like sentences, connectors, connecting paragraphs. You are using those words now, you know.
The use of metalinguistic terms demonstrates students' development of declarative knowledge. Hosoo’s use of metalinguistic terms helped Eve, the instructor, understand the content of his questions, as she noted that he “is better at asking questions. He knows what words to use when he describes a problem” (line 4). During whole classroom activities, Eve sometimes rephrased the students’ questions for clarification because they did not always use metalinguistic terms to make their questions explicit, and also because their oral language proficiency was limited. This excerpt reveals examples of metalinguistic terms that Hosoo was expected to know as a legitimate member of the college academic discourse community. As a result of Hosoo's employment of these terms, Eve comprehended his inquiry (line 10). The first step of being initiated into the discourse of writing an academic research paper is to learn a repertoire of metalinguistic terms for comprehension which provide students with interpretative frames (Tannen, 1993). Furthermore, Hosoo’s use of metalinguistic terms illustrates that he was establishing himself as a legitimate participant in the academic discourse community by broadening his declarative knowledge in writing a research paper.

For true novices to academic writing, nearly all metalinguistic terms are similar yet specialized, such as the terms “topic sentence/thesis statement,” “paraphrase-quote,” “citation/in-text citation,” and “response paper/research paper.” These terms are confusing concepts for novice writers, resulting in a cognitive conflict in their learning process (Rogoff, 1990). In initiating declarative knowledge, the use of metalinguistic terms in particular demonstrates the development of conceptual understanding and distinction among similar terms. That is, Hosoo’s use of metalinguistic terms is a proof that he had comprehended the interpretative frames needed to engage in the genre of a
humanities research paper; however, the learning process was non-linear because it mingled with his process of acquiring declarative knowledge of other components such as introduction (Excerpt 1), thesis location (Excerpt 2), and definitions (Excerpt 3). These four excerpts depict the significance of initiating declarative knowledge in Hosoo’s learning knowledge domains that are necessary for the target genre. However, this does not necessarily mean that he was able to perform this knowledge in his writing. In reality, for this transfer of declarative knowledge to occur in his writing, Hosoo needed to acquire procedural knowledge.

**Procedural Knowledge**

Whereas declarative knowledge is the knowledge of metalinguistic terms associated with writing a research paper, procedural knowledge refers to practical knowledge of how to write a research paper. For Hosoo, the move from declarative to procedural knowledge was facilitated by *artifact mediation* using sample papers (Excerpt 5) and *peer mediation* of talk (Excerpts 6-8) (Lantolf, 2000). In particular, peer talk in the study group helped him meet the page requirement for a course paper (Excerpt 6), write a clear thesis (Excerpt 7), and use parallelism (Excerpt 8). Building procedural knowledge that is mediated by artifacts and peers is a vital step for Hosoo to connect his declarative knowledge in order to participate in the culture of academic writing.

Excerpt 5 depicts the importance of the use of sample papers in building procedural knowledge by reinforcing or filling in gaps in Hosoo’s declarative knowledge. In this segment, Hosoo explains the process of how he wrote his introduction.
Excerpt 5. The need for sample papers

(02/25/08, 1:05, pair work in study group, translated from Korean, underlined words were spoken in English.)

1 Hyechong You did an excellent job.

2 Hosoo This was very hard [laugh]. I can’t find time to pay attention to grammar. I gave up grammar as I had to write fast in order to fill up one page for the introduction. I could not have written more than a half page for the introduction if I had not read the samples. In fact, I wrote my introduction while I looked at the samples in order to identify structure. Uh, how will I write without sample papers if they are not available?

In his writing process, Hosoo recalled the suggestions from a textbook and from class activities of using a question in the first sentence to catch the reader’s attention, using personal experience to increase persuasiveness, and writing a thesis sentence at the end of the introduction. However, because he was still unable to write a one-page introduction using these specific components, Hosoo began to imitate student sample papers “sentence by sentence” in order to extend the length of his introduction.

The use of sample writing is critical to make sense of initial declarative knowledge and transforming it into procedural knowledge. Scanty has been reported about the positive impact of using samples in student learning (cf. Leki, 1995); yet, they may play a significant role in novice writers' learning and development of their own writing strategies.

Excerpt 6 depicts how Hosoo connected a topic sentence and source materials by bridging his declarative knowledge to his procedural knowledge.
Excerpt 6. “How can you fit into six pages?”

(02/25/08, 1:11, study group)

1 Sisley Don’t you {Hyechong} think it is too short? ↑ Hosoo, you really did not paraphrase much. As Eve said, you {Hosoo} have to explain your topic sentence more before you get your source\(^{21}\) into your paragraph.

2 Hosoo Ah:

3 Sisley I didn’t do that either. So: I will probably change it tonight, too. After a topic sentence, you can’t just bring in your sources. You have to explain more, you know. Then you do not have to worry about the number of pages. Try: try. Talk more, then you won’t worry about the number of pages.

4 Hosoo AH: Really [excited].

5 Sisley Right now, I think you are more concerned about the number of pages.

6 Hosoo OH.

7 Sisley How can you fit this into six pages? ↑

8 Hosoo Ya: oh.

9 Sisley Try to explain a little more. Your sentences are too short.

10 Hosoo = I thi:nk so.

11 Sisley You have to work more.// I know students try to fill the number of pages first. You {Hosoo} know what I am saying. If it’s six pages, it is a B.\(^{22}\) Write a lot. Wow.

From Hosoo’s perspective, he followed his declarative knowledge about writing a research paper by stating the topic sentence as his own claim and adding supporting sources to back it up. In addition, Sisley used explanatory talk (“Don’t you {Hyechong}…

\(^{21}\) By source, Sisley means citation materials to warrant a claim.

\(^{22}\) B refers to an academic letter grade.
think it is too short?” [line 1]) and cumulative talk (line 3) to address the need to explain the topic sentence and to fill the page requirement.

From a native/emic point of view, Sisley related to Hosoo’s difficulty in meeting the required number of pages (“I know students try to fill the number of pages first.” [line 11]). More importantly, by playing the role of an audience member, she recognized that Hosoo failed to explain and extend his topic sentence (lines 1 & 3). By doing so, Sisley turned her declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge which benefited both of them, as shown in her reflective talk about reworking her own writing (“I didn’t do that either. So: I will probably change it tonight, too.” [line 3]). From this segment, it can be suggested that reading and analyzing others’ writing may help students embody procedural knowledge and peer talk may create a learning opportunity for both writers and readers. In addition, analyzing sample writing can be an effective pedagogical tool for learning how to write.

Excerpt 7 illustrates how Hosoo implemented procedural knowledge of writing a clear thesis in his paper by eliminating his indirect reporting style.

**Excerpt 7. “You need to go direct to the point.”**

(04/21/08, 38:04, study group)

1  Sisley         Oh, I think he {Dan} meant that he can’t understand what you are trying to write.

2  Quan          Ya: ya. That’s what he basically says.

3  Sisley         It’s probably the way you say it. We probably can understand you better because we are all Asian [laugh], you know, ( )
                   but, I don’t know.

4  Quan          Sometimes Americans don’t understand what we say.

5  Sisley         Yeh.
Hosoo: I am not sure.

Quan: And ( ) this {#4} is like, so (...) I mean ( ) we can’t discuss the reason in general terms (...) I don’t know why.↓

Hosoo: Uh.

Quan: That is, you can’t say something like, “I am going to talk about,” “This essay is about,” or “X is interesting.”

Sisley: WAIT, you can’t say, I am going to:

Quan: talk.

Sisley: talk or else?

Quan: “This essay is about” or “x is interesting.” This is that. The ways you say “take the reader longer to get answers to the questions I asked.” Did you mention that ( ) “so what” is important?// That is, you can’t say something like, “I am going to talk about”, “x is interesting.” You can’t say ( ) something that’s not direct. ( ) You just need to get directly to the point.

Students read Hosoo’s first two-page writing sample and comments from Dan, the course instructor, who stated that “the biggest area of improvement would have to be style. At times, I had to first get the sense of your sentences.” Sisley initiated interpretative talk regarding Dan’s general comments (line 1) on Hosoo’s first sentence, which started with “In Illiberal Education, D’Souza (1991) discusses preferential treatment....” Dan marked the word “discusses” in this sentence, referring to a writing rule convention about getting to the point without using indirect phrases such as “I am going to talk about,” “This essay is about,” or “X is interesting.”

Because Hosoo used the term “discusses” and did not use such indirect phrases, as shown above (line 7), Dan’s comment did not make sense to him. In interpreting Dan’s comments, Quan suggested not to use indirect phrases but instead to “get directly to the
point” of his argument (line 13). In the member checking session, Hosoo reflected that
the instructor may have wanted him to start with his own argument rather than summarize
D’Souza’s (1991) discussion point. This episode recognizes that students may have
difficulty interpreting the instructor’s written comments. In other words, writing a clear
thesis statement required Hosoo to transform initiating declarative knowledge toward
procedural knowledge. It also suggests that for novice writers, peer talk can mediate the
understanding of instructor comments and help identifying students’ specific writing
problems and ways to fix them.

In Excerpt 8, declarative knowledge of parallelism does not always easily transfer
to procedural knowledge in writing.

**Excerpt 8. Use “the same structure.”**

(04/21/08, 56:02, study group, italics added)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hyechong</td>
<td>For example, at first, you said <em>admission</em> and <em>scholarship</em> for a minority. But you did not say them here in parallel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hosoo</td>
<td>A:ll right.//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>For the first sentence, even when spoken aloud, doesn’t make sense, you know. “The preferential treatments on both <em>admission</em> to university and more opportunities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hyechong</td>
<td>= on a <em>scholarship</em> for a minority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ming</td>
<td>Ah, yeah. Eve said that (…) You should ( ) like ( ) the ( ) the same structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sisley</td>
<td>= Ya, actually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hyechong</td>
<td>Americans emphasize parallelism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hosoo</td>
<td>= AH, parallelXXX.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the main body of his writing, Hosoo argued against preferential treatment of African Americans in light of college admission and scholarship opportunities. However, in the conclusion, he only mentioned admissions opportunities.

As shown in Excerpts 6 and 7, knowing the writing conventions and performing them constitute different stages in students’ learning processes. However, peer cumulative talk about his writing not only helped Hosoo identify where he failed to apply the declarative rule but also allowed him to understand why the use of parallelism is important. Moreover, there are clear pedagogical implications to the benefit of peer talk for readers and writers alike. By reading and identifying Hosoo’s misuse of parallelism, the group learned how to apply it in authentic writing.

**Discourse Pattern Knowledge**

The discourse pattern knowledge comprehends the knowledge on both external and internal discourse patterns. The genre of a research paper should have macro moves (e.g., Introduction-Method-Result-Discussion; introduction-main body-conclusion) and micro moves (Swales, 1990) in terms of external discourse pattern. On the other hand, genre also refers to mode-of-text, or the internal discourse pattern (Paltridge, 2002), such as summary, analysis, argument, debate, discussion. Modes-of-text are domains of knowledge students should know in order to produce good writing. Excerpt 9 illustrates Hosoo’s struggle to identify the expected mode-of-text of the assignment

**Excerpt 9. “What was it, summary or what?”**

(04/21/08, 22:53, study group)

1    Sisley     U:m I have a question about your paper. Is it like ( ) what was it, a summary or what?
Through peer talk, Sisley and Hosoo reached a collaborative understanding of the genre expectation of an analytical summary assignment. Sisley asked Hosoo if he needed to summarize the reading (line 5) and he responded that the instructor did not ask for it (line 6). Hosoo was also not clear about the genre of the assignment.

Dan’s response to what he expected from the analytical summary was, "Argument. I emphasize thesis, claims, complicating evidence, and conclusion. I would also suggest that you can't get to the argument portion without analyzing the text in question. I do want the students to work closely with the text" (04/18/08 email, italics added). That is, he wanted an argumentative paper with careful analysis of texts whereby argument, analysis, and summary are all expected parts of the analytical summary assignment. Hosoo’s confusion (line 6) led to his misunderstanding that he did not have to analyze the text source and incorporate it into his writing.

During his first year, Hosoo built an understanding of the genre of a humanities research paper through ESL and first-year composition classes and simultaneously encountered the genre of a lab report in his Plant Biology class. Because he had not
experienced a meta-genre curriculum that helped him become aware of the differences between these two genres of writing, Hosoo was left to make his sense across writing contexts on his own. In particular, he struggled to understand modes-of-text types such as the analytical summary (first assignment) and compare-and-contrast papers (second assignment) from his first-year composition class. This indicates that Hosoo’s struggle to identify the genre of an assignment may be due to differences in instructor’s assumed expectations of mode-of-text types of the assignment and students’ interpretation of them.

*Language Use Knowledge*

Language use knowledge refers to the knowledge of using language legitimately and persuasively. As L2 learners gain knowledge of language and appropriate language use at the same time, their ability to use language in context is critical in building their writing knowledge domains. Excerpt 10 depicts mismatches of semantic priming between “same” and “equal” as translation equivalencies between Korean and English and Excerpt 11 illustrates Hosoo’s learning moment of the gap between spoken and written language use.

**Excerpt 10. Non-native language use**

(04/21/08, 48:00, study group)

1. Sisley  “Real same rights for students.” Hu:h.↑
2. Quan  Maybe, equal rights for students .↑
3. Sisley  Yeh, it will be easier. Uh.
5. Ming  It is Asian style.
Expert 11. “This should be more formal. Right?”

(04/21/08, 43:34, study group)

1 Sisley You {Hosoo} be careful with your sentence structures. ( ) For me, I would never use, like, “what I am saying is ( ) that the money ( ) that is ( ) for students who are not interested in studying can be used for other students who would like to study in the university” HUH [laugh].

2 Quan Oh, you can’t write this, “what I am saying is…”

3 Sisley = Yes, what you say.

4 Quan = If you are TALKING, maybe.

5 Sisley = You can do it for conversation.

6 Ming = This should be more formal, right?

7 Quan = Right, it is not formal. You can’t say “What I am saying is that money…”

8 Sisley Definitely don’t do that again.

9 Hosoo Yah [laugh].

Excerpts 10 and 11 describe how the group figured out how to use a non-native language. In arguing against preferential treatment for African Americans in college admissions and scholarship opportunities, Hosoo chose the title “Real Same Rights for Students” (line 1). Through exploratory talk, Quan suggested the phrase “equal rights for students” to make the meaning accessible (Excerpt 10, line 2). Hosoo seemed to accept Quan’s suggestion (line 9). In fact, in the member checking session, Hosoo reflected that the phrase “Equal Opportunities for Students” actually clarified his thesis and better reflected what he meant, showing his awareness of improved language use (12/26/08).
Excerpt 11 depicts the difference between the spoken and written register of language use in academic writing. Hosoo’s peers made him aware of the different usages of spoken and written language, suggesting that the clause “What I am saying…” (lines 1 & 7) is used in conversational English only (lines 4 through 7). Thus, learning to write a research paper is not limited to the learning of writing skills, but also includes simultaneously expanding one’s vocabulary, speaking skills, and different registers of spoken and written language in use.

Information Literacy Knowledge

Information literacy knowledge is operationally defined as knowledge of locating, evaluating, and using the needed information effectively with the use of internet technology. In addition to the meta-knowledge domains about writing skills illustrated above, Hosoo also needed to build humanities research skills for his ESL research paper on technology and sports and for his first year composition paper about affirmative action. Deciding search terms for his topics, knowing what search engines and specialized databases to use, locating source materials, judging what to read among lists of source materials, evaluating whether to cite source materials, and writing a bibliography are all information literacy domains of knowledge that Hosoo accumulated during his process of learning how to write a research paper. For instance, he practiced locating source materials to support his arguments. In his ESL class, Hosoo learned to find information from web-based sources such as Ask, Britannica, Google, and Wikipedia. In first-year composition, he found academic journal articles by searching JSTOR, a specialized database. Hosoo’s central task was to identify which keywords to look up for the source materials. For example, in first-year composition, he replaced the term “preferential
treatment” with the more general term “affirmative action.” Hosoo also added the search terms “racial discrimination” to find “an example of racial discrimination in America” related to affirmative action (11/19/08, email) and “globalization” for information on international students’ migration to the U.S. Next, he reviewed journal articles for particular information, “trying to find examples [that fit] the assignment and only then would he begin to read the articles” (11/19/08, email). In citing source materials, Hosoo presented his bibliography in APA or MLA style that he learned in class. As part of the information literacy domain, such research skills were needed for Hosoo to learn how to write a humanities research paper.

Subject Matter Knowledge

Subject matter knowledge refers to content knowledge of a specific topic and is related to the information literacy knowledge domain. Hosoo increased his subject matter knowledge through peer talk about ideas such as the definition of minority (Excerpt 3), which enabled him to make a more compelling argument in his final first-year composition paper. Accumulated subject matter knowledge about affirmative action, racial discrimination, and globalization was “helpful for [Hosoo] to make [his] thoughts strong” (11/01/08, email), indicating that the practice of citation was valuable for him. Namely, Hosoo developed a strong authorial voice through increased subject matter knowledge that allowed him to gain better understanding of the topic (08/05/08, interview).

Rhetorical Knowledge

Rhetorical knowledge refers to concepts of persuasion, such as the rhetorical triangle—text, audience, and writer. According to Hosoo, the study group session in
April and his interaction with Dan were two critical incidents in his path of learning how to write a research paper during his first year. For him, “[p]eer comments made me wonder whether I am a good writer” (08/05/08, interview). Although Hosoo received no other detailed feedback aside from what this study group session provided, learning about his writing problems from multiple voices was a unique opportunity for him, which made him more aware of his audience (12/26/08, interview). For instance, his peers encouraged him to define the term “minority” for the audience (Excerpt 3); yet, Hosoo understood that the instructor did not require one. Rather than comparing the non-equivalent terms “African Americans” (“black people”), as race focused in Hosoo’s term [line 1 in Excerpt 3]) and “international students” (non-citizens) as he did in his first assignment, Hosoo used the racially equivalent terms” African Americans” and “Asians” to address particular issues he faced as an Asian international student (Table 4.6). Hosoo explained his growing sense of audience awareness as such:

If I argued for a scholarship opportunity for international students, Americans may feel infringed. Neither will be effective to Americans if I only seek to extend a preferential treatment to Asians. Thus, I explained how Asians have contributed to the American society [in my final writing]. (08/08, interview)

Table 4.6 illustrates Hosoo’s intertextuality through time in writing his research paper. The purpose of his writing remained the same in his first and final versions of his paper – to raise the issue of unequal opportunity across races from the viewpoint of an international Asian student. However, given his American audience, his authorial voice shifted from arguing against affirmative action for African Americans to extending affirmative action to all racial minorities including Asians in his final version. In trying to
persuade an American audience to extend affirmative action to Asians, including Asian international students, Hosoo warranted his argument with a compelling example that international students pay three times\(^{23}\) the tuition of American students at his university, even though African Americans easily receive preferential treatment for scholarships (D’Souza, 1991). In light of the rhetorical knowledge domain, Hosoo’s emerging explicit audience awareness helped his argument become more persuasive and sophisticated in the final draft.

**Writing Process Knowledge**

The writing process refers to the recursive steps of writing from idea formulation to publication. The ESL instructor provided a step-by-step guidance in teaching students how to write a research paper. Hosoo learned to make a rough outline, brainstorm in a group to explore a topic, find sources and incorporate them into his outline, learn APA style, and understand editing practices. After ESL class, Hosoo “began to write a thesis and at least several central ideas to support a thesis on a paper” (12/26/08, interview). For Hosoo, the pre-writing outline became a knowledge domain that he transferred to his subsequent composition class. In addition, the biggest change in his writing process came from the social domain. He reports:

> During ESL, I asked my American roommate to proofread my work. Then I participated in the study group and got helped. While I got small help from my roommate, Dan [first-year composition instructor] gave me a big help to broaden my narrow perspective on the minority issue. Tutors at the writing center were

---

\(^{23}\) Unlike Hosoo’s claim, the research institution website states that international undergraduates ($21,918) pay 2.53 times the tuition of in-state residents in the U.S. ($8,679) for the academic year of 2008-2009.
also a little helpful … but I learned that I have to see a course instructor for content at 360 and 367. (12/26/08, interview, italics added)

Hosoo’s individual pre-writing activity of making an outline and post-writing activities of using social resources such as instructors, peers, and tutors to improve his language and content became routine for him.

**Genre Knowledge Domains for Writing a Humanities Paper**

I identified four meta-domains of genre knowledge (Figure 4.3) that Hosoo developed during his process of learning to write humanities research papers through his collaboration with others and his own meaning-making process. In this section, I discuss the significance of explicating genre knowledge domains in terms of broadening our current understanding on writing knowledge domains and the process of undergraduates’ learning to write. First, discourse analysis of the study group’s interactions revealed that learning knowledge of writing conventions involves moving from initiating declarative knowledge to embodying procedural knowledge of writing. An explanation of both types of knowledge domains is significant for students, especially for L2 novice writers, because these knowledge domains provide interpretative frames (Tannen, 1993) for them to access the cultural expectations of the academic discourse. If students do not acquire this knowledge in composition class, they might struggle later in their content classes because they do not understand the writing prompts and hidden assumptions in those classes. Furthermore, the study group’s exchanges of talk indicate that declarative knowledge alone is not enough for students to perform as writers. Rather, how the declarative knowledge is applied in the context of writing enables them to judge and discern metalinguistic terms and their understanding of writing conventions in context.
That is, providing pedagogical opportunities to practice procedural knowledge can be a helpful step for novice writers like Hosoo.

Secondly, my findings suggest the need for revisions of prior models of writing knowledge domains (e.g., Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition, 2000; Beaufort, 2004, 2007) by underscoring the social nature of the writing process. Tracing Hosoo’s learning to write portrays the process of writing, defined as “writing exploration and expansion” (Leki, 2007, p. 284), as occurring not only individually, but also collaboratively. The common assumption that underlie in prior models is that students write on their own. However, critical incidents in Hosoo’s learning occurred in his social interaction with his peers and his first-year instructor, as illustrated from his self-reflections and study group interactions.

In addition, the writing process is traditionally thought of as a series of revisions of an individual activity which includes pre-writing and post-writing. Hosoo, however, substantially engaged in writing practices and improved his language use through dialogic thinking with others, which accelerated his learning and writing outcomes. For instance, the instructor did not understand Hosoo’s thesis, but his peers recognized that the confusion stemmed from his misconceptualization of the term “minority” as exclusive to African Americans. As a result, Hosoo followed his instructor's advice and eventually changed his thesis, which broadened his knowledge of the topic, to “affirmative action” and “transnationalization.” Social interaction using exploratory, cumulative, disputational talk (Mercer, 1995) as well as informative, interpretative, intertextual, and reflective talk that I found in students’ collaboration considerably helped the group engage in writing content and form (see Table 4.3 for details). Indeed, the social aspect of the writing
process is significant in students’ learning to write, possibly more so than is currently known.

Third, information literacy would be an important domain of knowledge that is not addressed in the Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (2000) or by Beaufort (2004, 2007). Information literacy knowledge, which is necessary in the humanities to formulate and warrant a claim with citations, should be emphasized as an individual domain of writing knowledge. In addition to gaining writing skills, Hosoo had to acquire knowledge about information literacy through humanities ways of conducting research. In his ESL class, Hosoo cited source materials as a rule of convention. However, in the subsequent first-year composition class, he expanded his thoughts and made them more sophisticated through reading the source materials. In particular, Hosoo initially quoted citation materials to demonstrate his reading. More importantly, as his thoughts evolved, he drew on his knowledge on minorities and his viewpoint about the preferential treatment of African Americans changed to affirmative action. Through dialogical thinking with the text and his peers, Hosoo’s scholarly self evolved as he began to use citation materials to clarify, elaborate, and expand his narrow definition and scope of the concept of “minority.” That is, Hosoo was becoming an independent thinker through his active meaning-making process by adding his “intention” to prior literature on issues of preferential treatment and transnationalization (Bakhtin, 1981). The practice of citation helped Hosoo realize that “there is no right and wrong answer in argument. I do not have to agree with the course instructor. How to back up my opinion becomes more important in the composition classes” (12/26/08, interview).
Dialogic thinking with text (i.e., artifact mediation) and others (i.e., social mediation) can be as significant as the technical aspect of the practice of citation. Citation is important to support a claim but it is the student’s responsibility to be meta-cognitively aware of the different traditions in epistemology and research methods across courses (i.e., self mediation). As such, research methods in the humanities, categorized as information literacy in this study, should be emphasized in the process of learning to write a humanities research paper. However, the nature of knowledge varies across disciplines (Carter, 2007) and corresponding research methods also differ, meaning that inquiry skills based on humanities epistemology are not necessarily transferable to other disciplines.

Finally, the knowledge of language use and discourse patterns is essential for students like Hosoo to expand their context of learning. In the past two models language use knowledge was not specifically addressed, whereas discourse patterns was specified in Beaufort (2004, 2007) as genre knowledge. Both domains of knowledge are vital for L2 writers who need to acquire language knowledge and language use in context at the same time, as they do not have the common ground knowledge in writing and language of the L1 population.

In this section, I traced the process of Hosoo’s building writing knowledge domains. While proposing a genre knowledge model (Figure 4.3), I identified three categories of Lantolf’s (2000) mediation in Hosoo’s learning process and his authorial voice formulation: social mediation, self mediation, and artifact mediation. By social mediation, I refer to Hosoo’s instructor mediation through his reflection and Hosoo’s peer mediation. By self mediation, I refer to Hosoo’s own meaning-making which he acquired
by linking the word in text and the world in Freirian sense (2000). By *artifact mediation*, I refer to textbook and journal article reading which helped Hosoo’s learning process and formulation of a voice. As part of social mediation, the mediation of international students’ group support was critical for Hosoo’s academic socialization. This mediation happened by learning the rules of writing through peer voices, and by identification of the institutional identity of international students through sharing their own life experiences (03/17/09, member checking). In the following section, I further analyze why peer mediation helped Hosoo and other study group member’s learning to write. I examine students’ language-in-use through discursive function and knowledge domains, reporting how students co-construct the context of peer review by comprehending, assessing others’ work, and further making their own learning opportunities.

**Peer Talk in Learning to Write**

*Role of Talk in Peer Review*

Analyzing discursive function of peer review shows that students engage in three primary categories of talk. The context of peer review sessions allows for students’ comprehending and assessing Hosoo’s writing, while simultaneously creating their own learning opportunities that come through playing the role of audience (Figure 5.5). The first category, *comprehension*, includes informational talk, intertextual talk, and interpretative talk. *Informational talk* includes the explanation of specific terminology (see Table 4.4 for the category of talk). In one example, Sisley’s question on the definition of “minority” led to the students’ cumulative talk regarding who counts as a minority in the U.S. (Excerpt 3). Students’ use of informative talk allows them to access
disciplinary knowledge through the employment of academic terms. Whereas informational talk is used to define terms, students frequently use *intertextual talk* across classroom lecture, Hosoo’s writing, and peer talk. Intertextual talk allows students to strengthen their knowledge base at large and procedural knowledge in particular by bringing together disparate sources such as lectures, reading and writing texts, and taking part in peer talk. The significance of intertextual talk in learning is that students seem to strengthen their knowledge base by linking their learning across sites. Students, including Hosoo, also use *interpretative talk* to understand the written comments of Hosoo’s instructor. Despite Hosoo’s instructor’s endeavor to provide feedback, the examples of interpretative talk show that there would be a possibility that students struggle to make sense of instructor’ written comments (Excerpt 7).

![Diagram of peer review session](image)

**Figure 4.5: Modeling peer review session**

Along with their effort to comprehend Hosoo’s text, students also engaged in the assessment of Hosoo’s writing, using diagnostic talk, critical talk, suggestive talk, and resistant talk. *Diagnostic talk* refers to students’ identification of what they assess to be
Hosoo’s writing problems. Students identified Hosoo’s linguistic problems, while gently observing that Americans don’t understand non-native speakers’ ways of expression. Diagnostic talk is noteworthy because it comes from students’ emic perspective, which helped Sisley, for example, to identify that Hosoo struggled to fill the page requirement, a students’ common problem. Students used critical talk to more directly evaluate and criticize Hosoo’s writing problems. As a result, Hosoo was informed of his weaknesses of which he was unaware, as shown in the example where he uses topic sentences at the end of each paragraph (Excerpt 2). Students not only diagnosed or critically evaluated Hosoo’s writing, but also they provided alternative suggestions for its improvement.

Areas of suggestive talk included language use knowledge (Excerpts 10 & 11) and writing skills knowledge, such as Hosoo’s need to elaborate a topic sentence (Excerpt 6). During the assessment process, students used resistant talk when their knowledge base was different. As shown in the debate on the use of definitions, Hosoo advocated that a definition is not necessary, a position based on his declarative knowledge; however, Sisley used resistant talk (“I will DEFINITELY define the terms” in Excerpt 3) based on her writing knowledge, whereas she used suggestive talk that Hosoo needed to negotiate the instructor’s instructions of not using definitions with the common knowledge that definitions are needed (Expert 3).

Students’ talk is primarily associated with their linguistic acts of comprehension and assessment. On the other hand, students also engaged in their own processes of learning by playing the role of audience. For example, Quan spoke in the mode of inquisitive talk (“I don’t know why” in Excerpt 7) in order to make sense of Hosoo’s teacher’s comment about the misuse of indirect phrases, making the peer review a
learning opportunity for him as well. It is also noteworthy to see that Hosoo used *private talk* (“But the instructor criticized me when I did not summarize” in Excerpt 9) in a murmuring tone of Korean when his knowledge base about what counts as summary conflicted with the assessment of his instructor. As Lantolf (2000) notes, capturing adult’s private talk in a public setting is hard because adults tend to use inner speech for themselves and public speech for communicating with others. Whereas the course instructor explained that analytical summary is not a summary but analysis-centered writing, Hosoo, being a novice of the American academic culture of writing, had a cognitive conflict between no summary and textually-warranted writing requirement in college. In addition to inquisitive and private talk, students used *reflective talk* to take advantage of opportunities for critique and transform them into learning opportunities. I use the term reflective talk to show how students experience epiphanies about writing through playing the role of audience, as shown by the example of Sisley (“I didn’t do that either. So: I will probably change it tonight, too” in Excerpt 6).

The analysis of discursive functions of peer review shows that the students engaged substantively in the peer review sessions to make sense of Hosoo’s text by verbally *confirming* (i.e. “comprehending” peer writing), *applying* (i.e., “assessing” peer writing), and *expanding* their own knowledge base (i.e., “personal involvement in learning”) through sharing input (Figure 5.5). By engaging in this process, participants may have complemented their own knowledge gaps. Playing the role of audience provided affordance for students to improve their own writing. This important finding that switching roles between the writer (i.e., Hosoo) and the reader (i.e., three students) provided mutual benefit aligns with the theory of dialogism and reciprocity of interaction.
In addition to discursive functions of talk, it should also be emphasized that when students commented on Hosoo’s writing, their talk is not from a blank slate; rather, their talk drew on the meta-domains of the genre knowledge: writing skills, information literacy, language use, and subject matter knowledge. I also identified that students draw on meta-cognitive knowledge when they were not sure of their knowledge base.

First, students’ talk drew on writing skills knowledge\(^{24}\) in terms of the format and content of Hosoo’s writing. On the one hand, students commented on the format, including page number requirements (Excerpt 6), or the proper location of a thesis and a topic sentence (Excerpt 2). More specifically, students’ discussion of a thesis statement or a topic sentence shows that generalization can be one of the students’ learning difficulties in regard to writing. On the other hand, moving beyond the format, students also commented on content of Hosoo’s writing such as the need for a definition of a term (Excerpt 3) or paraphrasing a topic sentence before moving to citation to support the topic sentence (“You have to explain more” in Excerpt 6).

Secondly, students’ talk drew on information literacy knowledge. Sisley’s use of intertextual talk that a topic sentence or a claim should be warranted with source materials (“explain your topic sentence more before [you] get your source” in Excerpt 6) illustrates that students may be aware of the significance of evidentiary warrants using citations for humanities writing.

\(^{24}\) Because the cited data corpus is focused, I used an analysis frame of the format and content. However, with fuller excerpts, writing skills knowledge can be sub-categorized into five sections: initiating declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, discourse pattern knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, and writing process knowledge (Figure 4.3).
Third, students’ talk drew on their *language use knowledge*. Being non-native speakers of English themselves, students worked together to find Hosoo’s grammar errors. However, it is notable that students’ discussion of Hosoo’s language use encompassed not only grammar and sentence structure, but also the context of language use such as register (i.e., separating oral language and written language [Expert 11]). Students employed their language use knowledge to communicate meaning appropriately, rather than limiting themselves solely to the rules of grammar.

Fourth, students also accessed *subject matter knowledge* in their talk. For instance, Sisley questioned Hosoo’s understanding of minority (Expert 3), revealing that Hosoo had limited understanding on who counts as a minority population in the U.S. The use of specialized terms seems to reflect students’ access to subjects or disciplinary discourses in higher education.

In addition to four genre knowledge meta-domains that are proposed, what makes peer review unique is that students also drew *meta-cognitive knowledge* to make sense of meaning through inquisitive talk, private talk, and reflective talk. Meta-cognitive knowledge reflects that these students are novices who are in the learning phase, which will be eventually categorized into stable four meta-domains of knowledge.

The findings of this chapter, which I achieved by analyzing peer review sessions according to discursive functions and genre knowledge domains, enable an expanded theoretical understanding of how the *context* of peer review is co-constructed by student *talk* (Goodwin & Duranti, 1992). Peer review becomes a space of learning opportunity where students play reciprocal roles of writers and readers/audience and engage in dialogic thinking, resulting in mutual benefit. This chapter also extends the area of peer
review inquiry to an informal learning site, which is significant because the current theoretical emphasis in out-of-school learning opportunities. The explication of kinds of talk in this analysis informs us about how students engage in peer review, offering pedagogical insight into how to guide peer review sessions.

**Role of Talk as Social Mediation in Hosoo’s Learning to Write**

As mentioned earlier, I identify three categories of Lantolf’s (2000) mediation in Hosoo’s learning process and authorial voice formulation: self mediation, artifact mediation, and social mediation. Learning was not only mediated by the self (e.g., private talk) but also through artifacts such as textbooks and journal articles; indeed, as shown in the interview data, reading and citing outside materials allowed Hosoo to sharpen his thought. However, Hosoo’s evolving thought inevitably reflected the voices of others over a two-quarter period in his process of learning to write. Hosoo’s process of composition over time demonstrated that social scaffolding for entering the academic discourse community came not only from an instructor-expert dyad, but also from ESL peer scaffolding which served as a mediator for his awareness of the status of international students as part of minority groups.

Hosoo recalled that his peers’ “criticism” was a critical incident for him, which led him to question his writing competency. The honest assessment from his ESL peers enabled him to realize that “I may not have known my writing problems if they did not point them out” (08/05/08, interview). Though Hosoo originally mistook feedback for criticism, he gradually acknowledged that the constructive feedback given by his ESL peers was a central learning opportunity for him. In the final member-checking session just before Hosoo left the research institution, he reflected that the peer talk in the study
group taught him how to discuss the rationale or justification of choices that are generalizable to other learning contexts (03/17/09). In other words, the learning opportunities in a study group serve as a buffering zone because “students struggle to engage in the unfamiliar discourses or literacy practices of the academy, always feeling excluded and on the margins” (Lea, 2005, p. 184). The critical learning/growth point took place not when Hosoo received written feedback from his instructor, but when he attempted to decipher that feedback through dialogue with his peers. Dialogic thinking through shared dialogue enabled Hosoo not only to interpret his course instructor’s comments but also to identify his problems from emic point of view. By extension, he could transfer his declarative knowledge of writing into procedural knowledge (e.g., defining terms and deductive topic sentences in Hosoo’s final piece of writing).

**Pedagogical Values of Peer Talk**

This study demonstrates how peer talk, through dialogic participation, can be important in building the genre knowledge domains regarding how to write a research paper. Specifically, analysis of student talk in terms of discursive function and knowledge resources illustrates, from one perspective, how kinds of talk mediate knowledge co-construction regarding writing, and from another perspective, how students construct the context of peer review. From the knowledge gained from this chapter, composition instructors could consider multiple peer voices as a pedagogical tool using following fifth principles.

First, in contrast to a display of talk, authentic peer talk can help solve a task in an informal environment. Prior studies on L2 peer talk largely reveal that group interaction enables students to accomplish class goals which were impossible for
individual students to reach alone (e.g. Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; de Guerrero & Vilamil, 2000; DiCamilla & Anton, 1997; Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2001). The findings of this study confirm the effectiveness of peer talk in performing a task, as shown in asking authentic questions (Nystrand, 1997) and giving authentic comments, an exchange which enables students, in turn, to co-construct knowledge in peer review. There are several factors that contributed to the authenticity of a peer review setting. All the members of the study group being studied were forced to use of English to solve task for practical reasons, because the group was composed of four students of different nationalities and first languages. They used English, rather than clustering around their L1-group friends in the ESL classroom or being reluctant to participate in the first-year composition classroom. It should also be noted that the small number of students prompted everyone to participate in the group discussions. Finally, this group work happened in an informal setting where student interaction became authentic (Mori, 2002). Students participated verbally in the group work in order to gain the benefit of sharing peer feedback. The context they created in the informal setting by active use of language clearly contrasts their classroom setting.

Second, peer talk enables learners to create a group Zone of Proximal Development (Wenger et al., 2002), where all members contribute and benefit from mutual growth. Because collaboration is a form of group interaction, these students became involved in dialogic thinking by sharing their distributed expertise, integrating their different or complementary perspectives, and creating their own individual knowledge by getting involved in a community endeavor of knowledge construction. They shared knowledge and ways of reasoning by using different kinds of talk, formulating a space of group ZPD, which resulted in the fulfillment of their needs and
their collective growth in building their writing expertise. In the dyadic interaction between Sisley and Hosoo as well as the interaction among Quan, Ming, Sisley, and Hosoo, each student brought different contributions to ameliorate Hosoo’s writing. Even though a gap existed in their language and writing proficiency, everybody, even Sisley, who was the most proficient of them all, felt that they profited from this interaction (e.g., Ohta, cited in Lantolf, 2000).

Third, peer talk is able to provide support for individuals’ learning difficulties from an emic perspective. For instance, Sisley’s student *emic* perspective, unlike the instructor-expert’s input, allowed her to identify Hosoo’s struggle to meet the page requirements (Excerpt 6). Sisley also problematized Hosoo’s limited understanding of the concept of minority (Excerpt 3), an area that Hosoo’s mainstream instructor was not able to identify. However, in addition to peer review, it should be noted that these students highly valued their instructor feedback as well.

Fourth, this study confirms that role-playing between writers and audience can be mutually beneficial for writing improvement. Although the effect of peer review in the composition class is still a controversial topic (see Paulson et al., 2007), by playing the role of an audience that analyzes and critiques their peers’ work, students can improve their own writing by validating and verbalizing their implicit knowledge, transforming it into *robust knowledge* in context. In the study group, novice ESL writers performed successfully in their roles as readers, audience members, and critics. More importantly, students ultimately may have become more aware of their own writing problems by analyzing Hosoo’s writing. This study demonstrated, to some extent, that the social function of inquisitive, private, and reflective talk in the category of personal
involvement can be a sign of how students construct learning. For example, Sisley’s reflective talk (Excerpt 6) demonstrated that the practice of taking a reader’s role can be crucial for helping students develop as writers. This finding can justify the importance and effectiveness of an audience’s role in promoting a students’ own writing improvement. Furthermore, intertextual talk from an audience perspective can underscore the effectiveness of taking the audience role for applying their declarative knowledge to procedural knowledge (e.g., Ming’s intertextual talk how to use parallelism by linking an instructor’s lecture and Hosoo’s writing performance [Excerpt 8, line 5]).

Fifth, to increase learning opportunities, peer review in the classroom can be expanded to out-of-classroom settings like electronic course bulletins and writing centers. Peer feedback can be rendered effective and efficient if instructors provide students with specific guidelines for discussion. Given the characteristics of each context, instructors may construct their own guiding questions using the three discursive function categories of peer review that are posed in this study. Instructors may also encourage students to write reflective journals regarding what they learn from giving and receiving peer feedback in order to take advantage of peer talk.

On the other hand, caution should be paid that the effect of this peer group interaction may not be generalizable to other classroom situation. These students’ micro peer talk activities were solidified through their self identification as a group of non-native English-speakers and Asians (i.e., use of “we” versus “Americans”) over time. During the first three weeks, students hesitated in sharing their grammar error-ridden writing until the Hosoo-Sisley dyad underwent a successful scaffolding experience, where both students perceived that they benefited from the interaction. After the incident,
these two students started leading the study group and promoting active participation among their peers. Sisley also received an A grade on the paper she had presented to the group, creating a snowball phenomenon as other group members wanted to receive peer feedback for their own benefit.

This finding implies that a non-evaluative affect zone may be an important space for the creation of a constructive feedback zone that enables students’ active participation in a peer review activity. In order to create a non-evaluative affect zone, a small group with comforting human relations[^25] should be encouraged in classroom, out of classroom, and online learning sites so that students don’t have to hide themselves from frequent dialogic participation.

By tracing the process of Hosoo’s learning to write in general and by analyzing spoken discourse in peer review, I demonstrated how learning to write is both individual endeavors and collaborative acts. Social mediation was pivotal not only for Hosoo’s learning to write but also to formulate his authorial voice regarding affirmative action.

**Concluding Remarks**

Chapter 4 contributes to the understanding of literacy socialization in three primary ways. First, this chapter clarifies how L2 literacy practices are inexorably linked with identification in the situated world, and ultimately deconstructs the power-laden term “international student” across Korea and the U.S. This chapter illustrates the identification of a social construct in tracing how an international freshman negotiates the gap between his asserted and assigned identities. As an international student, Hosoo

[^25]: Gee (1998) provided an analytical frame to analyze student discourse. He provides the linkage of *human relations* in the micro talk and macro social structure where micro talk is embedded.
negotiated identities through writing assignments, which allowed him to envision himself in his situated world. Writing is a matter of enacting identities through engaging in discursive tensions and creating a social space of transformation. Micro text and language use intersect with macro features of social, historical, and institutional contexts. The academic socialization process to learn academic literacies and locate one’s self in the local community is a game of knowing and participating in the textual, social, and political discourses of the community effectively and legitimately. Hosoo stated his identification:

Identification decided the direction of my reading and my argument in writing. In my first writing assignment, I argued against the exclusive preferential treatment to African Americans. I argued for equal treatment to African Americans, Caucasians, and Asians. Once I realized that I am a minority, however, I saw the same phenomenon from the other side. My argument became a little different in the final writing assignment. (03/17/09, written communication, italics written by Hosoo in English)

The socialization process to the U.S. leads to a person’s “change in ways of thinking, using language, and envisioning the self” (Casanave, 2002, p. 36, italics mine), as demonstrated in Hosoo’s reading, writing, thinking, and negotiation process, and a further possible desire to change in the community. As the multiple discourses of languages, nationality, and identities overlap, disrupt, or contradict one another, identification is more than “smoothing over the tensions” in the critical negotiation of a “process of translation and rearticulation, a rewriting or reinscribing” (West & Olson, 1999, cited in Bryant, 2005, p. 95) between asserted and assigned identities.
Identification is “inextricably linked to cultural and power structures in society […] associated with reading and writing in different contexts” (Street, 1993, p. 433-434). By participating in the real world through the production of texts (reification), people portray themselves (being) through linguistic actions (doing) for social transformation.

In the home country of a monolingual situation, a student may develop his critical and creative voices through reading in his L1 context. In the multilingual Inner Circle setting, the student’s voice becomes richer and more complicated due to his crossing of different communicative boundaries. Being in the U.S. and reading the lives of minorities in the U.S., the student may become a cosmopolitan individual by localizing himself in the globalized world, expanding his own thinking, and fine-tuning himself to the situated context. Indeed, performing literacy includes a situated identification process.

Secondly, this chapter articulates the creative resistance of an L2 international student in his becoming dialogically literate in L2. Hosoo tactfully formulated a logic to extend affirmative action to Asians by rationalizing how immigrants come to U.S. and emphasizing Asians’ contribution in this country. The literacy socialization process is traditionally focused on students’ one-way adaptation from the periphery to the center in building cognitive literacy skills, while helping them identify and present themselves in the community (e.g., Bartholomae, 2001). It is especially true that L2 writers tend to struggle to be insiders in the academic discourse community as discursive conventions are not transparent to them. However, with increased knowledge and conventions of an academic discourse community, learners can present their arguments legitimately. Moreover, this chapter reveals how an L2 developmental writer, who acquires and uses
L2 at the same time, can become a sophisticated user of L2 and an agent for social mobility by being creative, persuasive, and tactful in his critical consciousness.

Third, this chapter illustrates that the ideological nature of L1 and L2 literate activities would be similar. Meaning is constructed through negotiation of the self in the situated context; it is fundamentally dialogical between the author who address his issues and audience/people who answer in context. The process of how Hosoo opened his social eyes suggests that L2 proficiency could constrain his expressive ability; however, his thought mediated through his L1, Korean, is much more important in his literacy development. In an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) context, Hosoo should master English. However, in the situated Inner Circle setting, English becomes a medium of expression where his identification across national and linguistic boundaries is crucial to his awareness of and participation in social issues. The English language is the medium that allowed Hosoo as a L2 user to express his being and to incite his tactics in the world. English was not simply a cognitive barrier that he should have mastered; rather, Hosoo controlled the English language to influence the world for social change.

As shown in Hosoo’s example, reading and writing skills can assist learners to address their issues in an academically legitimate way. More importantly, one’s identification explains the invisible values and assumptions that are inscribed in the power structure of the society. The ownership of language and thought goes beyond the deficit and different views of L2 users. English becomes a tool that broadens Hosoo’s worldview that gives him a medium to communicate with others. With his ownership of language and thought, Hosoo negotiated the power-laden term, international student, in his situated context of the Inner Circle setting He attuned himself to the discursive
conflict inscribed in the term, while acting as an agent of social change by his attempt to create an alternative discourse.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the academic socialization of L2 international undergraduates at an American university. In particular, I examined their learning processes and learning outcomes while mapping their trajectories of learning through monologic coordination and dialogic collaboration with others. As addressed in Chapter 1, I shaped my study using three parameters of research methods that have either been under-researched or not researched at all in prior literature on L2 undergraduates. These parameters are: symbolic modalities (speaking and writing), units of learning (individual and collaborative learning), and time (longitudinal study). These parameters helped me capture each distinct trajectory of the socialization process of L2 undergraduates while enriching the notion of their academic socialization. Among my three focal students, Joon and Nana showed their identity negotiation through talk, whereas Hosoo primarily negotiated his identity through his course writing. By following their learning processes, I illustrated how individual learning outcomes can be effectively achieved through collaboration with others in the social network. Longitudinal investigation enabled me to capture the critical moments of their identity negotiation over their academic years. In this chapter, I bring together my previous discussions of each individual student in a cross-case analysis of the three focal students (i.e., Joon, Nana,
and Hosoo) and three additional students (i.e., Quan, Ming, and Sisley) who are study
group members mentioned in Chapter 4. My findings are organized around the three
research questions posed in Chapter 1:

1. How do L2 students negotiate the tensions and conflicts of writing practices
   across contexts?

2. How do L2 students accomplish their course writing assignments effectively?

3. What does it mean to be academically literate in L2?

By synthesizing my findings, I propose a model of academic socialization that
accounts for the complexities of L2 students’ experiences. Because I investigated the
process of L2 academic socialization through an ethnographic approach, conceptualizing
the culture of L2 students is necessary. I discuss the culture of silent resistance shown in
L2 students’ academic socialization process. On the basis of the culture of silent
resistance, I theorize discourse hybridization that these students construct in their
movement across geographic contexts. The notion of discourse hybridization is used to
explain Hosoo’s attempt to create social transformation by proposing his counter-
discourse against commercialization, non-citizenship, and attitudes toward English as
second or foreign language users in the Inner Circle. Students’ endeavor to become
academically successful in the U.S. does not involve simply crossing boundaries among
nations, disciplinary content classes, and textual spaces. Rather, academic socialization is
an active identification and negotiation process in which L2 students create their own
third spaces in a situated context through glocalizing themselves while continuing their
own identity shift and impacting the situated community with their acts in the world.
Finally, I end my dissertation with a discussion of the implications of this study for
theory and practice and suggestions regarding future directions for L2 academic socialization research.

**Findings across Cases**

**Research Question #1: How Do L2 Students Negotiate the Tensions and Conflicts of Writing Practices across Contexts?**

This study began with the assumption that tensions and conflicts in writing practices are generated when student writers move across multiple contexts. My analytical framework (i.e., intercultural, interdisciplinary, and intertextual levels) is one way researchers can approach the tensions and conflicts that students experience. Each three focal participant – Joon, Nana, and Hosoo – had his or her own distinct learning difficulties in learning across the three levels; in turn, each person’s level of a negotiation space was different. My analysis illustrates that identity is a central link that helps in understanding students’ negotiation of different writing practices across cultures and genres. Each student brought his/her distinct autobiographic self to the research institution and identity negotiation was vital for his/her academic socialization because each student underwent a unique negotiation trajectory of tensions and conflicts in learning across multi-level contexts. In previous chapters, I identified key concepts for understanding the writing identities of the three participants: Joon’s asserted identity as a poet, Nana’s identity as a scientist, and Hosoo’s identity gap between his asserted identity as a cosmopolitan student and his assigned identity as a racial minority.

Joon’s writing opportunities in the U.S. was an eye-awakening experience for him, especially since he limited himself to the genre of creative writing. The values and norms
of creative writing were a lens that allowed Joon to assess various other genre of writing, including academic writing. The transition from his literacy worldview to the expectations of American academic discourse was neither seamless nor straightforward; it was a slow and inquisitive process where Joon got rid of his building block belief system of creative writing. Joon’s involvement in the literacy value system derived from his self-identity as a poet. It is noteworthy that Joon kept a strong poet identity across transnational contexts. In other words, Joon’s transition to various academic discourses was enabled by his self-identity crisis as a poet and subsequent negotiation of his asserted identity as a poet with the academic writer identity. Learning to write, in addition to his writing experiences in various academic discourses in college, allowed Joon to break free from his limited worldview of what counts as good writing and to, ultimately, wholeheartedly embrace different worldviews of academic and professional discourses.

Like Joon’s attachment to his self-identification as a poet, Nana maintained a strong professional identity as a scientist. Her scientist identity was a building block for her to access ways of humanities writing. In Nana’s experience, scientific thinking and writing are similar in Japan and the U.S, resulting in her smooth transition across transnational educational systems. In contrast, the adaptation to the ways of knowledge and writing in the humanities was not seamless. As a scientist in the pharmaceutical area that is grounded on positivist epistemology, Nana struggled to acquire the relativist epistemology of the humanities. In addition to her transition from a scientific epistemology to a humanities one, Nana eventually distinguished unique culture-specific ways of writing in the humanities across countries. It was her active reflection that enabled her to be aware of these differences in cultural and disciplinary epistemologies.
Joon and Nana had strong academic goals in terms of building academic credentials. On the other hand, Hosoo did not have a strong academic-related identity. He seemed to make a smooth transition across countries and disciplinary ways of knowing and writing. Joon and Nana are relatively mature in age and social experiences compared to Hosoo, who came to the research institution at the age of 18 after graduating high school from a small town in Korea. Because Hosoo had little training in writing in Korea and had no personal interest in writing itself (12/08, interview), there were a few barriers in his transition to various academic discourses in the U.S. Hosoo successfully adapted to each writing context, such as ESL, first-year composition, plant biology, second-year composition, human development, and family science classes. Through various writing experiences, Hosoo sensitized himself to epistemological differences and different ways of knowing across the curriculum and, ultimately, informed me of his meta-genre (Carter, 2007) awareness during his fifth academic quarter (12/08, interview). Adapting to different academic discourses and styles of instructors were smoother learning experiences for him.

Relatively young, Hosoo experienced intense negotiation of racial and foreigner identities across his transnational settings. His increased awareness of his social identity as a minority and foreigner equipped him with a lens to look beyond the textual world to build academic credentials. While awakening his relative social identity shifted his reading of text toward reading the world, he seemed to evolve as a social activist. Frustrated with the gap between the connotations of the term “international student” between Korea and the U.S., Hosoo finished his 19-month academic journey in American higher education and returned to Korea to explore other opportunities. Indeed, writing
opportunities in the U.S. ignited Hosoo’s identification in the U.S and fine-tuned his identity negotiation in the glocalized world.

Research Question #2: How Do L2 Students Accomplish their Course Writing Assignments Effectively?

The three students self-reported good academic achievement. Joon graduated with an accumulated GPA of 3.5 and Nana with over 3.8, whereas Hosoo was over 3.7 at the end of his first year. They showed individual coordination to increase their own learning outcomes; at the same time, they commonly sought feedback and collaborated with their peers and instructors to improve their learning outcomes. In this way, the learning process was effectively mediated by their social resources. By social resources, I mean scaffolding through human interaction with others, such as course instructors, recitation TAs, writing center tutors, peers, and family members. In addition to interviews with students and their instructors, Hosoo’s group interaction data, in particular, shows why and how peer collaboration can be effective in L2 students’ learning process.

Cross-case analysis of the three focal participants reveals that scaffolding through the use of social resources and collaboration was effective in their learning outcomes for writing assignments. Key to their scaffolding was individualized support of dialogic thinking for a target student’s writing as well as dialogic thinking to explore the rationale behind the right answers for evaluation. For instance, in Hosoo’s writing for the humanities, I identified sources of scaffolding that included individual readings and lectures (i.e., traditional individual ways of learning) as well as interaction with peers, his instructor, and writing center tutors (i.e., dialogic scaffolding). Book reading is much
more than the individual meaning-making of the book author or the idea inscribed in the book. Reading a book provides the opportunity of dialogic thinking; however, it is thinking together with the counterpart with no voice. In other words, Hosoo was unable to ask the author of the book for help while reading. Therefore, the classroom was more of a dialogic space where Hosoo could, for instance, explore dialogic thinking. Nevertheless, in his self-report for first-year composition class, Hosoo participated only once at the end of the quarter in order to get a participation grade. Although a classroom is a social space of learning, Hosoo did not participate in first-year composition class where whole-class activity was the main way of interaction (my observation of the class). Therefore, Hosoo coordinated knowledge and information individually while listening in class, whereas he thought dialogically by verbally participating with his small study group members, first-year composition instructor, and writing center tutor. Learning outcomes may be individualized; however, this study confirmed that dialogic thinking helped students grow academically together by sharing their growing expertise. It is especially noteworthy that dialogic scaffolding not only from instructors, but also from peer groups such as our study group, Hosoo and Ming’s pair work, and Quan’s major study group, is a powerful tool for students’ mutual growth.

Despite the fact that the role of dialogic scaffolding is a significant finding of this dissertation, each student’s use of social resources was different. While Nana preferred to work closely with instructors, Joon and Hosoo seemed willing to take full advantage of the available social resources, particularly once they became aware of the significance of
feedback and dialogic thinking. As a successful learner and scientist,¹ Nana dealt with two areas that she needed social support with by scaffolding with her instructors to check what their expectations are and then resorting to English proofreaders. During her American undergraduate years, she worked closely with her instructors. “What I pay attention always is to provide the information which THEY want to know (not what I want to let them know). After I came to the U.S., I found out that there are particular criteria like evaluation grids in the U.S. system (e.g., TAs have evaluation grids to evaluate essay-like assignments)” (01/23/09, email). To meet her instructors’ criteria, Nana interacted with instructors after writing her drafts in order to check what they expected from her in terms of content and language use. After her first-year composition instructor recommended to have native speakers proofread her papers, Nana visited the university writing center but she did not return, because it did not provide editing services she expected. She eventually ended up asking help from her 1.5 generation Asian-American friend. Nana knew that her friend could not provide her with native-like grammatical and syntactical feedback. However, this friend was the only source in her social network to seek assistance from in the U.S. Nana seemed to repeatedly resort to her friend until she asked me about online editing services and to introduce her to a professional editor. It is important to note that Nana did not have information about professional editing services and did not have a social network of native-speaker peers that she could ask help in proofreading her papers.

¹ During her professional career, Nana obtained four international patents. She also was accepted into the best graduate school in her field and awarded a renowned international organization scholarship after six months’ of graduate work.
Unlike Nana, Joon took advantage of wide dialogic scaffolding to increase his learning outcomes. His self-identification as a slow learner, positive experience with instructor feedback, and peer help seemed to encourage him to continue seeking feedback from others. His social network included his peers, sister, and classmates, along with course instructors and writing center tutors. Two distinctive features emerged from his seeking feedback from others. First, Joon took advantage of his sister who is a communication major in the same university and with whom he lived during his time in the U.S. Joon used his sister’s college GEC writing samples and sought her feedback before he began to use his social network. Because Joon’s major in Logistics required few writing assignments (details depicted in Chapter 2), he sought his sister’s help which proved to be an effective strategy for him to get general feedback on content and grammar before he received more specialized feedback from others. In this way, imitation is a key learning source for a developmental learner such as Joon. Secondly, Joon engaged in a voluntary informal study group for two plant biology classes. As shown in Appendices B and C, vocabulary in the disciplinary content class of plant biology was challenging for him. Another difficulty was the distinct way of writing for a scientific research paper compared to the humanities essay writing he learned in his sequence of composition classes. However, the collaborative voluntary study group helped him learn genre-specific writing and realize that he can improve his grades with peers’ assistance. It is noteworthy that Joon chose voluntary study work for a science class where one absolute truth/answer can be reached. In contrast, Joon was conscious that a study group for a humanities class would not be effective because there is no right answer, although he could not articulate the relative epistemology and ways of knowing.
that operated in humanities classes (03/07, interview). Accordingly, he chose to work closely with his instructors in his humanities classes.

Nana’s and Joon’s cases allow us to conclude that dialogic scaffolding in the group learning process can be effective in increasing individual learning outcomes.\(^2\) In the same vein, interactional data from Hosoo’s learning process in the classroom and during study groups warrants the effect of dialogic scaffolding more concretely. Dialogic thinking was a point of contact through the initiation of authentic questions and comments, which was followed by students’ extension, elaboration, and refutation of each others’ ideas. The study group interaction data, as presented in Chapter 4, demonstrated how the study group functions as an *affordance* (Gibson, 1977) to Hosoo and others by creating learning opportunities for themselves and others. Further, I demonstrated why the notion of thinking together (i.e., dialogic thinking) is effective by extending Mercer’s (1995) model. I proposed a model composed of a three-phase peer review: students’ endeavors of comprehending others’ work (i.e., reinforcing their existing knowledge) and assessing others’ work (i.e. applying their existing knowledge) while creating their own learning opportunities (i.e., expanding their existing knowledge base). In this way, out-of-classroom interaction opportunities, along with the use of social resources, helped students effectively achieve their learning outcomes.

\(^2\) The significance of using a social network sharply contrasts when looking at a low achieving student, Hana, who did not “know how to seek help” during her three-year undergraduate stay at the same institution, even though she was best friends with Nana. Nana, Joon, and Hana all attended a monthly informal international student group, through which I accessed the culture of how international students share information, help each other, and become close friends.
A surprising finding from Hosoo’s study group was the domino effect among study group members in content courses. The domino effect can warrant students’ perception of effective peer collaboration. When Hosoo struggled in an Economics course while attending our spring study group, he stated that working with Ming was more helpful than meeting with his TA or with a senior with a degree in Economics. It was Ming, a member of the study group, who was able to provide the practical help to fill in the blanks of a class powerpoint and explained the knowledge gaps that he encountered in class. Hosoo and Ming went on to become study partners in subsequent quarters for courses such as accounting, a survey-based communication class, and Ming’s Korean class. In the Accounting class, for example, Hosoo and Ming continued their collaboration online (see Appendix K). Both did not score high on the first test, but their online collaboration and phone conversations allowed them to experience successful collaboration. Another study group member, Quan, started a two-course study group for his major classes. The students in this study group found that once they experienced the potential benefits of studying collaboratively, they were willing to re-create this format themselves to pursue academic success. In short, this dissertation reports the significance of collaborative learning for effective learning outcomes.

*Research Question #3: What Does It Mean to be Academically Literate in L2?*

What counts as academic literacies in L2 is a multi-layered question. The assumption inherent in the definition of language socialization is that there are two ways of being literate. According to Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), children learn to speak oral language while learning the norms and conventions of the community. In their socialization into a literate community where oral language mediates written language,
people learn to read and write while interacting with others and, in turn, learn the norms and conventions of the community. Street (1984) succinctly divides these processes into two literacy learning models. One is autonomous literacy learning, in which people acquire decoding and encoding skills; the other is ideological literacy learning, in which people’s acquiring skills is inevitably linked with learning the norms and values of the community to which they belong. Following Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) and Street (1984), for international undergraduates to become literate in English academic literacies, we need to deconstruct these two processes that are intermingled across national boundaries.

In the first section, I deconstruct the roles that oral and written English play in the three focal participants’ autonomous English literacy learning in an EFL setting in the U.S. Because the sociolinguistic reality of English use is not the foci of this research, I chose to report on it briefly; however, explaining and comparing the three students’ literacy learning environments is crucial to understanding their trajectories of acquiring literacy in oral and written language in the U.S. In the second section, I discuss ideological literacy development in the learning and use of oral and written English for developing academic literacies in the U.S. I report on the three students’ literacy stances, reflecting on their socialization process to the texts, norms, and values at an American research institution. In the process of being academically literate in English, the three students showed commonalities and differences in their exposure to English and their practice of English.
Autonomous academic literacy development across L1 and L2 contexts. The way that international undergraduates learn language transforms dramatically across learning contexts in ESL and EFL settings. In their schooling in EFL settings, English is an academic subject to read and write. In Nana’s case, English also had a professional function: when she applied to obtain four international patents, she used English in reading, documenting, and drafting her research team’s findings. Therefore, the fundamental unit of meaning is vocabulary in the EFL setting. The ideology hidden in teaching English is what I refer to as knowledge economy, where students learn vocabulary and grammar rules first and then apply them to reading comprehension. In the EFL setting, these students’ reading and writing in English was an individual textual practice rather than a function of communicating with various English users. Increasing vocabulary repertoire for written communication is a challenge. On the other hand, the challenge shifts when students arrive into the ESL or the Inner Circle setting. Delayed automaticity\(^3\) by the non-native’s use of awkward expressions, resulting from translating chunks of meaning units from L1 to L2, can hinder communicability between non-native speakers and native speakers (Table 5.1).

\[^3\] The delayed or absence of automaticity in the levels of vocabulary, a chunk of phrases, and discourse/genre (Lucy, 1996) may hinder the communicability of non-native speakers in their interaction with native speakers of English.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1 countries</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal for using English</td>
<td>Learning an academic subject</td>
<td>Communicating with English speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ role</td>
<td>Acquiring English</td>
<td>Interacting through the medium of English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Role of English in schooling and college | Reading comprehension  
  - L2 use as a written textual process | Speaking (i.e., oral interaction) as the pre-requisite to play the role of a social actor.  
  - L2 use as a social process |
| Focus of English learning | Vocabulary as a primary unit of comprehension  
  - Bottom-up build up | Oral interaction/discourse between interlocutors  
  - Build up a discourse repertoire |
| Assumption in learning | Based on knowledge economy, each student learned vocabulary and linguistic rules first and applied them to reading. | Each student went through his own learning trajectory in building a written and discourse repertoire. |

Table 5.1: Sociolinguistic reality of English use in an educational setting

In the following section, I compare and contrast how the three focal students developed language proficiency, self-perception, and awareness of language use, in the media of speaking and writing. Upon starting undergraduate coursework, as depicted in Chapters 2 through 4, these students had to take a systematic sequence of composition courses for both ESL and first-year composition classes. In turn, these students developed relatively strong writing skills to prepare for content classes, but did not attend speaking preparation classes. Their writing samples over time and interview data suggest that these three students worked hard to meet the university writing requirement. Writing classes provide “affordance” (Gibson, 1977) for L2 international students to prepare themselves for the discourse of American higher education. The writing curriculum was

According to Joon, nine of his 17 classmates in the advanced ESL class had already taken the first-year composition class at other institutions; however, having failed the composition entrance exam for non-native speakers of English, they had to take the ESL composition sequence. It can be interpreted that the research institution requires a relatively high level of English proficiency in writing (03/07, interview).
an affordance for students to build their academic credentials, showing that the research institution values literacy achievement through the assessment of writing.

Despite the academic importance of writing that is valued in the curriculum, in the final quarter of Nana’s academic residency and Joon’s second year, their primary concern with regard to English proficiency was not writing. English speaking proficiency gained urgency as they became more aware of their academic and professional career paths. Joon reported, “My current English score is so low [to apply for Naver or Samsung]. My father also expects my spoken English to be good enough to communicate with his international business clients. He expects my spoken English to be good enough to communicate in English. Writing is not that important from now on. Speaking matters” (09/07, interview). Joon thought that the reason his spoken English did not improve is because of the majority of time he spent within his social network of Korean speakers, from whom he received academic and personal help. In Nana’s case, during the months before graduation she stayed in her dorm to study for the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) for more than 10 hours a day for a period of 10 months, while taking four courses each quarter. Living alone in a dorm, Nana had few opportunities to observe how native speakers use English in formal and informal settings. She ultimately became critically aware that the speaking demanded in small group lab meetings for graduate students is different from large undergraduate classroom interactions. During the final quarter of her

5 In Autumn 2007, Nana took a major cross-listed class where undergraduate and graduate students intermingled. In her self-report, Nana mentions that she was one of the few in the class who was not asked to change her research proposal by the professor, while several graduate students were required to change theirs. In comparison to her struggle to adjust herself to humanities classes, writing a research proposal and final research paper were not difficult tasks for Nana. In the following quarter, the professor recommended Nana join his weekly graduate student lab meetings (12/07, interview).
undergraduate studies, she realized that speaking could be a hindrance to her performance. In my analysis, Nana’s opportunities to observe how a small group of native speakers interact in formal and informal settings were rare. More importantly, the lack of occasions to participate in group discussions affected Nana’s relatively late awareness of the different genres of academic speaking contexts.

In contrast to Joon’s and Nana’s struggle with spoken English as compared with writing, Hosoo, who came to the U.S. at the age of 18, adapted to the new setting. By observing how his peers and seniors in a Korean church improved their spoken English, Hosoo realized that it is not easy to learn to use English like a native speaker as an adult. Hosoo said that he was a lucky case to be able to improve his spoken language in comparison to his age group peers in his Korean church (12/08, interview). One aspect of Hosoo’s experience that was different from Joon, Nana, and his other Korean church friends was that Hosoo stayed in the North dorm his first year where domestic students are the majority of the dorm population (03/17/09, final interview). Hosoo believed he was lucky to choose the North dorm rather than the South dorm, where many international students lived with others from their home countries who share their L1. In other words, Hosoo had the opportunity to observe how his three American roommates interacted with each other over an academic year. In this way, Hosoo was forced to speak in English with native speakers on a daily basis. Hosoo discovered that when he roomed with other Korean and Chinese speakers in his second year, his interaction with them
excluded English.⁶ Due to the lack of opportunities to observe native speakers and interact in English, Hosoo began to watch television to improve his English and observed how kindergarteners at his church pronounced English differently from his Korean peers.

Three primary differences exist between Hosoo and the two other focal students in their exposure to spoken English in the U.S and their self-report trajectory of oral language development over time. First, given the critical age hypothesis, age still seems to matter in learning a foreign/second language. Second, the opportunity to be forced to use English varied between Hosoo and the other two students in their daily settings. Third, Hosoo developed an observation system for learning how native speakers pronounce and use English idiomatic expressions in speaking and also devoted time to self-reflection regarding his performance and English use (e.g., observing how Korean-Koreans insert [a] in the end of consonants, while Korean Americans do not, 12/08, interview). In other words, the participation metaphor, addressed in Chapter 1, is not a panacea to explain people’s acquisition of a second language in an Inner Circle setting. Hosoo’s early realization that by observing native speakers and by reflecting on how he might improve his practice was different from Nana’s relatively late realization and Joon’s lack of realization during their stay at the research institution, although their initial explicit goal was to improve their spoken English in the Inner Circle. An awareness of how native speakers use language may be a distinction that separated Hosoo from Nana and Joon. Non-native speakers need exposure to authentic communicative events to increase their awareness, consequently broadening their repertoire in native speakers’ language-in-use,

⁶ According to Hosoo, his Chinese roommate preferred to use Chinese, which was incomprehensible to him (12/08, interview).
a route which is somewhat similar to the written genre pedagogy of the English for Specific Purposes camp for non-native speakers of English.

On the other hand, in writing, it was Nana who was most critical and aware of the distinct nature of writing practices across cultural, disciplinary, and textual levels and, in turn, best articulated the similarities and differences among the three levels. While Hosoo was adept at comparing native speakers and non-native speakers’ pronunciation and expression through his exposure to the uses of spoken English, Nana’s main concern was her written style in English at the textual level. Thinking in Japanese and expressing herself in English did not automatically match the use of vocabulary, syntax-semantics priming, and discursive use of expressions (see Lucy’s [1996] framework of three levels of linguistic relativity; Slobin’s [1996] thinking for speaking). Given the transferability of meaning across languages, Pinemann’s (1984) learnability hypothesis for L2 might explain Nana’s efforts to fashion her English expressions to suit an academic milieu. For example, replacing her childlike vocabulary with the more complex lexis of the GRE was not always appropriate because English idiomatic expressions semantically do not necessarily map from non-native speakers’ mental translation of the appropriate expressions. However, being aware of academic and non-academic uses of written English allowed Nana to attempt to improve her repertoire of native use of written English. In turn, by being acutely aware of each distinct contextual use of written language in academic terms and native idiomatic expressions, Nana broadened her repertoire of English use. Nana’s awareness of language use in written genres extended to
her speaking genre once she started attending lab meetings. Such social interactions gave her access to a regular opportunity for participating in a small group setting.

To recapitulate, for the focal three participants, the sociolinguistic reality of English use differed across L1 and L2 settings. Furthermore, the way they developed speaking and writing proficiency shows the significance of, first, the opportunity to participate in authentic communicative events and second, reflection opportunities for students to understand people’s use of speaking and writing in authentic communicability settings. Nana in writing and Hosoo in speaking developed their awareness of the distinct nature of native speakers’ use of English, which consequently affected their endeavors to improve their English and to participate in communication through writing and speaking. The role of English and the context of English use were distinct for the three participants. If academic success is defined in terms of high GPA scores, we can assume that all three research participants were academically successful. Nevertheless, Nana and Hosoo developed their awareness regarding how English is used differently through the medium of speaking and writing, whereas Joon failed to develop the awareness of why and how English is used differently by native and non-native speakers and across different settings. In terms of autonomous English literacy development, as shown in the research participant cases, the existence in their language use awareness grounded on the observation of and participation in native use of English may explain the different nature of their oral and written language development and their different learning outcomes. This suggests that curricular support to increase L2 students’ awareness in academic speaking, as well as academic writing, will help their spoken English.
However, the autonomous skills that are involved in learning oral and written English are influenced by beliefs, practices, and social relationships in situated communities. Thus, learning literacy means learning and enacting social roles and affiliations with specific communities. L2 undergraduates, consequently, need to negotiate their norms and values inscribed in their oral and written English use and, more importantly, their ways of being in the U.S. Indeed, learning and using English in the U.S. is an active meaning-making process of the English-mediated text and certain norms, values, beliefs, and practices of the U.S. This active meaning-making process is rich and complex because the L2 population crosses national and linguistic boundaries. Therefore, in the next section, I depict the ideological literacy development of three focal students during their stay at an American university. Their development of different critical literacy stances was inexorably linked with their social meaning-making process.

**Ideological academic literacy development.** As stated in the above section, literacy is not only an autonomous force that facilitates individual development by building reading and writing skills; but literacy is also an ideological social force in a specific context where people enact themselves in cultural and power-laden structures. Literacy practices cannot be neutral because they reflect a particular way of being, knowing, acting, and use of oral and written language. Literacy is not individual skills to possess; rather, literacy is a *communal resource* to make sense of individuals’ lives in the context, to work toward resolving life issues, and to achieve their goals in everyday lives (Street, 2004; Tusting & Barton, 2005). By situating literacy within social, cultural, and historical contexts, as illustrated in Chapters 2 through 4, I organized my dissertation based on the critical literacy stances that three students developed in relation to their learning across levels of
contexts. It is important to note that these students’ critical stances on texts seemed to be mediated by their larger socialization into the discourse of the research institution. It was not only the textual content but also the discursive environment of the learning context in the Inner Circle that influenced these students’ development of a literacy stance. Comparing and contrasting the empirical data of Joon, Nana, and Hosoo demonstrates why learning literacies is social and ideological. Consequently, the development of literacy stances and identity negotiations is inevitable in literacy development. In this section of ideological academic literacy development, I focus on different shades of critical literacy stances that these three students developed at the American research institution and beyond. Joon kept an analytically critical lens (i.e., analytical literacy); Nana grounded herself on critical epistemology (i.e., questioning literacy); Hosoo developed critical consciousness in being in the U.S (i.e., contesting literacy).

Joon stepped into American academic discourse equipped with an analytically critical lens. More fundamentally, he used his comprehensive lens to get good grades. His interactions with the first-year composition instructor, his major writing practices, and his narration of his professional writing show that he was pushed to accommodate himself or that he pushed himself to be analytically critical. However, Joon’s case was intriguing because he was able to distinguish various genres of Korean writing, a feature which Hosoo could not articulate; however, Joon developed only a low degree of awareness of similarities and differences across genres and meta-genres of the curriculum he encountered in the U.S. He seemed to do his best on each assignment and displayed little awareness of meta-knowledge across disciplines. In our final chat session, Joon wrote that the biggest gain for him from studying abroad was to enhance his societal label as a
graduate of a third-tier college in Korea, which made him not regret his choice to study abroad (12/08). This outcome was not related to his initial goal statements of improving English and participating in intercultural experiences. His self-assessed learning outcome while enrolled in 10 consecutive quarters over 30 months was that his Inner Circle experience would provide leverage in his social status in Korea. Until the final chat session, he failed to enter top-tier Korean companies and explored second-tier Korean companies, saying that “I did not expect to apply for [second-tier] companies when I began my job search [from the U.S.].” His undergraduate degree that he earned in the U.S. was not helpful in the transparent and competitive job market system of top-tier Korean companies. Over the two and half years while I interacted with him, Joon was rather reserved in evaluating his experiences at both the Korean and American universities. Although Joon clearly acknowledged the learning outcome of his writing training in the U.S., which is based on cognitive comprehension and being analytical, his holistic assessment of the American research institution was “not bad” (12/08, chat session). There was a gap between his ideal vision and reality because he believed that graduating from an American state-level university that was a recognized research institution would heighten his social status and would equal being a graduate from a top-tier Korean college, but the market assessment of a study abroad population in Korea is equivalent to graduating from a second-tier Korean college (12/08, chat session). More importantly, by informing me that Korean companies evaluate job candidates by taking into consideration objective information such as English scores, major-related licenses, and international internship opportunities, Joon seemed to correct his mistaken prior assumption of the Korean job market. His intercultural experience at the American college was an eye-
opening experience and he asked me to inform Korean students at the research institution that “graduating [the research institution] with a GPA 3.5 is not helping students get jobs. Korean companies require objective evidence of job candidates’ abilities before recruiting them such as a high English proficiency score, licenses, and international internship experience” (12/08, chat session). Joon, unlike his competitors, did not have all three requirements. The Korean job market’s objective evaluation system seems to be similar with the analytical stance that is warranted by objective information, which was the way that he was trained in writing at the research institution. Joon’s learning text and his being in the world illustrate that he kept an accommodationist ideology in the U.S. to be academically successful. As an accommodationist, Joon realized the outcome of his financial and time investment in studying abroad only after he left the American research institution.

Unlike Joon’s accommodationist view and analytically critical lens on the textual and discursive worlds, Nana and Hosoo kept critical stances on their venues of their literacy development. Nana, armed with a strong academic history and a corresponding professional experience, did not simply accommodate herself to the new framework of knowledge instruction. Her writing seemed to keep comprehensive and analytically critical stances at the textual level. However, unlike Joon’s accommodationist stance to each learning context, Nana questioned the ESL one-size-fits-all pedagogy in the interview session. Furthermore, she was skillful at the meta-learning level and explored what new knowledge means in relation to her prior experiences. Rather than accommodating herself to the new frame of reference, she kept her critical stance in
epistemology. As the representative of the unheard international undergraduates’ underlife voices, Nana’s text did not seem to tell her critical epistemology in my reading of her text. However, Nana’s questioning of the cultural prototype of the five-paragraph essayist tradition in our talk is one example of how international undergraduates might question the nature of knowledge that they experience in the U.S.

For Nana, pursuing an undergraduate degree in the U.S. to improve her English and raise her GPA was a reconfirmation and a rediscovery of her scientist identity and her ways of being and thinking. By taking GEC classes, especially humanities classes, Nana challenged herself to attain the postpositivistic nature of humanities knowledge. Consequently, Nana was making her own theory that there are culture-specific ways of writing in the humanities across Japan and the U.S. In her quest to acquire American ways of writing for the humanities, her endeavor to make meaning was not simply grounded on analytical comprehension but also on her ways of being a contestant. She seemed to constantly compare and contrast the nature of knowledge and what counts as good writing across spaces and time. By being a contestant in the culture-specific humanities' ways of knowledge, she was not only demonstrating her being and becoming, but also creating a hybrid space of contestation that international students may experience in the larger Discourse.

However, caution is needed in interpreting Nana’s case because her academic superiority and professional background are distinct from ordinary international undergraduates. For example, at the first formal interview, Nana already had strong opinions on why she experienced difficulty in humanities-based writing. Through her rich
prior academic and professional experiences, Nana was more explicit in expressing her opinion and comparing the educational systems and the nature of knowledge in her home country and the U.S. While Joon’s and Hosoo’s euphoria period in foreign countries was longer, having just left the confines of home, Nana was quicker to catch the discourse of commercialization. Nearly every time I met her, she raised the issue that her tuition is not reflected in the worth of the quality of education provided by the research institution. During her second quarter in the U.S., she already started to prepare for the GRE and decided to return to Japan if she would not be accepted to the top two graduate programs in her field. As a self-sponsored student who did not want to waste time by moving to another school, Nana was skeptical about her status and the quality of American public education at the undergraduate level.

As a traveler to many foreign countries including Asia, Europe, and other third-world countries, Nana also questioned the quality of administrative services of the research institution. Her critical stance was not limited to epistemology which extended to the quality of the education and service in comparison to the tuition that she paid. Her critical stance to the text that she learned across the American curriculum and the discursive world were aligned. I listened to the undergraduates talk in resistance at international students’ gatherings. They highlighted the scholarships and cash-equivalent allowances that African American students with a GPA over 2.5\(^7\) receive and that

\(^7\) The university section director stated that African American students should have “the minimum criteria of a student being in the 50% and having a 2.5 GPA” to receive “the Freshman Foundation grant.” However, “about 50 to 60%” of African American students receive need-based financial aid, only with their submission of the grant application, excluding merit-based scholarships (05/07/09, email). This is in sharp contrast to the fact that 4.5% of international undergraduates received funding including both merit
American honors undergraduates also receive. These voices in the international student gathering allowed me to build an information pool about American undergraduates. The study group students, including Sisley, Ming, and Quan, also shared that there is no merit-based scholarships for international students at the research institution, although their self-reported GPAs are over 3.7. Because my undergraduate education was practically free,\(^8\) listening to their discussion about the research institution helped me understand the degree of their resistance to the Discourse of non-citizenship and commercialization as international undergraduates. The objective information that they obtained in this situated context was in sharp contrast to their romanticized notion of Inner Circle countries. Nana was quick to identify the Discourse, while 19-year-old Hosoo seemed to become a linguistic activist upon realizing these gaps and whose voice was vividly illustrated in his first-year composition class. Hosoo learned from Sisley about the institutional Discourse of commercialization in the study group, which ignited his reading about the world of the Inner Circle.

Because Nana’s case is distinct due to her strong academic and professional experience, Hosoo’s case is crucial to our understanding of the critical stance in terms of his critical consciousness as an ordinary first-year undergraduate. After graduating from high school in a small town in Korea, Hosoo entered the research institution. Hosoo was explicit about his different ways of knowing across disciplines; during our meeting in his

---

\(^8\) During my undergraduate education in Korea, I often paid $4 per semester, which was reimbursed when I submitted documentation. At least 30% of undergraduates in national universities were known to have their tuition waived. When I did not receive any funding for my graduating semester, I paid less than $400 in full-time tuition. My tuition investment differs from Hosoo’s tuition investment of $28,236 (American dollars) during his first academic year.
second year, like Nana in her first interview, he was already expressing the meta-genre of curricula. In particular, Hosoo was clear about the nature of knowledge between the humanities and science; however, his awareness on meta-genre was not clear-cut. He defined social sciences as “something in between [humanities and science]” (12/08, interview). Because the survey-based communication class was the only class in the social sciences that he took during his first four quarters of enrollment, his exposure to ways of knowing was limited. He was not able to articulate the nature of knowledge and ways to warrant his claims. However, it is important to note that Hosoo was aware of the distinct nature of knowledge and ways of knowing which Joon did not develop upon finishing his undergraduate degree. While his cognitive ways of knowing was developing, Hosoo's studying abroad experience seemed to face a challenge by the discursive Discourse of the research institution in terms of citizenship and commercialization that were illustrated through his voice in Chapter 4.

As addressed earlier, Hosoo's uniqueness is in his becoming an activist defending his beliefs. One thing to note is that Hosoo did not think of what it means to be an international student at the research institution until Sisley from the study group mentioned the textual meaning of being a minority and an international student. He knew it from his experience, but he did not have an opportunity to reflect on what his experience meant. Sisley's talk initiated his thinking about what it means to be an international minority student in the U.S. Unlike Nana, Hosoo channeled his voice through his writing assignments. Directly dealing with the value-laden term “minority,” as described in detail in Chapter 4, Hosoo moved from being literate to becoming a
creative activist in the world. English was not a burden for Hosoo. He told me that “though my expression is not comparable to the native speakers” and instead of focusing on his weak English expression, he was confident of the power of logic (08/08, interview).

Nana’s and Hosoo’s cases show that learning in L2 is fundamentally similar to L1. All three students showed comprehensive and analytically critical stances in their textual learning. More importantly, Nana and Hosoo linked their textual learning with educational services and their discursive environment in the Inner circle setting and ultimately developed their ideological lens of the world. Being outsiders of the situated American discourse community seemed to help Nana and Hosoo to realize the frame clash of their romanticized notion of the Inner Circle and the discursive reality in which they were situated. It was learning beyond reading the text where cognitive learning operates. Through their identification process of what it means to be an international student at the research institution, Nana chose to be silent and decided to leave the institution as soon as possible. In contrast, Hosoo chose to address his issues tactfully in his first-year composition class. Literacy learning, as demonstrated by these students, was not assimilation to the frame of knowledge and ideology projected from the institution. I proposed the notion of dialogic becoming in Hosoo’s socialization into the word and world by dialoguing his marginalized voice to change the world, whereas I applied Bakhtin’s (1981) notion of ideological becoming in Nana’s silent resistance into the Inner Circle. Nana’s and Hosoo’s views may be limited; nevertheless, my documentation of their voices and their stories of ideological literacy is significant where the discourse of non-citizenship and commercialization these students encountered can be heard. By
raising their unheard voices and the counter-discourse of international students, Hosoo and Nana projected how the policy of the situated world should be changing, just as Hosoo addressed his hope of social transformation at the research institution and as Nana hoped of good quality education compared to the tuition that she paid.

Discussion

Researchers’ choice of research method parameters and populations\(^9\) reveals various aspects of the academic socialization process and product. By bringing together the three parameters of speaking/writing,\(^10\) individual/collaborative learning, and longitudinal investigation, I reported the salient individual trajectories of three focal L2 undergraduates’ academic socialization (Chapters 2 through 4) and highlighted their similarities and differences through a cross-case analysis (section 5.2 in Chapter 5). Incorporating my empirical findings and conceptual frameworks, I propose an academic socialization model, which depicts diachronic and synchronic processes of L2 academic socialization. From L2 students’ academic socialization process, I conceptualize the culture of silent resistance of L2 international students.

\(^9\) However, in prior literature, a consistent finding is that L2 socialization in the Inner Circle is a lengthy and painstaking process (e.g., Belcher & Braine, 1995; Canagarajah, 2002; Casanave, 2002; Spack, 1997).
\(^10\) In prior literature, language socialization and literacy learning have tended to be separated. Language socialization research has mainly focused on L2 graduate students’ discourse socialization to graduate school through the speaking medium (e.g., Morita, 2004), whereas L2 literacy learning research centered on undergraduates’ development of literacy skills and their apprenticeship process to the local and/or global academic socialization process is through the writing medium (e.g., Spack, 1997, 2004; Leki, 2007). Since English is a written language, I view language and literacy socialization as occurring in L2 academic socialization.
In the following section, I propose an academic socialization model to articulate and extend our current understanding\textsuperscript{11} of academic socialization of the L2 student population. Theoretically, academic socialization is a multilayered, thus complex and less articulated social phenomenon. No empirical longitudinal research on L2 international undergraduates in a same group has yet been reported in the U.S. due to such factors as time and financial restrictions, limited access to students’ culture, and students’ attrition over time. The rich data that I collected, thanks to my accessibility to L2 international undergraduates’ formal and informal learning spaces as well as academic and non-academic communicative events, allows me to model an academic socialization process. Therefore, by incorporating an \textit{a priori} theoretical lens and the empirical findings from students’ own perspectives, I propose a model that enables the academic field to envision what counts as academic socialization and clarifies how L2 undergraduate students’ academic socialization occurs. My model includes a diachronic dimension (i.e., phrases of academic socialization) and three synchronic dimensions (i.e., contextual levels, settings, and mode of learning in academic socialization) (see Table 5.2).

Methodologically, articulation of the culture of L2 students that create the academic socialization process is pivotal for my study because of the nature of the ethnographic tradition. Ethnographic research is distinct from other research methodologies in its inclination to find the culture of people or social phenomenon under study (see Chapter 1 for details). In the following section, I will conceptualize the notion

\textsuperscript{11} I used the term \textit{understanding} because I consider that a theorization of academic socialization has not been articulated so far.
of resistance as concomitant to L2 students’ culture. Further developing my conceptualization of resistance culture, I dwell on the social consequences of resistance in terms of discourse hybridization. This section will discuss diachronic and synchronic processes of my academic socialization model as well as the culture of resistance and its theorization of discourse hybridization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Euphoria</th>
<th>Critical Academic Becoming</th>
<th>Evolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextual levels of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intercultural level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interdisciplinary level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intertextual level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites of Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ continued adaptation to different discourse communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out-of-classroom site (e.g., dorm, lab meeting, study group, writing center, &amp; online)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modes of Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monologic coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dialogic collaboration (using speaking and writing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Academic socialization model

**Academic Socialization Model**

**Phases of academic socialization.** Through analysis of the data, I identified three phases of academic socialization: euphoria, academic becoming, and self-evolution to other communities. One of the most important findings that helps in understanding the L2 international population is their euphoria at the initial phase of academic socialization. The euphoria phase has typically been identified as the first phase in the acculturation
model in a foreign country (e.g., Brown; 2000; Schumann, 1978). Two factors account for students’ initial euphoria phase: (a) escaping from home and encountering a romanticized notion of the Inner Circle and (b) experiencing a sense of achievement in being accepted to the Inner Circle university, and hoping to settle in the new environment. The following four examples illustrate the euphoria phase, substantiating its presence in the data. First, the transfer students in my study justified their choice of research institution mainly because it facilitated the transfer of credit hours from other universities, which implied faster graduation and less financial expenses in their admission process (e.g., Joon, Ming, and Quan). Second, responses from friends in their home countries regarding their admission to and academic life in the Inner Circle university accelerated their personal and academic sense of achievement. As Hosoo put it, “my friends are envious of me when they look at my pictures” (several informal discussions). All six participants posted pictures of their college life in the U.S. on social networking sites like Facebook and other L1 equivalent sites. Thirdly, their parents often reminded them that American universities are competent schools, prompted them to listen to their instructors, encouraged them to do their best academically, and urged them to graduate earlier to reduce their families’ financial burden (interviews with Joon [09/07] and Ming [02/08], various informal discussions with Ming and Hosoo; cf. Nana). Fourth, hearing anecdotally that a few of their peers struggled academically at the research institution and finally dropped out, students actually maintained their euphoria phase, firmly believing

---

12 However, three cases of my pilot study reveals that students needed to enroll in five years in an undergraduate program or enroll in continuing education after graduating in order to be accepted into graduate school.
that they were successfully assimilated into the romanticized notion of the Inner Circle country, which was justified by their high GPAs. This seemed to be especially true for students in their first year who declared that they had attended third-tier universities in their home countries (i.e., Joon and Ming). These students verbalized satisfaction in their first year and projected their contentment into the future. In the phase of euphoria, key to understanding the culture of this population is their sense of pride. Their pride was due to the high sense of achievement that these students had experienced and their belief that they successfully assimilated to the new environment.

Moving from the euphoria phase, the second phase of the academic socialization process is critical academic becoming. Prior studies point that undergraduate education is an initiation (Bartholomae, 2001; Lea, 2005); however, I countered this argument by demonstrating Nana and Hosoo’s academic literacy practices in earlier chapters. In fact, 19-year-old Hosoo successfully transitioned from a novice to a full-fledged member of the academic discourse community at the undergraduate level by channeling his comprehension to critical consciousness and towards creative literacy practices. Nana, on the other hand, showed an assimilation attitude on the surface level; however, she demonstrated a critical epistemology toward general and specific composition curricula and was quick to notice what she termed the discourse of commercialization. Nana discovered that the best way to improve her situation was to get high GRE scores and leave the research institution at her earliest opportunity: “I had stress at that time, but I tried to solve the problem and improved myself...” (01/23/09, email).

Within this process of critical academic becoming, the evolution of the students’ academic literacy stances overlaps with the stances developed in the process of their
larger Discourse socialization in the research institution and the social Inner Circle setting. This proves that learning is not only a cognitive phenomenon but also a social one by which individuals are influenced. As novices in American academic culture and outsiders of American culture in general, at this second phase in their academic socialization, these students began to break the romanticized notion of the Inner Circle with their experiences in policy and social Discourse. The Discourse of citizenship (e.g., Quan’s cancelled internship opportunity during the summer of 2008 due to the new school policy for international students’ enrollment; Ming’s frustration with her inability to get an internship because of her nationality), real or perceived discrimination (e.g., Hosoo’s accounts in Chapter 4), and commercialization (e.g., Sisley’s report to the study group members that the research institution recruits international students for financial purposes) seemed to break their romanticized notion of the Inner circle and provoked them to build a resistance which was not necessarily linguistically articulated (i.e, Quan and Sisley). This developing resistance, influenced by objective facts that these students were newly exposed to or had experienced, shifted their sense of euphoria to a more critical stance in their academic socialization phases.

The third phase in international students’ academic socialization was continuous evolution of the self, which involved moving to a sense of themselves as apprentices in different academic or professional communities. These students’ Inner Circle college experiences are indeed transitional with respect to their longitudinal life trajectory and they left the research institution with various critical stances on their socialization experiences. Joon started his professional career in 2009 in Korea, training himself in the
company culture that he had not experienced before. His messenger identification shows his sense of belonging by displaying himself as “Apprentice [Joon]—[BADA] LOGISTICS” (03/09). Nana achieved her goal of entering a prestigious graduate school and obtaining a renowned international organization scholarship after six months: “I miss the productive conversation with you. you always helped me! Even though I have difficulty to catch up with class and manage my schedule... I enjoy or prefer graduate study more” (12/19/08, email). Nana further identified herself in relation to the larger discourse community of health care, which was different from her undergraduate milieu where she focused only on the academic community and tried to meet the instructor’s expectations. Her affect of belonging to a larger discourse community broadened in her graduate school where she sensed a sort of self-evolution on the professional level: “I feel we learn more depth and professional knowledge and skills in graduate school, [which will give me] strong competence to work in the field” (12/19/08, email). Likewise, Hosoo went back to Korea to explore other opportunities such as taking the Korean college entrance exam, transferring to other American universities, or even coming back to the research institution (11/08, informal discussion). 13 Indeed, socialization is a lifelong process and therefore, these students will be apprentices in multiple communities. Their negotiation of self in relation to other discourse communities will continue because the relationship of an individual learner and the social context is “dynamic, reflexive and constantly changing” (Mitchell & Myles, 2001, p. 25).

---

13 On the other hand, I heard Hosoo tell Ming that he would not come back to the research institution (12/08, informal talk with Hosoo and Ming).
It is important to remember that the critical academic socialization process is not a simple boundary crossing from the euphoria phase. The negotiation between euphoria and situated reality can be painstaking and time-consuming. Even Hosoo showed a reluctance to shift from the euphoria phase in the Inner Circle setting. It was especially surprising for me to observe Hosoo’s resistance to Sisley’s report on the commercialization discourse of the research institution because he seemed to have already developed a critical and creative stance in his writing. Contrary to his creative resistance to the dominant discourse in his writing, Hosoo underwent a period of serious negotiation in which he explored his future as an individual in real life. I was not aware of Hosoo’s negotiation phase from euphoria to critical consciousness until he sought my opinion in November, 2008. In doubt about his different future options, Hosoo collected all the fact-based data he could about placements and graduate funding for the Sports Marketing field at the research institution. Drawing on facts and objective data, Hosoo accepted Sisley’s report about the commercialization discourse of the research institution after seven months of her talk – a stance that opposed his romanticized notion of the Inner Circle he hoped to stay in. The negotiation period was not short for Ming, either. Her endeavor to secure an internship opportunity helped her realize the discourse of citizenship. However, her father maintained his belief about the Inner Circle country and wanted Ming to stay at the research institution and graduate earlier to reduce the financial burden (03/09, informal group discussion). Her father’s decision seemed to lead

---

14 According to Ming, her father, who has a Ph. D degree in Chinese literature and teaches college, believes that American universities are the best in the world (02/08, interview). Finally, Ming decided to go to graduate school, registering in a GRE cram school in China during the summer of 2009 (05/09, informal discussion).
her into a longer negotiation phase of the reality that Ming had confronted. Given her own endeavor and observation of her Chinese seniors to find an internship opportunity, Ming was in the negotiation phase of critical academic becoming, looking for a “miracle” internship to come her way (02/09, informal discussion), and eventually deciding to go to graduate school as a practical solution (05/09, informal discussion).

The silent resistance of Nana, Hosoo, Quan, and Ming to the social systems that they were situated in was explicit in their academic socialization in the Inner Circle setting. These students were not simply assimilated. While managing to achieve high GPAs, they kept a critical stance toward their situations, while their home peers envied them and their parents pressured them to academically succeed.

The diachronic three phases of academic socialization (i.e., euphoria—critical academic becoming—evolution) in my model counter the myth of assimilation in Schumann’s (1978, see also Brown, 2000) acculturation model proposed three decades ago. Although few studies have revealed the longitudinal trajectory of L2 undergraduates’ experiences in the Inner Circle, the findings of this study enables me to propose a term for understanding critical academic socialization because students make active negotiation of meaning in the situated Discourse and identify themselves in the glocalized world for situating themselves in their possible future. In the next section, I model three synchronic dimensions of academic socialization, portraying how these

---

15 Longitudinal studies regarding the L2 undergraduate group are hard to find. Zappa-Hollman (2007) studied Mexican undergraduates’ transition to a prestigious university in Canada. However, because Zappa-Hollman states that the Mexican students’ SES is high, that the host university is one of the top three universities in Canada, and that the students are relatively short-term exchange students, I do not consider her study to be comparable to my dissertation.
students’ cases defy the assumed happy-ending assimilation discourses of L2 users in Inner Circle settings.

**Contextual levels of learning in academic socialization.** In Chapters 2 through 4, I emphasized academic identity negotiation by focusing on each student’s academic learning. Academic achievement would be primary in students’ academic socialization. In fact, my division of students’ need to negotiate their writing practices in particular and their academic learning in general into analytical frameworks (i.e., intercultural, interdisciplinary, and intertextual levels) create the possibility for researchers to collect data that are fundamental to shedding light on students’ learning processes. In the data, for example, at the intercultural level, literacy education based on contrastive rhetoric still exists in culture-specific humanities writing (e.g., Matsuda, 2003); however, my findings illustrate that the existence of contrastive rhetoric may not account for students’ transition to American academic discourse in writing. Instead, students, according to the data, struggle to develop awareness in meta-learning or adapt to meta-genres (Carter, 2007) of learning across the curriculum at the interdisciplinary level. Because a disciplinary discourse focuses on a distinct nature of knowledge and ways to warrant it, each student was responsible for reflecting on his/her learning and awareness of meta-genre across the curriculum. On an intertextual level, furthermore, the three focal students had different trajectories to be aware of in order to improve their non-native accents in spoken and written English.

**Sites of learning in academic socialization.** Along with the contextual levels of learning in academic socialization, the classroom and the out-of-classroom sites (e.g.,
dorm, lab meeting, online) appear important for increasing learning outcomes. Due to the nature of the undergraduate curriculum, the three focal students had few interactional opportunities with other native-like English users in out-of-classroom sites. Therefore, the three focal students’ cases illustrate that the forced living environment with native speakers may positively impact L2 students’ development of speaking skills. Level of speaking practice and interactional opportunities in the living environment improve academic socialization process, which is consistent with Mitchell’s and Myles’ (2001) argument that language “learners are essentially social and learning process is social.” This statement underscores the significance of accessibility and participation opportunities of the L2 population with native-like English users in the U.S. It is ironic to see a pattern where L2 students, who might have come to the Inner Circle to improve their English with contact with native-like users, receive social and academic scaffolding from other L2 students, as depicted in prior literature (e.g., Myles & Cheng, 2003; Zappa-Hollman, 2007b). Ming and Quan were mainly assigned labor-intensive positions.16 When Hosoo was assigned to live with other Korean and Chinese speakers in his second academic year, he realized that living with three American roommates during his first year provided him the opportunity to speak in English in an English-rich environment and gain access to American undergraduates’ extra-curricular activities such as soccer games. From Hosoo’s perspective, living with American roommates was the most important factor for him to improve his spoken English. We should consider not only the

16 Quan in his first two years and Ming in her second year worked at the cafeteria in my dorm. As I conducted my dissertation data analysis and writing at the cafeteria, I had opportunities to observe what they did and we chatted during their break time. Ming described that cleaning was not a fun job for her (03/09, informal talk).
intra-comparison of Hosoo’s forced environment to use English in his first year and few opportunities in his second year, but also the inter-comparison between Hosoo and Nana who lives alone and Joon who lived with his sister and later with other Korean students. This inter-comparison may explain the significance of a forced interactional environment to use English for L2 students in observing how native speakers use English with other native speakers, which allows them to notice their incorrect priming caused by mental translation from L1 meaning to L2 expression. By observing how native speakers communicate in authentic contexts, Hosoo built a language repertoire similar to a native speaker’s and additionally gained access to the American undergraduate culture. Hosoo’s opportunity to observe and speak with native speakers was the biggest difference between him and the two other participants, Nana and Joon.

For international L2 students, language proficiency usually matters. Both cases of Yuko (Spack, 2004) and Yang (Leki, 2007) address language barriers in learning academic literacies in the Inner Circle setting. Although interpretative frames in learning to write or cultural frames of language use are important to identity seeing, believing, and guessing about the community, international undergraduates still lack language repertoires as a textual practice. Leki (1997) addresses that Yang’s “language proficiency was not unidimensional but had a differential impact on her studies and her success or failure depending on what kind of an activity system they were employed in” (p. 113). Language deficiency matters because it can cause the breakdown of communication, resulting in misunderstanding and “differential treatment of domestic and [L2] students” (p. 113). Yang’s lament that “life would be much easier for her if her English were better”
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(p. 120) addresses the paradox that international student come to the Inner Circle setting hoping to increase their language ability; however, the contextual examination of my study and prior literature illustrates that international students flock around their nationality groups and other international students. In other words, there might be an illusion that L2 language develops once students arrive in the Inner Circle setting. This signifies that language use opportunities in the out-of-classroom sites are critical in their development of language proficiency.

An administrative support system for learning in the out-of-classroom site seems to be fundamental in L2 students’ successful socialization. Instances like Nana’s dependence on her 1.5 generation friend (i.e., her lack of access to native speakers of English in the U.S.) and Ming’s request to her 1.5 generation friend to help Hosoo proofread his papers in his second year demonstrate that there is “no place,” as Nana puts it (Chapter 3), for international students to receive assistance in correct language use, although some instructors wanted students’ papers to be proofread by native speakers. Ming visited two job fairs to seek an internship opportunity in her major but was frustrated with them because she found it very hard for international students to even apply for an internship. Ming’s case is another example that illustrates that this university manages unpractical services for the international student population. By accumulating these facts based on their experiences, L2 students seemed to learn that it is efficient to resort to other international students to seek practical information that cater to their needs. It may not be surprising to note students’ resistance to the administrative system because six international students stated that they pay more than 2.5 times the tuition of domestic
students with very few funding opportunities in comparison to domestic students and receiving very little specialized administrative services.\textsuperscript{17}

As shown in the above three dimensions of academic socialization, cognitive learning would not only account for the entire academic socialization process. For L2 students, interaction with English speakers and the institutional support system would be crucial for them to achieve their learning goals. Especially, in addition to improving language proficiency, interactional opportunities seem to be pivotal for them to build interpretative frames (Tannen, 1993) that may be foreign to them. In the next section, I will deconstruct the learning spaces which students move across by mapping their individual coordination and collaboration with others.

\textit{Mode of learning academic socialization}. Chapters 2 through 4 depict that learning outcomes can be individual, but the learning process is social through interaction with various social resources. Dialogic scaffolding through dialogic thinking was an effective strategy for producing individuals’ efficient learning outcomes.\textsuperscript{18} In addition to individual cognitive learning, the classroom is a collaborative space of learning; more importantly, students in this study demonstrated out-of-classroom collaboration where

\textsuperscript{17} Nana’s question about the role of the writing center for international students may be legitimate; however, the research participants who are relatively young with no prior professional career experiences did not note that the policy of the writing center, for instance, can be shifted with their collective voice. As shown by the examples of Nana, Joon, Ming, and Hosoo, they wondered who to secure as native speakers to proofread their papers and eventually used the online editing services once they were informed of its existence (e.g., Nana).

\textsuperscript{18} This significant finding of using a social network sharply contrasts Hana, a low achieving student, who did not know how to seek help during her more than three years of undergraduate residency at the same institution, even though she was Nana’s best friend. Nana, Joon, and Hana are all peers who attended an informal monthly international student group through which I accessed the culture of how international students share information, help each other, and become close friends.
they sought feedback from instructors, collaborated with their voluntary online and offline study groups, and endeavored to secure writing samples for each other.

In alignment with Vygotskian (1978) scaffolding in the learning process, all of the study’s students also preferred an expert’s feedback after recognizing its significance (cf. Nana). Their preference for expert feedback increased upon learning the outcome that met the evaluator’s expectations. More importantly, this study sheds light on the empirical reality that undergraduates prefer to work in a group, while warranting a Neo-Vygotskian (De Lisi, R., & Golbeck, 1999) view that peer-group scaffolding is also effective to increase learning outcomes. My finding is significant especially because interactional data explicates how students, while helping others, can create learning opportunities for themselves. My argument explains why all group members in the study group showed satisfaction that changed my initial hypothesis, which was that high achieving students might not feel satisfied when comparing their contribution and their learning outcome. In addition to students’ satisfaction, seen in interviews and their continuous attendance in the study group, the benefit of our study group can be primarily warranted with the fact that three of the four study group members began to seek other pair or group for work in other content classes (i.e., Hosoo, Ming, and Quan). The scholarly debate on the effectiveness of homogeneity and heterogeneity ability grouping of peers in learning outcomes is on-going (Retrieved May 1, 2009, from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues046.shtml); however, at least in my peer
review data and the accounting test, heterogeneous ability grouping also proved to be effective for students filling each others’ knowledge gaps and sharing their reasoning on authentic problem solutions.

Students not only benefited from dialogic scaffolding through instructors, peers, writing center tutors, and family members, but also from samples of specific genre of writing. Joon’s imitation of writing genres and students’ interaction data illustrate that there are two levels of learning: declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge learning. Students suffered identification of the genre of writing by generalizing writing rules that they accumulated in composition classes. Therefore, dialogic scaffolding is made not only by interaction but also by who can acquire the best samples for a specific assignment. In Quan’s words, “We learn better with samples” (04/08, study group interaction). Quan requested another sample from me: “i would like you to help me on doing my research proposal as this is my 3rd assignment in Eng110 class. If you could do that, i will much appreciate. If you have the example of the research proposal, that would be even great” (05/03/08, email). Their need for writing samples is shown in Hosoo’s account that he struggled with the genre expectation of writing assignments in his Human Development and Family Science course: “If you do, Could you please [give] some advices.. Also, there is a lot of works to write..and I kinda don’t get what the professor

39 One thing that lab-based peer homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping study cannot warrant is the significance of interpersonal relationships in the dialogic scaffolding process. Effective in my study group is the group culture where students help each other and grow together as a community. In my observation, these students created a supportive culture by themselves and advocated their lack of expression that “Americans do not sometimes understand us” at which the use of “us” implies group solidarity. In particular, in the use of language, Ming was supportive of Hosoo’s weakness in language use by showing her empathy, which seemed to explain why Ming and Hosoo became best friends.
wants” (09/28/09, email). The instructor’s verbal account of the genre was alien to these novice writers because they needed procedural knowledge through genre-specific writing samples. In other words, writing samples were significant to scaffold these students’ learning. Students sought help from other students who took the course in advance and secured samples, as experienced by the struggling learner, Joon, and high-achieving student, Quan. However, Nana, the high achiever in learning outcomes, also wanted me to send samples of grant writing proposals (03/13/08, final interview) when she was expected to do an internship at a health organization in Switzerland. This internship was arranged by her graduate program that she began in AU 2008 where grant writing was her main job duty. It was students’ social networking ability that allowed them to obtain writing samples for their efficient learning by analyzing the genre expectations that their instructors assumed. Indeed, the learning outcome also partially depended on their accessibility to social resources such as getting hold of writing samples.

In this way, the research participants were able to increase their learning outcomes through seeking scaffolding from people or writing samples. Students needed various scaffolding from the social network to improve their learning outcomes or to perform their tasks: “Learning is not in heads, but in the relations between people [to secure writing samples and to build a culture of support]. Learning is in the conditions that bring people together and organize a point of contact that allows for particular pieces of information to take on relevance... Learning does not belong to individual persons, but to the various conversations of which they are a part” (McDermott, 1993, p. 292).
McDermott’s quotation underscores the significance of *social capital* (Bourdier, 1986) in students’ successful academic socialization.

The cognitive approach to learning theory suggests that the three students should negotiate the tensions and conflicts at different levels of intercontextuality, as discussed earlier. Indeed, in my study, cognitive coordination is significant for meta-learning that helps students better understand the tensions and conflicts of learning spaces. However, more significantly, the data also show that the social approach, including individual’s accessibility to learning opportunities (i.e., language and content), school administrative systems (e.g., writing center, job fair), and the social network surrounding each focal student (e.g. international students’ small group gathering, a study group of L2 students), was important for them to effectively achieve their learning outcomes. Students’ academic success would depend upon how they use social resources, even though the degree of needs might vary. Therefore, “collaboration, cooperation, and coordination on a moment-to-moment basis [were] required” for students’ academic socialization process “to be meaningful and successful” (He, 2003, p. 143).

Using diachronic and synchronic dimensions of academic socialization, I have so far provided an ecological picture of an individual’s academic socialization process. Different aspects of the process of academic socialization show why the “whole social person” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 653, cited in Roberts, 2001, p. 109) should become the minimal unit of analysis for understanding literacy. Importantly, this argument is opposed to the contrasting cognitive view, which tries to dissect an individual into smaller units of attributes and skills, such as language proficiency. Because a whole person is a minimal
unit of analysis for literacy studies, a person’s literacy stance — Joon’s analytical literacy, Nana’s questioning literacy, and Hosoo’s contesting literacy — is most important to his belonging in a particular community. L2 students’ being, becoming, and belonging in a situated community is important not only for individual socialization but also because L2 students as a group of newcomers create a local hybrid culture in relation to existing old-timers. Because ethnographic research serves to investigate local meaning, local culture, and the culture of a group of people in a situated context, in the next section, I depict the localized culture created by a group of L2 undergraduates, a culture that I have identified as silent resistance.

**The Culture of Silent Resistance: Monologic Voice**

Central to understanding L2 students’ academic becoming is the culture of silent resistance that students seem to develop in relation to the discourses of commercialization and citizenship that surround them. The contradiction between their initial romanticization of the Inner Circle setting and the reality of the situation that they chose to situate themselves in seem to lead the participants to formulate distinct resistance positions. Countering the myth of silent transience and assimilation to academic discourses of the Inner Circle setting (e.g., Schumann’s acculturation model, 1978), the research participants developed distinct critical stances towards the discourses they experienced. As Canagajarah (1999) explained, “[t]here are sufficient contradictions within institutions to help subjects gain agency, conduct critical thinking, and initiate change” (p. 22). However, Roberts’ (2001) argument that “the institutions where language socialization can take place represent what is different, ‘other’ even hostile and
discriminatory” (p. 119) for the immigrant labor population in the U.K. would be too strong to describe the situation of the self-sponsored student population. Nevertheless, the research students struggled for meaning while experiencing various levels of “unfavorable treatment” (Hosoo’s phrase in Chapter 4), especially in relation to the discourses of citizenship and commercialization (e.g., Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Haneda, 2006).

In this study, international students transitioned into the academic becoming phase using their distinctive critical lens. In a situation which might be the hard reality they experience after awakening from the euphoria phase, these students strived to create their own possibilities for the future after internalizing the instability of their social status and understanding their apprehension for failure. These students sought to negotiate tensions and conflicts that they face, resulting from their status as non-resident aliens, which eventually required their agency for their decisive moves for their future. They struggled for their own meaning by crossing the unstable communicative boundaries of nationality, language, and disciplinary content; in turn, case studies on three focal students portray that these students may have constructed their own hybrid space of negotiating dominant discourse through proposing counter discourse in their mind.

In the asymmetrical milieu of power and conflict, students’ culture of resistance to the system would be almost not publicly heard. Often, rather than publicly or loudly resisting the unique challenges of their situation, in my research participant pool, these students blamed themselves for the state of their difficulties. In real life, no research participant took a directly oppositional stance. Instead, they blamed themselves because they thought that it was their own fault for not knowing the reality of the research
institution before they arrived (i.e. Nana, Quan, and Sisley) or by just following the advice from the study abroad agencies that seek to heighten the admission rate to advertise their success rate (i.e., Hosoo and Ming).

The research participants made the decision to graduate quickly or left the research institution silently but with resistance.²⁰ Some of them (i.e., Hosoo, Nana, and Quan) tried to transfer to other schools; however, due to multiple overlapping constraints such as time, family control, and apprehension of adaptation to the new environment, most of them (cf. Hosoo) remained at the research institution, while questioning their own qualifications (i.e., Quan blaming himself for the possibility of not being accepted to Berkeley) or fearing that one more transfer would delay their graduation and/or increase their financial cost (i.e., Nana and Quan). Hosoo’s decision to leave might have been easier compared to the other research participants because he was a first-year student who had just started his college experience at the research institution. In Joon’s case, through experiencing the Inner Circle where he had no other opportunity to be a blue-color part-time cheap laborer, just like Quan and Ming who tried their best to secure internship opportunities, he realized the significance of the opportunity to seek a decent job in his home country.

²⁰ Examples include “I heard from my friend when she is exchange or intl student in a Japanese university. The school will actually assign (or volunteer) one japanese student to the new intl student in order to help the new student to catch up on academic and also in daily living. Compare to [the Japanese university], [the research institution] is very unfriendly and provide less help to the intl students” (01/09/09, email); “i heard being honored students does not guarantee any scholarship [to international students]. the scholarship might be something from their government” (05/07/09, online communication). In informal talk, students responded about their experience as not recommending the research institution to their biological “brother” and their own future “kids,” although there are counter evidences: Joon and Quan chose to attend the research institution because their siblings were attending when they arrived in the research institution.
This culture of silent resistance is not a new social phenomenon in describing a few L2 undergraduates. Matsuda (2008), who was an international undergraduate in the 1990’s at an American state university, has become a renowned L2 compositionist addresses L2 international students’ status in American universities:

Many of them contribute to the visible diversity and enhance the international flavor of the campus. They would bring foreign capital—they are required to demonstrate that they have sufficient financial means to fund their entire course of study and cover the cost of living. They pay full tuition because they don’t qualify for many scholarships and financial aids. At state institutions, they usually pay the out-of-state rate because they are not considered residents even when they pay full taxes in the state. They also maintain full-time status because their visa status requires it. They also bring cheap (and legal) labor to campus because they are not allowed to work off campus due to visa regulations. (Retrieved April 1, 2009, from http://cccc-blog.blogspot.com/search/label/Paul%20Kei%20Matsuda)

Despite international students’ financial contribution to university that Matsuda (2008) mentions and their own increased awareness in the discourses of commercialization and citizenship, international undergraduates’ lack of social experience to tackle situated problems and family pressure to finish quickly often seem to prompt them to endure unfavorable treatment. Diversity is a catch phrase at the university

---

21 The estimate for the university revenue reaches over $22,954,737 from 1,202 international undergraduates in the academic year of 2005-2006, although $249,893 in need and non-need based financial aid was provided to them. This is in sharp contrast to the university policy for minority students that are U.S. citizens, in which at least 50% to 60% of African American students receive a needs-based scholarship; international students are not regarded as minorities (May 7, 2009, email with a university section director and publicized statistical summary on the web).
that is used to include opening American university doors to international undergraduates, even though this also implies welcoming the “foreign capital” in Matsuda’s description that they bring (see also Leki, 2007).

While critics like Matsuda (2008) have a platform and a voice to describe this situation within the Inner Circle, undergraduates with minimal social experiences not only do not know how to address their “unfavorable treatment” experiences but are often blinded by their initial euphoria phase. They are also unable to determine whether they are treated unfavorably until their peers point out what their experiences mean (i.e., Hosoo). By accumulating situated experiences and consequently breaking from the euphoria phase, students seem to build their silent resistance over time while painfully learning what it means to be non-residential aliens, an institutional phrase that refers to international students and represent their lack of belonging in the discourses of commercialization and citizenship in the Inner Circle education.

The earlier studies on L2 undergraduates addressed situated and different literacy practices across learning contexts and required that students should be sensitize themselves to the different demands of writing (e.g., Spack, 1997). While focusing on writing and literacy skills development, composition instruction provides “students with opportunities to practice reading and writing activities that lead to conscious awareness of the deeper level of engagement” in cognitive learning and writing development

---

22 The research institution president heralds that “to open doors still wider to international students” is helpful for the research institution to be “a truly global university.” For “[the research institution] to learn outside our borders,” (retrieved April 1, 2009, from the university website) international students are expected to bring the “foreign capital” (Matsuda, 2008), even though international students represented as the research participants may not be aware of what it means when they arrive on to campus.
(Sternglass, 2004, p. 58), However, the situated view of writing more centers around identity negotiation whereby bringing students’ autobiographic selves to the new context becomes a critical area of concern. Students’ learning academic literacies start meaning making in the context, which is beyond the level of a textual meaning making process. Nana, for example, developed her questioning literacy because the ESL five-paragraph essayist training contradicts her understanding of various genres of Japanese writing, which means that her literacy demanded her to perform an identity negotiation at the institutional level. Another instance is Hosoo who developed his contesting literacy by applying the textual concept of minority to his identification in the U.S. Parallel to my findings, Leki (2007) argues that learning is “a fundamentally social process,” addressing prior studies that “shed light primarily on the development of writing skills, their relentless focus on writing” (p. 12). In other words, learning to write in the Inner Circle becomes “worthwhile challenges that any border crossings do, the opportunity to rethink

23 When academic fields of composition or literacies studies refer to L2 students, they usually refer to the large population of immigrants or refugees (e.g., Nam in Herrinton & Curtis, 2000), and international students in general. This generalization makes it difficult to analyze case-based findings of the L2 population. L1 studies perceive the L2 population in comparison to the L1 group, which also includes L2 students with visas. However, L2 students with visas may have different characteristics and goals that distinguish them from the whole range of L2 students who have gone through K-12 education in the U.S. or equivalent Inner Circle countries. For example, Strenglass (1997) cites Ricardo, Delores, and Jacob as members of the L2 population. However, Declores arrived in the U.S. at the age of 14, while Jacob had studied in Australia, which is part of the Inner Circle, where he attended elementary and high school education. Because Sternglass calls Jacob “the prototypical ‘insider’” (p. xxi) in her study, it is hard to tell whether Jacob is a typical international student who has few foreign experiences. In my view, Ricardo who came to the U.S. at the age of 21 from Puerto Rico can be compared to the participants of my study; however, Stenglass focuses on Ricardo’s linguistic difficulties in her study.
and reinterpret the invisible ideological frames that occlude some perceptions and enhance others” (p. 119).

In the prior literature of L2 international students on the graduate level, resistance is not uncommon in the cultural clash between self and academic discourse (e.g., Surya and Carla in Fox, 1994; Virginia in Casanave, 2002). On the undergraduate level, Spack (1997) “see[s] accommodation when something else was actually taking place” (Spack, 1997, p. 47). By “something else,” Spack views Yuko as “not passive learner, ready to follow any educational approach” (p. 48); rather, Yuko was an active manipulation of the system” (p. 48) in the competing discourses of the Japanese ways and American ways of writing. Because learning is mediated by institutional and larger social discourses, learning to write in the Inner Circle is beyond accumulating writing skills; for this reason, I don’t think it is quite clear that Yuko was resisting to the western ways of writing, as opposed to the graduate students in Fox (1994) who were explicit in addressing their identity concerns. Carla, a psychology graduate student from China, states that “[l]earning to write in an American style, it is much more than learning a new technique” (p. 77). Fox argues that international students resist “the western view” (p. 74) or ideological domination of how writing should be. Therefore, mixing and merging different writing demands is beyond learning skills, which demands inevitable identity negotiation through “rebelling to write” the American way (p. 72) in the clash of world views in writing cultures. Carla in particular describes that “I was afraid that I forced myself to write in this new style. [...] I need to change to survive here,” just as Nana in Chapter 2 expressed her concern regarding the essayist tradition. In sum, writing to learn
becomes more than building writing skills. Nevertheless, students’ voices are not necessarily heard in their texts as they negotiate their identities. In fact, Nana’s case can warrant that international undergraduates appear as acquiescent assimilators when listening to their American instructors; however, Nana’s heart resisted the American institutional discourse regarding how a text is produced, distributed, and consumed (Fairclough, 1992). In this way, Nana employed agency in looking at the two geographic worlds; despite her sense of permanent exclusion as a non-native English speaker, Nana can be considered “a successful intercultural speaker, not merely an unsuccessful imitator of a native speaker” (Roberts et al., 2001, p. 240).

In Hosoo’s case, in comparison to Nana, the resistance is much more explicit because his resistance is grounded on reading words and worlds. Although Hosoo accepted the larger situated Discourses of commercialization and citizenship in the Inner Circle, he chose to voice his concerns through linguistic action in his first-year composition writing. Furthermore, Joon’s addressing of international undergraduates’ resistance in the inclusive first-year composition class practices informs us how international first-year students can be critical, creative, and productive agents of their social identities. In choosing to address or not to address their concerns, these students’ position as international students “resisting alone, without the support of a group, [can be] difficult and in some circumstances [can be] pointless” (Leki, 2007, p. 280). Community or dialogic voice, therefore, can help these students act together to achieve their social goals and social relationships in collaboration; community or dialogic voice also can
advocate the “local, historical, and interactive aspects of the context that writers in academic setting construct for themselves” (Casanave, 1995, p. 88).

In crossing the communicative boundaries across nationality and languages, academic socialization is more than “issues beyond text and beyond language” (Leki, 1992, p. 3) as students navigate institutional and larger social discourses. In other words, these students need to build sociocultural and discourse competence in addition to linguistic competence. In undergraduates’ learning and using academic language, “asymmetry is inherent to academic writing games, [which] contributes to change as newcomers develop embodied knowledge through interactions over time” (Casanave, 2002, p. 262). While learning different textual demands of writing, in the situated context of the Inner Circle, undergraduate students’ identities are “always in the process of reconstructing themselves, always in the process of transition particularly in the settings where people are learning to participate in practices that are not yet routine to them” (p. 264). More importantly, my study empirically demonstrates that these students can be distinct cultural constructors by bridging two separate worlds of writing and creating their being in the intercultural space, which is “in between two cultures, at home in neither one of them” (Fox, 1994, p. 71). This bridging happens while students acknowledge the commonalities of writing across cultures (i.e., awareness of different writing according to the purpose as shown in Nana [Chapter 3] and Yuko, Spack, 2004) and differences of it.

Leki (2007) emphasizes the socioacademic relationships in L2 students’ academic socialization. While 26-year-old Yuko had steady three study group friends, which provided a “safe place” to “discuss grievances, problems, or victories, and a place
to be cherished and admired.” Through collegial relationship with others, she had a strong sense of belonging and bonding with other classmates. In Yuko’s case, group work itself “was neither a plague nor great boon, but the informal work... with her little clique, proved to be socially quite vital” (p. 220). This socioacademic relationship with others figured more importantly for 36-year-old Yang, who borrowed classmates’ course notes which contributed to her academic success. As international L2 students inevitably engage “with otherness of their new environment not just as an opportunity to improve linguistic competence and their ability to produce appropriate utterances, but as whole social beings who are developing, defining and being defined in terms of their interactions with other social beings” (Roberts et al., 2001, p. 237), learning academic literacies in the Inner Circle becomes the negotiation experience of their social identities.

Although their units of data analysis were much more individual, Leki (1997) and Roberts et al., (2001) identify the “notion of interculturality” which adds to the significance of “social identities involved in any interaction, and the significance of understanding the constantly changing worlds and lives of ‘the other.’” (p. 241). My study also herald how students broaden their social networks of support by strengthening their social relationships. Grounded on the safe house of international students’ study group, Hosoo’s case portrays how learning though group interaction is constructed and negotiated over time. Hosoo’s academic socialization “path was made easier by being part of [...] a small socioacademic group that worked together closely” (Leki, 2007, p. 230) where the accumulated declarative and procedural knowledge of writing were built,
in addition to his accumulation of knowledge on the larger social discourse (i.e., notion of minority) and administrative information about the research institution.

In my study, the silent resistance is primarily monologic because it takes time for students to realize what their experiences mean, students do not have information to compare systems, and there seems to be no platform for student voices to be heard within the system. Eventually, these students began to question the romanticized notion of the Inner Circle and euphoria with their experiences. In turn, they negotiated the gap between reality and their euphoria, creating situated meaning and seeking future possibilities by leaving the research institution. Silent resistance is not simply self-doubt or acquiescence to the hidden expectations of the Inner Circle. These students blamed themselves for not knowing the existing discourse. However, blaming themselves regarding their choice of school through study abroad agencies or personal connections is not simply self-doubt nor being acquiescent or submissive to the expectations of the Inner Circle university. In contrast to the idealized resistance theories which “initiate change” (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 22), in empirical reality, most students monologically negotiated the discourses of commercialization and citizenship, seeking individual future possibilities by leaving silently but are adamantly resistant to the current status quo. The change of these students over years through their study abroad may not be heard by others as they used in their monologic voices and left. Yet, the true change through studying abroad seems to have

---

As shown in the presented data, students seemed to keep themselves in the euphoria phase to rationalize their choice of studying abroad. In my interviews, students were cautious to describe the discourse of discriminatory practices; yet, they (including pilot study students) seemed to agree that it is the moment when they seek an internship or job employment opportunity that they confront the discourse of commercialization and citizenship with their heart. In the pilot study, as students graduated without getting jobs which they hoped would pay back their tuition, their voice of silent resistance became explicit to me.
come from the mindset of these students as being sensitive to the hidden ideology in the
discourses of commercialization and the citizenship of the Inner Circle, in turn,
broadening their worldview. Being silent implies monologic voice; however, the culture
of silent resistance is neither self-doubt nor acquiescence, which is disruptive or being
tamed to the dominant discourse. Their silent resistance is a counter-discourse that is
dialectic to the dominant discourse of the Inner Circle.

In the development of their culture of silent resistance, some students (e.g., Hosoo,
Joon, Nana, and Ming) showed hybridization in the dichotomy between being non-native
speakers of English, non-white, and non-U.S. citizens, while glocalizing themselves by
identifying their future in either their home country or in third countries. Their
identification as social beings was, therefore, dynamic and resilient from their
introduction to the situated Inner Circle setting and to the unknown geographic space of
their future. As foreigners with distinct autobiographical selves, these students’
negotiation of self was a richer engagement whereby they continuously compared and
contrasted their past in their home countries and their present in the situation of other
universities in the U.S. and third countries. Their rich engagement in the meaning-making
process can be expressed as “selectively assimilating the words of others” (Bakhtin, 1981,
p. 341) and placing themselves in “a hybrid process of both learning to belong and yet
remaining apart” (Roberts, 2001, p. 116) from the dominant discourse of the Inner Circle
setting. Indeed, L2 undergraduates are not necessarily assimilators to the ideology given
to them. The participant trajectory shows how L2 students would grow as cosmopolitan
individuals who have multiple memberships in their home countries, outsiders to the
commercialization and citizenship discourse in the Inner Circle, and the future dweller of some country on the globe (see Figure 5.1).

Because their primary culture can be epitomized as *monologic* silent resistance, Hosoo’s voice in writing in his first-year composition class is important because his voice is intended to be *dialogic* to implement his desire for social change and transformation in communication.

In the land of a foreign or strange country, these students mainly kept a monologic voice in comparison to a dialogic voice. The forms of their voices were different; however, the common thread through either a monologic or dialogic form of voice is their counter discourse of resistance to commercialism and citizenship. These students’ active meaning-making and their ways of being in the Inner Circle, as shown in their attitude to solve the situated reality and move forward to create their own future, demonstrate how human beings are *resiliently* adapting to the environment and, more importantly, creating the hybrid discourse.
The Deficiency Ideology on L2 Users as the Other in the Inner Circle

The overt citizenship discourse and covert commercialization discourse of the research institution are embedded in a larger discourse that identifies L2 English users as an inferior Other. Parallel with the fact that the research participants came to the Inner Circle with a romanticized view of how things would be, the perspective of the Inner Circle on L2 users may be grounded on the idea of the Other as inferior. These self-sponsored students come to the Inner Circle to improve their English in an authentic context; but, paradoxically, their access to native English users is limited in the Inner Circle and the school does not provide curriculum targeted for them (e.g., English speaking classes) or administrative services that are specific for this population (e.g., internship opportunities for L2 students and making a new school policy of L2 students’ enrollment for accepting individual internship offers). As established above, the research
participants mostly remained silent on their rights, blaming themselves for their struggles or sought ways to transfer or leave. However, their silence does not mean that these students are immune to the discourses of commercialization and citizenship; rather, they become sensitized to the position of the international Other given to them. Even though American universities “compete for the money they bring” (Leki, 2007, p. 285), there seems to be little public space for L2 students to advocate for their rights and vocalize their issues.

Nevertheless, the relationship between each student participant and the situated social context is dynamic and fluid. These students reflect their acclimation to the dominant discourse of the Inner Circle as non-residential aliens and consequently, they engage in rethinking/revaluing the discourse of their home countries while exploring the possibility for the future in their home or third countries. Indeed, their identification to the American situation was constantly evolving over time and expanding to other countries. The college experience in the U.S. is, in fact, a provisional space of lifelong becoming to be a cosmopolitan. Instead of remaining in the identification through blaming themselves, these students glocalized and mobilized themselves to other possibilities. Central to decoding these students’ identification across geographic

26 In addition to the lack of scholarship opportunities and low-quality administrative services, there is much anecdotal evidence of additional discriminatory practices. As young aliens in a foreign country, these students do not know how to protect themselves. Even when the university happens to engage in issues of theirs, students are not protected. For example, one pilot study student informed me that even after the course was closed down after a university investigation, an individual student experienced retaliation because he was identified as the one who had addressed the issue with the university.
27 For example, two pilot study students graduated with degrees in accounting and communication/business and are currently attending graduate schools in London, England as their third and fourth country for schooling purposes, while one engineering graduate found a job in Singapore, his third
spaces is their hybrid construction of identity in the globe (e.g., Hosoo’s negotiation of assigned and asserted identities; Nana’s exploration of her future in a third country) and, more importantly, the social impact of their acts on their local cultures like discourse hybridization (e.g., Hosoo’s critical consciousness). These students did not simply cross two national boundaries or assimilate in the discourse of the Inner Circle. Rather, they invented and re-invented themselves in the hybrid space that they created in negotiating power differences across languages, race, and nationalities, and exploring their social mobility in the globe. In the next section, grounded on the monologic voice that I have been describing for L2 student culture of silent resistance and the dialogic voice, I explicate my theory of discourse hybridization.

**Toward a Theory of Discourse Hybridization: Dialogic Voice**

![Diagram of discourse hybridization]

Figure 5.2: Discourse hybridization

In composition studies, voice has been regarded primarily as the individual’s discovery of her inner self in writing, grounded on the notion of a unitary, stable, and endowed self (e.g., Elbow, 1991; Shen, 1989). It was Harris (1997) who argued for the idea of voice outside of writing. Subsequently, Ivonic (1998) theorized writer identity as

---

28 This section is primarily copied and pasted from my candidacy paper in February 2006.
a social practice by proposing the notion of autobiographic self. Writing portrays something about the author because the author is somehow inherently embedded in the writing. In this way, writing and identity are connected and the case studies support this argument. However, this study extends the connected nature of writing and identity to literacy and identity by my use of the communicative medium of speaking and writing. Composition studies in social orientation have focused on self performance in relation to multiple discourse communities that individuals belong to, which suggests that self formulation is an on-going process of socialization and self’s positionality is a prerequisite to his performance of multiple identities across contexts.

I also focus on the relationship between self and discourse community as bi-directional, emphasizing the social consequence of one self’s act in the discourse community especially when it becomes a group’s act of dialogic voice. Traditionally, in composition scholarship, studies have focused on the self who has been enabled or constrained in its relationship with the discourse community. In a seminal study grounded
on the social orientation of composition studies to university, Bartholomae (2001) argued for the need to initiate students into the privileged discourse of academy.

Students’ initiation to academic discourse is a matter of taking a “position of privilege” by discarding the “common discourse” and students’ own discourse (p. 521). Bizzell (1986, cited in Harris, 1997, p. 103) exhibits an attitude similar to Bartholomae’s, stating that “[o]ne must first ‘go native’ [for the mastery of academic discourse]” (p. 53); thus, the students become “insiders” of the privileged, “established, and powerful discourse” (p. 516). Bartholomae (2001) and Bizzell (1982) encourage students to appropriate the privileged discourse by one-way imitation, appropriation, and acculturation. This initiation-to-community metaphor corresponds to Bakhtin’s (1981) idea of centripetal force. Students are taught to follow the norms and expectations of the discourse community, taking on the expected roles and the authoritarian language. The

---

29 Bruffee (1985, cited in Elbow, 1999a, p. 141) states, “[w]riting is not a private act. It is an aspect of social adaptation. When we write, we return conversation, displaced and internalized as thought to the social sphere where it originates” (p.2). Bruffee, one of the earliest proponents of social constructionism in composition studies, considers writers’ situated contexts and urges writers to take social roles within a discourse community. Bruffee (1986) explains that social constructionism “assumes that entities we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, selves, and so on are constructs generated by communities of like-minded peers. Social constructionism understands reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, selves, and so on as community-generated and community-maintained linguistic entities” (p. 774). Thus, “[a] writer’s language originates with the community to which he or she belongs. We use language primarily to join communities we do not yet belong to and to cement our membership in communities we already belong to” (p. 784). In brief, social constructionism argues that one’s thought, discourse, and actions are socially constructed through language. Bizzell (1989) supports this view, suggesting that “the writing a student produces can be interpreted as [a] culturally situated effort at meaning-making” (p. 226).

30 “Every time a student sits down to write for us, he has to invent the university for the occasion—invent the university, that is or a branch of it, like history or anthropology or economics or English. The student has to learn our language, to speak as we do, to try on the peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding, and arguing that define the discourse of our community” (Bartholomae, 2001, p. 511).
individual self is encouraged to follow this centripetal discursive force such as the rules of academic writing.

In the initiation metaphor, little attention has been paid to students’ conflicts with the discourse community or the differences in communities from which they come. The border between academic discourse and the discourse of students’ autobiographic selves has not been a topic of much scholarly concern. However, the discursive self does not necessarily meet the expectation of centripetal force. Students bring their various experiences with languages, formulating centrifugal forces. Therefore, there is a contact zone between the academic discourse community and the student self – his own life experiences, norms, and literacy practices. Tensions and conflicts arise due to this multiplicity and the differences of discourses, which is referred to as multiple voices (Bakhtin, 1981); however, “[a]uthoritative discourse itself does not merge with these [other types of discourses]... One must either totally affirm it, or totally reject it” (p. 343). By this quote, Bakhtin implies that an individual does not necessarily conform to the authoritarian discourse of power, although power permeates in human life. That is, individuals can reposition themselves through creating the hybrid space of negotiation by their acts of addressivity and answerability with the discourse community.31 Although discourse communities are rather stable, as shown in Bakhtin’s (1986) phrase that “all our

31 “Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear. The processes of centralization and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect in the utterance; the utterance not only answers the requirements of its own language as individualized embodiment of a speech act, but it answers the requirements of heteroglossia as well; it is in fact an active participant in such speech diversity. And this active participation of every utterance in living heteroglossia determines the linguistic profile and style of the utterance to no less degree than its inclusion in any normative-centralizing system of a unitary language” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 272).
utterances have definite and relatively stable typical forms of construction of the whole” (p. 78), however, because of the dialogic interaction of discourses, authoritarian discourse communities are not entirely stable; rather, they evolve and transform as the social consequence of human acts.

At the individual level, people are able to reaccentuate their identities through the negotiation and improvisation of centripetal and centrifugal forces of discourse. In this study, students created the culture of silent resistance in the mixing and clash of their own L1-based discourse and the discourses of commercialization and citizenship in the Inner Circle. However, as shown in Nana’s questioning literacy and Hosoo’s contesting literacy, the reaccentuation process is also a process of constructing the space of social transformation, resisting the one-way accommodation and subordination to the centripetal force. At the hybrid space of self negotiation, students have a chance to deal with these clashes and conflicts of discourses productively for Nana’s individual or Hosoo’s social purpose. Discursive friction, thus, has the potential to create a space of productive invention and renovation for individual’s appropriation of the authoritarian discourse and bring change in the community. Bakhtin’s (1981, 1986) discourse theory problematizes two concepts that are not addressed in the initiation metaphor: (a) discursive friction or conflicts due to various discourses and multiple memberships in discourse communities, which are not addressed in the initiation metaphor of a single discourse community and (b) reaccentuating through affirming or rejecting authoritative discourse.

Building upon Bakhtin’s discourse theory, I unravel discursive conflicts by first employing a contact zone metaphor and then a repositioning metaphor through
establishing their construction of the space of discourse hybridization where students actively negotiate the self and the authoritarian discourse individually or collaboratively. An individual is not complete without the fulfillment of social roles. Social role expectations differ by context, and multiple role identities from multiple memberships may overlap or conflict with each other. This space of clashes (of role, discourse, or discipline) is called different names by many sociocultural literacy scholars and theorists, including borderland (Anzaldua 1987), contact zone (Pratt, 1991), hybrid discourse (Bizzell, 1999), hybridization (Bakhtin, 1981), third space (Bhabha, 1994), and safe house (Canagarajah, 1997).

In my theorization, I distinguish the contact zone and the third space of discourse hybridization. The contact zone metaphor implies a contact space of conflict and differences, third space, where a third space is the ‘in-between’ space where multiple cultures, languages, nationality, and identities cross borders, merge, and transform into hybridity (Anzaldua 1987; Bakhtin, 1981; Bhabha, 1994; Bizzell, 1999). A third space is a contestory space that requires an individual’s agency, or choice of discourse, to balance clashes and conflicts and that brings social impact to the existing community.32

32 Pratt (1991) theorizes a contact zone as the border space between cultures, which is the space of “half-ours and half someone else’s” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 345). While Pratt (1991) explains the contact zone as the space of conflict and differences, Harris (1995) criticizes the concept as vague and superficial, stating that “Pratt offers little sense of how more tolerant or cosmopolitan cultures might be created out of the collisions of such local groupings, or of how (or why) individuals might decide to change or revise their own positions (p. 33). On the other hand, third space, or ‘in-between’ spaces are where multiple cultures, languages, nationality, and identities cross borders, merge, and transform into a third kind of space or hybridity (Anzaldua 1987; Bakhtin, 1981; Bhabha, 1994; Bizzell, 1999). Against a unitary view of language, culture, and identity, Bhabha (1994) suggests a third space, or liminal space, where “the borderline work of culture demands an encounter with ‘newness’ that is not part of the continuum of past and present” (p. 7, italics mine). It is a dialogic space which rejects the dichotomy of English/other languages, home/school, citizenship/non-citizenship, moves beyond the dichotomy, transforms the dichotomy in a way that is "neither the one... nor the other... but something else besides, which contests the
Central in understanding discourse hybridization is the individual’s critical viewpoint, dialogic voice, and consequently changing power relationship in a community (Canagarajah, 1997, 1999, 2002; Canagarajah in Matsuda, Canagarajah, Harklau, & Warschauer, 2003). The academy is “social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power” (Pratt, 1991, p. 34). Pratt’s description of the unequal power relations imply that the individual’s agency in appropriating dominant discourse is a shuttling process rather than a simple boundary crossing and transcending. Contending that boundary crossing is not an appropriate metaphor to describe L2 writers’ shuttling among communities that possess ideological tensions and power differences, Canagarajah (2003) prompts a formulation of a third space between L1 and L2 by “selective, generative, and inventive nature of linguistic and cultural adaptation,” (i.e., transposition) which is “dynamic, involving active engagement and resistance” (Zamel, 1997, p. 350). In the mixing and clashes of discourses, L2 students have to develop subtle and creative strategies for resisting dominant conventions of the academic discourse community. Canagarajah (2003) terms these subtle and creative strategies for resistance “appropriation,” which

---

33 Canagarajah (2002) criticizes Zamel’s (1997) transculturation model and considers it an attempt “to ease difference and nullify power” by the boundary crossing metaphor (p. 38), therefore erasing the power relations that are inherent in reality and setting up an idealistic egalitarian perspective.

34 Appropriation is a skillful resistance and Canagarajah (1997) identifies students’ “underlife” as the non-obvious way of resistance in their classroom lives when performing the fuller identities is not possible (e.g., Brooke, 1987, 1991)
refers to taking over the dominant discourse for the learner’s purpose without conflicting with authority.

Hosoo appears to be the only one among the other student participants to perform creative resistance through his writing in an attempt to appropriate the dominant discourse and create a hybrid discourse. Because other students chose to be silent by blaming their choices and resisting in their mind, Hosoo’s act of writing brings out two important points. First, Hosoo’s proposition to counter the dominant discourse in the form of creative resistance is significant, because it incorporates not only his voice, but also the voices of other silent L2 students. Without Hosoo’s creative resistance or appropriation, the dominant discourse will always perpetuate the myth of assimilation of the L2 population in the research institution in particular and the Inner Circle at large. The other point is that shedding light on critical stances of the L2 population in the Inner Circle counters the myth of assimilation. Even though most of the research participants were silent about their concerns, this study would demonstrate that L2 undergraduates are not acquiescent assimilators or initiators to the norms and values projected by the American higher education; rather, they are active meaning-makers both at the social and cognitive levels.

As noted above, the individual act of students’ voicing their counter-discourse is important so that the myth of L2 students’ silent assimilation to the Inner Circle ceases to be perpetuated. More importantly, Hosoo’s voice is amplified by collaborative discussion and analysis with his peers of the dominant discourse that they faced. At times, L2 students appropriate the situation as a group of dialogic voices. According to Joon’s
account, a group of L2 students purposely filled one class of first-year composition because they wanted to compete with other non-native speakers of English. However, the university prohibited international students to repeat such an act after that quarter by creating a quota for international students in first-year composition class. Opposed to the notion of absolute power, their collaborative act may symbolize L2 students’ resistance to the system by which they raise their issues and contest power given to them.

In a less confrontational yet still resistant space as compared to the act of L2-students-only first-year composition class, the out-of-classroom study group functioned as a safe house35 for the students in this study to enhance their cognitive learning and generate social capital (Bourdier, 1977). The four-student study group as well as another study group setting (i.e., Joon’s, Quan’s, and Hosoo and Ming’s pair work) became a safe house for these students where they co-constructed knowledge collaboratively as a group and shared information specific for international students (e.g., internship and scholarship opportunities). The study group allowed them to share their growing expertise of academic content, which created the opportunity to learn for themselves and others, and ultimately to build a repertoire of beneficial information.

The culture of support mediated by four international students in the study group was important for these students to become academically successful and affectively comfortable, where Canagarajah (1997) proposes the possibility of negotiation and appropriation between the primary and secondary discourses in the classroom by establishing a safe house in the discourse contact zone. A safe house originally refers to

35 In my view, Canagarajah’s (1997) safe house is an equivalent term for a third space (2003).
“social and intellectual spaces where groups can constitute themselves as horizontal, homogeneous, sovereign communities with high degrees of trust, shared understandings, and temporary protection from legacies of oppression” (Pratt, 1991, p. 40). The study group as a safe house provided an additional pedagogical space where critical distance, oppositional stance, and personal space intermingled, enabling individual students to seek their voices without having their “identities on trial each time” (Giroux, cited Canagarajah, 1997, p. 194). A study group as a third space played a space of peer support to buffer the tensions and conflicts that they faced academically, affectively, and structurally in the Inner Circle. In my observation, these four first-year students did not recognize their collaborative power that they can address their group difficulties in the system of the Inner Circle. Yet, their study group was a small positive milestone for them to recognize their collaborative power to share their writing expertise and information about the university by creating their communal resource to change the status quo productively and creatively.

To recapitulate, those on the initiation side argue that self can be positioned as insider/colonized/outsider (Gee, 1996), whereas those on the contact zone side argue for thinking of self positioning in terms of compliance or resistance (Brooke, 1991). Within this dichotomy of compliance with or resistance to the discourse community, each individual may choose to accept, reject, or transform the expected roles by negotiation (Brooke, 1988). Individual student agency becomes significant in the negotiation process of compliance, rejection, and transformation by role negotiations and discourse merging. As shown in this study through an episode of group resistance in a first-year composition class and collaborative learning in a study group, extending the self’s position of
accepting or rejecting to transform the authoritarian discourse collaboratively, L2 students demonstrate that they are not just passive or acquiescent participants in the relationship with community, being enabled and constrained by the force of the discourse community; more importantly, they are creating a space of discourse hybridization by their dialogic acts. Discourse is ideologically shaped by power relations in society. Power is important as it determines what is normal and ordinary in social practices. The initiation metaphor regards the discursive space in the community as homogeneous, where power operates deterministically and top down and consequently, there is no space of transformation. In contrast, discourse hybridization formulates heterogeneous discourses, providing a new voice in the discursive space where conflicts and power differences between old-timers and newcomers are being negotiated, allowing for change and transformation of the current status quo in both individual and community levels.

**Implication of the Study for Theory and Practice**

The situations of the students that I outline in this study can be, in many ways, representative of the identity challenges and experiences of learning and growth points that L2 undergraduate students who come to the United States to build their academic credentials face. Because of this, the study has implications both for the field of academic socialization research and for students and university administrators who strive to facilitate the academic socialization process for this population in a practical way. In the following section, I will first deconstruct the theoretical and methodological implications of this study. Secondly, drawing on the empirical data collected in this study, I will discuss my project’s practical implications for the successful academic socialization of L2 international undergraduates. In particular, I elaborate support systems that can be helpful
for L2 students’ academic socialization on the individual, social, and institutional levels, and be informative to future students and institutional policy makers.

**Theoretical and Methodological Implications**

Borrowing the notion of socialization from sociology, academic socialization or academic discourse socialization in L2 was primarily researched in the communication media of either writing (e.g., Casanave, 1992; Prior, 1998) or speaking (e.g. Morita, 2004; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a). With the advent of language socialization research in L2, academic socialization can be studied from various perspectives. As addressed in Chapter 1, because spoken English is inseparable from the medium of written language for L2 students, I view language socialization and literacy socialization as fundamentally belonging to the same category as academic (discourse) socialization. In L1 research, academic socialization has been primarily studied from the perspective that there is a gap between academic/secondary and home/primary/vernacular discourses (e.g., Gee, 1995). In L1 writing research in particular, identity negotiation between the autobiographic self and academic discourse has been primarily discussed (e.g., Bryant, 2005; Chiseri-Strater, 1991), while longitudinal studies have begun to portray how undergraduates build a genre repertoire over the college years (e.g., Carroll, 2002). In L2 research, especially at the undergraduate level, however, little research has been done on how international students negotiate their identities while they build longitudinally academic literacies (cf. Spack, 1997; Leki, 2003, 2007).

Theoretically grounded on the critical ideology of language use (Duranti, 2003; Lucy, 1996) and critical academic socialization (Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Lea & Street, 2000), this study shows how my research participants of L2 students developed a critical
stance towards ways of knowing and learning in the American context. By presenting empirical examples of students’ development of identification and literacy stances, this study enriches the literature of academic socialization by countering the myth of the L2 population’s assimilation in the Inner Circle setting (e.g., Schumann’s acculturation model, 1978) and their seamless transition from periphery to center in the larger Discourse (Gee, 1996) in traditional socialization research (e.g., Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Rather, armed with the critical lenses that they developed through their discourse and Discourse socialization in the U.S., I identify that my focal research participants formulated a culture of silent resistance to the Inner Circle system in which they are situated. Given the personal and social investments of these students, the silent resistance, characterizing their local meaning and local culture, can coincide with the current understanding on the “unquestioned advantages of studying abroad” (Zappa-Hollman, 2007b, p. 240) in the commercialization of Inner Circle higher education (IAU report, 2006; IIE report, 2008). I also identify the social phenomenon of some L2 students’ glocalizing themselves by their international mobility instead of locating themselves in the country of origin, or the U.S. Indeed, the American undergraduate experience is a transitional one that enriches their lifelong trajectory of socialization and evolution of self in multiple communities.

Methodologically, this study contributes to the field of academic socialization research by broadening the scope of research out of one classroom, lengthening the research period, and using spoken interaction data. First, I show how learning outcomes may be individual ones; but, at the same time, show how the learning process is social. Based on their individual needs and information, each student used social resources to a
different degree to improve their learning outcomes by collaborating with others. Given the current expanded understanding of learning to people’s situated lives, future studies of academic socialization may investigate the ecological perspectives of students’ academic success in relation to the academic support system in schools, peer networks, and family support in facilitating student learning. In future studies, approaching the multiple spaces of the learning process and learning outcome can reveal a distinct trajectory of individual academic success. Furthermore, my proposition of an academic socialization model, which integrates conceptual frameworks and empirical findings, as well as diachronic and synchronic dimensions of academic socialization, can be an analytical tool for future research inquiries of the field.

Secondly, by adopting a longitudinal investigation method, this research is able to portray the salient moment of identity and literacy negotiation, the causes of tensions and conflicts in individual students’ learning process, and the learning outcomes in their longitudinal socialization process to an Inner Circle university. While trade-offs exist based on the short-term or long-term research focus, future longitudinal studies of academic socialization might reveal different aspects of learning processes and learning outcomes. This study suggested that learning development can be reflected in students’ needs for different scaffolding over years, where learning outcomes in writing may not be explicit at the individual level.

Thirdly, by adopting context-sensitive multiple data collection, I was able to produce data-warranted claims regarding the learning process over time and space. I examined trends that are not widely reported in prior studies, such as these L2 students’
struggle to find proofreaders to correct their language use, while their proofread writing was regarded by course instructors as a true reflection of their actual competency and linguistic correctness (i.e., Nana and Hosoo). In other words, based on this study, it is clear that textual analysis of academic socialization in the traditional research method of composition studies may not adequately capture these students’ real shortcomings. Furthermore, because interviews reflect changing perceptions of individual’s experiences, triangulation with students, their instructors, and curriculum administrators helped me capture the ecological perspective of learning development and student socialization to the Inner Circle. In addition to their writing samples, interviews with multiple people in the individual’s learning process and the collection of classroom and out-of-classroom interaction data where people negotiate meaning by co-construction of knowledge vividly captured how these students learn.

**The Support System for L2 Students’ Academic Socialization**

In the introduction, I addressed that international students come to Inner Circle countries to build academic credentials and experience academic success through the specific mediation of English as a communication channel. By tracing three students’ interaction with others, I identified factors that may facilitate these students’ socialization to an American research institution. In reporting my findings, I compare and contrast their trajectory of academic socialization at the individual, social, and institutional levels. In interpreting my findings, particularly in relationship to the fourth research question, two contextual pieces of information should be noted; first, the research institution ranks...
in the top 15 international student host institutions in the U.S. and second, these research participants, including the non-focal students, are all self-sponsored.36

At the micro level, facilitation of academic socialization can be approached individually. By observing and interviewing the student participants, I concluded that the degree to which each student is determined to attain their immediate and long-term goals may affect his/her academic achievement. Joon set a clear goal to graduate with a high GPA to maximize his chances of getting a decent job in Korea; Nana had a clear goal of gaining admission to the two best graduate schools in her field to achieve her longitudinal goal of working for an international health organization. The goal of 19-year-old Hosoo was to improve his oral English skills as an important asset for his future.37 These students seemed to focus on their immediate goals of academic success. Once their immediate goals in terms of high GPA were achieved, they seemed to move to considering their longitudinal goals. Joon began to realize the significance of oral English skills for the Korean job market after he met fellow job seekers in Korea; Nana began to ask me about how to improve her oral English repertoire, a shift from her questions regarding the strategy to enhance her GRE score and out-of-school scholarship opportunities. That is, having clear goals, and ultimately adapting and refining those goals to the situation, followed by their individual endeavors to achieve goals, seem to be key for these students’ successful academic socialization.

36 Except Joon, none of the research participants reported that they themselves and their friends ever received financial support during their stay at the research institution. Joon is the only one who received need-based funding of $2,000 among the research participants and their friends (see Footnote 33 in Chapter 1).

37 “I wanted to challenge myself. For example, I thought that English will be helpful for sports marketing, but it was a big challenge to me who was not able to make any sentences in English when I first got here.” (Hosoo’s email in English dated 02/10/09).
At the meso level, facilitation of academic socialization can be approached socially. Social mediation seems to be critical for students’ academic success and their larger socialization to the discourse community. Learning outcomes were achieved effectively through students’ deliberate use of social resources (see the detailed findings at research question #2). I identify three points that can help their academic achievement. First, students may need to be informed of what resources are available in their school community. Although a one-credit online or offline survey class for freshmen and transfer students can be helpful, international students especially might not know what social resources are available in their community network. For example, my research participants did not know that they can seek individual assistance from instructors as part of their enrollment in courses. Another example of available social resources is that the writing center might be emphasized as playing a role in students’ writing achievement, especially in their initial stage of academic socialization. As a third example, although Nana sought information regarding enhancing her pronunciation, nobody provided information that a speech pathology clinic for non-native English speakers was available at the research institution.

Secondly, students may need positive information about social resources. For instance, students who had a positive experience with the university writing center tended to use it continuously over the years. In contrast, Nana stopped visiting it after one encounter when it did not provide a service that she had anticipated. After Hosoo and Ming visited the writing center, they sought information regarding what tutors at the writing center would be especially good to work with. Hosoo specifically tried to find out whether his tutor was a native speaker in helping to identify his language difficulty.
(12/08, interview). If students’ initial experience is not good in using social resources, they seem to stop using these resources, though these experiences might simply be caused by either their mistaken expectation about the services offered or their belief of not being well served.

Third, student collaboration through group work need to be emphasized in the out-of-classroom site. The four student participants in Hosoo’s study group revealed that they received substantive help in various group interactions, which led to Ming and Hosoo’s voluntary study group and Quan’s disciplinary study group. Hosoo and Quan expressed that the study group was effective for them because it explicated the thinking process. According to Hosoo, contrary to his initial reluctance to join a study group with other non-native English speaking peers in favor of being grouped with native speakers, he began to realize over time how smart the study group members are and how important their attitude in collaboration is much more significant in helping him finish his assignments productively (03/17/09, final interview with Hosoo). Further, Hosoo was using English to finish his assignments, as opposed to Joon’s preference of joining a Korean student study group where he used Korean. Hosoo’s collaboration with Ming continued until his final quarter.

In Hosoo’s observation, international students go through similar coursework at the research institution; therefore, formulating a study group of ESL can be a significant resource for students’ academic success (03/17/09, final meeting with Hosoo). In other words, Hosoo was not sure of the effect of the peer study group with other non-native speakers of English until he had the positive effect on his writing assignment when he
worked with Sisley. In his second year, Hosoo had difficulty in studying alone in a GEC class, which he chose because the name of the course matched his interests, implying that there were few international students in that course. By mainly studying alone for his last two quarters, Hosoo realized the significance of a study group to his academic success. In classes where there were few international students, Ming did not hesitate to find a study buddy, whereas Hosoo could not do that (12/14/08, group meeting with Ming and Hosoo). It may be hard to generalize the positive experience of Hosoo, Ming, and Quan regarding the effect of a study group; nevertheless, it is hard to deny the importance of collaborative learning in a content area by analytically generalizing my deconstruction of the effect of peer talk in a writing peer review study group and the domino effect of our study group among the study group members.

At the macro level, academic socialization can be facilitated institutionally in three specific ways. First, given the academic and professional needs of international students, it is necessary to provide training in academic speaking skills for international students. Unlike the mandatory writing classes by which students hone their writing skills to be able to transition to an American university, Nana and Joon’s experience is telling about the need for support systems such as mandatory speaking classes that include teaching how to improve academic presentations. Hosoo, in the same vein, mentioned that his panel speaking in his geography class during AU 2008 was a unique experience. Like a writing center, an academic speaking center can help facilitate the professionalization of all students, including native and non-native speakers of English.

38 Students reported that there were classes that are known as easy courses or to have easy instructors. Usually, they seemed to choose classes by instructor name to obtain easier As.
Second, the school may need to establish an advising system with staff that comes from a background similar to that of self-sponsored international students to be able to understand these students’ perspectives. Ming’s two visits to the job fair enabled her to realize the harsh reality regarding her own internship opportunities. She told me that she was looking for a “miracle” to land an internship opportunity as an international student major in Finance (2/10/09, informal discussion after a group meeting with Hosoo). At her request, I met with an academic specialist to ask my research participants’ question regarding whether any merit scholarships are available for them at the research institution and was informed that there were none tailored for international undergraduates. When I informed them international students have one need-based small assistantship opportunity, Hosoo resisted the idea, arguing that he wanted to be a recipient of or a candidate for a merit-based scholarship, similar to the one he was eligible for as a high school level finalist in Korea. After these accumulated negative experiences, these students questioned the quality of administrative services that they received from the research institution. Students’ perception of the lack of practical administrative support may lead international students to cluster around other international students to obtain information specifically relevant to them.

Third, the research institution may need to advertise its available social resources. L2 students tend to not know some cultural assumptions. The function of faculty office hours is one example. Students often do not know the function of office hours; at least, none of the research participants was aware of it when I inquired. Students became frustrated by the confusing content and format of classes instead of seeking help by visiting the instructor or sending a draft to the instructor for feedback (i.e., Hosoo, Ming, 264
and Sisley). After my observation of two GEC Economics classes where there were around 400 students in each class, I, as a former graduate student of Economics back in 1991, thought that it was not strange that Hosoo could not grasp Economics. Hosoo blamed himself (i.e., “I may not be good at Economics” [04/08, interview]) rather than pointing to the problem of the educational system where students are not given information on how to specifically ask for help. Similar to the critique of the quality of the American public educational system offered by Nana (e.g., large class size\(^{39}\)), who finished her undergraduate in Japan, Hosoo would reflect on his Economics class in the U.S. if he chose to attend a Korean university after his break. He may not blame himself as much as he did during his first year in the U.S. if he could have information to compare two educational systems. In other words, the research institution may need to provide a detailed guideline of its academic support system (e.g., office hours for content feedback, instructors’ informing students that they can send their drafts for feedback, students’ right to report to the department when instructors do not provide feedback or return course papers, and students’ responsibility to secure written evidence regarding unfavorable treatment) while considering the cultural outsider’s perspective.

**Future Research Directions**

This study of L2 international undergraduates’ academic socialization contributes to the theoretical and methodological development of academic socialization by challenging the myth of assimilation and transience of the L2 population into the Inner

\(^{39}\) Quan, an engineering major, mentioned that he developed his own strategy to build his content knowledge by watching online MIT videos which he found by Googling. Quan devised this strategy because the large-class lectures he took did not correspond with the assigned book readings. (06/16/09).
Circle. Furthermore, I explicating these students’ academic socialization process by proposing an academic socialization model of what counts as academic socialization across time and space. For future studies, this project offers a number of potentially interesting directions that could broaden our understanding of academic socialization and of the situation of international students in Inner Circle higher education.

First, academic socialization research is a burgeoning area with a wide range of possible applications and the longitudinal and multi-site structure of this study opens up important new areas for tracing development. Extending this study chronologically to trace incoming students’ socialization process or to conduct follow-up studies of returnees to home countries or students who started another career (e.g., graduate school) could track the longitudinal trajectory of their academic socialization even beyond the development process that takes place during the college years. As shown in this study of the social impact of learning processes, possible research sites include a classroom or classrooms at schools, home, and other group literacy event settings. Within these possible populations and learning contexts remain many sub-fields that require further research.

Secondly, because this study demonstrates that social scaffolding can become an important learning tool for students’ academic success, its role in academic socialization could prove to be a productive area for future research. For example, Hosoo’s instructor emphasized his good reasoning in comparison to his bottom-up skill building. I interpret Hosoo’s concrete reasoning development achieved in his final first-year writing might be due to the instructor pushing Hosoo for better reasoning to attain a persuasive argument,
such as making a claim, warranting it, and how his overall claims are interconnected. In this area, research on the kinds of authentic questions that help support and extend students’ thinking and writing is a promising area of research. Analysis of classroom and conference international data, as shown in my extension of Mercer’s (1995) model in the analysis of why a study group is effective, will show what questions and comments are pedagogically effective.

Third, another area for fruitful research would be an investigation into the links between the online community and classroom-based or face-to-face communities. As shown in the domino effect of a study group, learning opportunities for increasing learning outcomes is important; however, the students informed me that making time to meet burdensome for them because of their busy undergraduate lives. As shown in this study, interactions should be expanded into out-of-classroom online spaces for creating alternative learning opportunities. Because students’ offline and online relationships are reciprocal, students’ built-in intimacy in the classroom can form a buffer zone in their interactions in a class Wiki or blog in an out-of-classroom site, and vice versa. In implementing collaborative assignments in online spaces out of the classroom, I consider mediated activities key to facilitating students’ engagement and allowing for increasingly productive learning outcomes. By expanding the time and space of learning, out-of-classroom online collaborative activities can offer learners the pedagogical tools of interactions for promoting their dialogic thinking. Further, in creating a pedagogical out-of-classroom space, online and offline activities can be designed to achieve different learning objectives to supplement and reinforce each other. Therefore, the social
scaffolding effect of online communities and their consequent academic socialization process could be an area for future research.

Fourth, research on the gap between students’ use of English and students’ self-analysis of their authentic discourse would be an interesting field of study. Genre analysis on written discourse has an established scholarship in L2 studies to help L2 students access the Inner Circle’s ways of writing. In the same vein, genre analysis on spoken discourse will help L2 students improve in speaking. For example, Hosoo’s awareness of the discrepancy of his spoken English in relation to native speakers’ helped him realize the gap between native and non-native speakers of English. Analysis of how native and non-native speakers use English in instances of what counts as classroom discussion and small talk would also enable people to develop a repertoire of spoken language.

**Final Comments**

By grounding this study in the post-positivistic philosophy, paradigmatic assumptions on critical theory, critical epistemology, and critical researcher positionality, I have portrayed the creative, critical, enabling, and positive force of L2 international undergraduates in their negotiation of literacies individually and collaboratively. These findings are important because their negotiation of literacies can counter the dominant ideologies of language deficiency and the deficient Other that is given to L2 undergraduates in the Inner Circle. Using three focal cases, this study has shown how L2 students resiliently adapt to situations, and more importantly, they contingently and creatively use social resources for achieving their goal of academic success and progressing to their future. Though not well heard publicly, it would worth remembering that some of these students also wish to transform the status quo where they are situated.
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APPENDIX A

FIELD NOTE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Feb 25, 2008, 7:00 – 8:30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Only two students, Sisley and Hosoo (Pseudonyms) attended the first-year undergraduate student study group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Activity</td>
<td>The purpose of the activity was to help the 3 page peer writing by discussion and written feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description/Literacy Event</th>
<th>Interpretation/Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sisley arrived on time and I began the mentoring session by listening to her concern about her grades on Biology and Economics 201. She was worried on Biology because she is on the edge of A and B+ based on her quizzes and mid-term. As for her Economics, she was late 45 minutes for the mid-term exam due to the bad weather. Though the instructor allowed additional 15 minutes for her exam, she scored the worst because she also did not carry her calculator which is mandatory for Economics exam. She tried to write a paper for Biology for extra credits; she was wondering about the topic to pursue. I provided my opinion that there are two solutions in her approach: short-term and long-term. In a short term, she can ask course instructors whether she could do additional assignments for raising her grades; Sisley was reluctant to ask to instructors while worrying about her grades. In a long term, I advised her to get ready well for courses and exams in light of material preparation. On the other hand, Sisley said that she is not worried about her ESL writing.</td>
<td>First-year undergraduates struggle among the terms. In one hand, they are blank slates [EP], as shown in their lack of awareness between topic, title, and thesis. On the other hand, they are also bringing their “autobiographical selves” (Ivanic, 1998) [CF; identity] as shown in Sisley’s creating writing training in her high school days. Contradictions in the activity system of prior learning experience and current writing expectation are clearly shown. How students negotiate these contradictions to make sense of the academic writing culture is my topic. It can be an individual game; I may find some patterns from their experience. How to theorize is a key (Ortega, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosoo arrived; Hosoo and Sisley brought their three-page first drafts for a six-page assignment for their ESL composition class to the table. The assignment was a research paper based on the topic of their choice. I explained them the purpose of study group session is to talk about writing in order to help their audience awareness in addition to written feedback. I asked Hosoo about his topic. Upon my question, he read his title “Technology for climbing.” I asked him what his thesis is; he began to read relatively long paragraphs of his writing. I asked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the same question to Sisely; she responded her topic as her title such as “What can we do for extreme sports?” According to her, her thesis was to provide the history of extreme sports and discuss the advantages and disadvantages.

I explained them the relationship among topic, title, and thesis. They have no problem in identifying their topic; however, title should be emerged from their writing with phrases, which is specific representation of their topics. I emphasized to narrate their theses with each one sentence, saying that their thesis should be explicit to the audience including their course instructor. Hosoo succinctly rephrased that his writing is for how new technology enables climbing easier. I asked him how he backed up his claim. Hosoo replied that he mentioned clothing and equipment effect for climbing; I commented that they are very clear and asked them whether there are additional backups. Hosoo replied again that he will add additional paragraph and a conclusion. On the other hand, Sisley repeated her topic as her thesis and I asked her what the main argument is for her writing. I scaffolded her how she supported her thesis; she repeated that she provided the history of extreme sports, provided variety of extremes sports, and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of extreme sports. In my question regarding the ‘variety of extreme sports,’ she said that she will provide three examples of extreme sports. I wondered whether her topic would be “too broad”; I suggested that rather than three paragraphs with history of extreme sports, three examples of them, and advantages/disadvantages, she would be better to provide example of extreme sports with discussing about advantages/disadvantages of each example, and discuss the commonality and differences across the examples of extreme sports. I also recommended to narrow down three examples to one example and to discuss in depth; however, Sisley responded that she could not write a six-page paper with one example of extreme sports. Sisley seems to accept that her,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[CF; negotiation]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sisley showed the pattern of undergraduates’ difficulty in narrowing down the topic. [EP] In the later part of literacy events, it is shown that narrowing down the topic is related with her concern that how she could fill the expected page requirement. For undergraduates, how to fulfill page requirement is their major concern as shown in the conversational data set in the below. [EP]

Writing one page takes 3 hours for the beginning students. I view this as the cultural alienation to academic writing (cite Macbeth, 2006). The term, academic writing, is alien to them; nobody heard the term before. They are initiators to academic writing in terms of academic discourse expectation. I term it as “cultural alienation.” As shown in my other data, writing development is shown in the “lessened time” how to write a paragraph. [EP; time, writing development] As their genre knowledge in light of how to start, what content is expected, how to incorporate source, and what is counted evidence, the time to write becomes lessened. In this sense, writing development, through they are
After the overview of their writing became explicit through talk, I suggested to exchange papers of Sisley and Hosoo and give comment each other. They began to read each other’s writing; I sat next to Sisley. Sisely began to correct the grammar mistakes for Hosoo first, asking him whether it is acceptable for him. While Sisley and I read Hosoo’s paper together, she asked me whether her grammar correction was correct. I told her that I am not sure about English usage just like her, while confirming her grammar correction of Hosoo’s. When she began to start the second page of Hosoo’s writing, I moved to Hosoo. I moved to Hosoo, saying that he did an excellent job in his writing. He conceded that it took time for me to write the three page paper. I asked him whether it took three to four hours for him to write each page, while reminding him that I heard it from other study group member. He wondered whether he could go to graduate school with his current writing competency. I assured him that it will be safe as long as he sought only for master’s level and he could acquire disciplinary genre writing. Hosoo mentioned that it took really long time. In my question how he could well organize his writing, he responded that he imitated the “skeleton” of writing structure in the class textbook. I mentioned Hosoo that he did not necessarily provide feedback sentence by sentence. Then Hosoo began to comment globally and asked me the translation equivalent of “envious” of Sisley’s writing from Korean (which is the native language for Hosoo and me) to English. He asked me and wrote down; but, once Sisley signaled that she heard our talk, Hosoo erased his comment on a paper and asked her how long she stayed in the U.S. Sisley told that it is her fourth year. Hosoo commented that the students who stayed in the U.S. longer tend to writer better. I challenged Hosoo’s comment, commenting him that Sisley is also assigned in the ESL composition just like him, who came confounded by the variables of biological, social, and mental variables, can be seen from the broadening the repertoire of genre and the socialization process. I can problematize the construct of writing development and reframe it with my theorization. Use Applebee’s problematization, Prior’s definition on writing development, Rogoff’s broad concept of human development. Students learn academic writing convention by examples. I liked Hosoo’s writing structure in terms of clear thesis and how to bring the topic to his thesis. I also liked the parallelism of his evidence one and two. His use of “Another example” was a perfect transitional phrase. Hosoo’s parallelism was not appropriate; however, I guess that his careful imitation may fit for my genre expectation. I have to ask how he imitated his first draft. On the other hand, Sisley was confident about her writing because the course instructor gave her A+ for her prior writing. In my perspective, he is a novice who does not know the rules or conventions of academic writing. Once students get teacher comment, they may tend to generalize what the teacher likes or misunderstand what the instructor commented. I have to ask the course instructor how she likes Sisley’s writing in order to identify the gap between Sisley’s interpretation and the instructor expectation. Students generalize instructor comments. It is a still vexing
directly from his home country after finishing his high school. I told him stay longer does not necessarily result in better output in writing. Hosoo wondered how to comment; I scaffolded him whether he likes her long narration of her experience and broad background in her introduction. Hosoo replied that using her long narration is good because the course teacher informed them using personal experience in introduction is good because it enhances reader attention. [EP; GENERALIZATION]. I asked him again about the knowledge economy in relation between her long narration and her thesis; Hosoo commented in the paper that Sisley may write too long. I scaffolded him whether it would be better to erase personal experience or make two paragraphs of Sisley’s narration and historical background. However, Hosoo responded that introduction should be one paragraph, which is taught in the ESL composition class. Hosoo wrote his comment that Sisley’s writing is good but it may be better to get to the point. In the main body, I asked him how he likes Sisley’s. Hosoo mentioned that it is fluent, commenting that it is hard for him to write even one page. I pointed out with specific examples of vocabulary use in supporting that Sisley’s description is good; however, I asked him how much that description is relevant to her thesis. Hosoo did not write any comment for that paragraph. In the following paragraph, when Sisley began to write about one example of extremes sports, Sisley started with two questions. I asked Hosoo how he thought of the use of interrogatives. He responded that interrogatives are good because it poses a “gap” and “problem”, which is taught at the ESL composition (Sisley’s response was the same). I replied that posing a gap or problem is important; however, it should not be necessarily an interrogative form. I also scaffolded Hosoo by asking how the previous paragraph of the history of extreme sports and the new paragraph of the example of extreme sports, mentioning question; but, I now partly understand why my pilot study students responded that ESL taught five-paragraph essays. In reality, the class I am observing teaches them to write reading-based research paper; but, students conceptualize instructor’s every comment as the rule of academic writing. [EP; TI; generalization] This signifies the significance of pedagogy in the ESL students’ first year when they are highly motivated to succeed academically. On the other hand, whether the curriculum intended or not, the “one-size-fits-all” (Ferris, 2003) approach of the ESL is causing a problem for students to generalize the instructor comment. Therefore, adaptation may be a key from five-paragraph essayist tradition to different genres. The critical perspective on the five-paragraph essay can be reinterpreted by the student employment of variations of writing genres. [TI; genre]

Among the literacy events, I love this spark by student helping each other. They know they problem much better than me. I gave feedback on advance organizer and the significance on the awareness of audience. The opportunity to verbalize their theses to us as audience provided them to make clear of their theses. In addition, Sisley brought undergraduates’ primary focus in finishing course expectation; she sates that as long as fulfilling six pages, they are automatically guaranteed to obtain B.
that there is no transitional phrase how paragraphs are connected. Hosoo wrote his comment such as he was not sure why she used question sentences there.

I went back to Sisley and found that she corrected Hosoo’s grammar in details from second to third pages. I asked Sisley whether there is any global comment on his writing. Sisley began to write that he has to provide in detail in his backup evidence. Here is our talk about Hosoo’s writing and undergraduates’ appreciation about page expectation: [1:11]

Me: “Explain each point more.”
Sisley: “Yes… Don’t you think it is too short? He did not paraphrase much. As [Eve] just got today… you have to … explain your topic sentence more … before we get your source into your paragraph.” [EX]
Hosoo: “Ah..”
Sisely: “That I didn’t do, either. So I probably will change tonight, too. After topic sentence, you can’t bring to source. We have to explain more. You know. Then I do not have to worry for the pages. Try to like… talk more. You don’t have to worry about pages.”
Hosoo: “Ah… Really.”
Sisley: “Right now I am thinking you worry about pages. How can you fit into six pages? You have to write six pages.”
Hosoo: “Oh ya…Oh”
Sisely: “How can you fit in to six pages? Try to explain more. Your paragraph is too short. You have to work more.”
Hosoo: “Oh… Ya. I think so.”
Sisley: “Try to ….. Your paragraph is too short. I think you have to work more.”
Me: “Good point.”
Sisley: “I know students try to fulfill the pages first. You know what I am saying. If six pages, it is B. Writing a lot. Wow” [EX]
Me: “She gave wonderful feedback for you. Let’s see....”
Hosoo: “Your writing was wonderful. The thing you have to change is just focus on thesis statement.”

That is the reason why Sisley rejects my suggestion to cut off her writing that is not related with her thesis. I would like to focus on the concept of “safe house” (Pratt, 1991) in language use and the feedback opportunity. [CF] By safe house, I mean that it is an alternative literacy space outside of school curriculum where students could get support for their academic achievement without worrying about being judged on their academic performance. They happened to see my writing proofread by a native speaker. Once they saw my language use corrected, they seemed to be relieved that I am not judging them by their language use. Prior mainstream literature tend to present international students’ problem in the language issue from the low achieving students perspective of mainstream students, which does not fit from the applied linguistic perspective. This will be an area that has to be shed light on because international students have no place to get help in the official curriculum that grammar errors are regarded as effortless. Once I assured them it is not their fault or lack of effort but the interference of their native grammar, Sisley and Hosoo seemed to be relieved and willing to help each other by providing the local and global feedback. Secondly, I did not identify Hosoo’s major concern about writing six pages. I knew but I did not identify the seriousness of his concern. However, as a peer, Sisley identified his problem and provided the feedback that Hosoo needed in terms of how to make his sentence longer by linking paper expectation and instructor comment. Further, Sisley in the dialogue knows that she
Sisely: “Ya.”
Hosoo: “And some structure.”
Me: “Hosoo is clear.”
Me: “What I think is this part is beautiful… Shorten here.”
Sisely: “No, I don’t. I can’t fill six pages [with shortening]… I agree but I have to fill one page. I have to talk about the guy…” [1:13]
Me: “This is beautiful… But, you may need shift from creative writing to academic writing.”
Hosoo: “Ah.”
Hosoo: “Can you send me your final draft?”
Sisely: “If I get A, I will send it to you.”
I wrap the session in pointing out that Sisely needs transition from creative writing to academic writing and academic writing needs clear thesis, advance organizer, and transitional phrases.

wrote too much about the content that are not related with her thesis of writing, if her thesis existed, which I suspect. Through the talk and feedback opportunity of the study group, it is shown that Sisely identifies her problem as a creative writer in academic writing; further, she provided the strategy that Hosoo needed to fill the course requirement. Specifically, Sisely’s pointing out that Hosoo’s insertion of the details between each paragraph thesis and source material got big support from Hosoo. I have to ask Sisely whether she knew that her transitional problem from creative writer to academic writer. It is not clear in the dataset whether Sisely identifies her problem though the study group session or somewhere else. However, the conversation provided explicitly presents that interaction opportunity was a great feedback source for each of them.
APPENDIX B

PLANT BIOLOGY TERMS
Lecture 1 (What you’re in for: plants and you)

1. List five features that characterize all life?
   (organization, metabolism, reproduction, responsiveness, evolution)

2. Three vegetative organs of the plant?
   (stem, leaves and root)

#. vocabulary
respiration: the act of breathing
chloroplast: the green substance in plants that absorbs light from the sun to help them grow
plasma:
membranes: a thin layer of tissue that covers cells in a plant
vacuoles: membrane bound pocket of cell sap. May occupy 90% of cell volume
starch deposits:
annuals: any plant that grows and dies within one year or season
   a plant that goes from seed to seed in a single season
perennial: a plant that lives for many years
microbes: an extremely small living thing that you can only see under a microscope and that may cause disease
fungi: any plant without leaves, flowers or green coloring, usually growing on other plants or on decaying matter. Mushrooms and mildew are both fungi.
Tissue: aggregation of similar cells
Simple tissue: Tissue composed of one cell type
Complex tissue: Tissue composed of multiple cell type
Lecture 2 (How they do it: The methods of science)

1. The steps in the scientific method.
   a) Select a problem and collect information already available
   b) Formulate a testable statement: a hypothesis
   c) Test the hypothesis by experimentation or by further observation
   d) If the data fit the hypothesis, keep it.
   e) This does not mean the hypothesis is right, only that is not wrong

#. vocabulary
hypothesis: A testable statement. In the scientific method, an hypothesis can only be proven wrong, never completely right.

Lecture 3 (The whole ball of wax: The vascular plant)

1. Three unique features of the plant cell
   (the presence of chloroplasts, cell walls, central vacuoles)

2. The development of the plant cell
   a) Cell division
   b) Cell elongation: the enlargement of a cell in its long axis
   c) Cell differentiation
   d) Cell maturation

3. Define: stem, leaf, roots
   a) stem: Transport at water and organic materials, important leaves, storage of food materials
   b) leaf: photosynthesis, storage of food
   c) root:

4. Describe three variations to the common plan of the vascular plant
APPENDIX C

JOON’S ART EDUCATION PAPER
What I watched for this assignment is the movie “Spiderman 3”. As everyone knows, this movie is one of the popular Hollywood movies in the world. When I entered the AMC movie theater, many people were already waiting for this watching movie see[Ming]ly with much of expectation. One of the reason why this movie is popular is that the movie ‘Spider man’ uses very diverse trials which use well advanced visual effect during the movie. In a detail, the movie ‘Spider man’ uses various kinds of colors to characterize Spiderman and other villains. Though too many storylines were included in a movie, visually the movie did pretty well to describe every character’s traits.

At the first to end of the movie, I think that graphic skill is really advanced and vivid about each character’s movement. Compared to other previous two series of works, this third movie ‘spider man’ has 3 different villains are appeared; different spider man, Sandman and new goblin. In a descriptive effect, procedure of changing to sandman is well expressed using graphical skill. Furthermore, movement of black spider combining with Peter and Brock is really dynamical so that it is graphically doing significant effect in the movie. Nevertheless of this well graphical colored uses, entire mood of this movie is somewhat old-fashioned and dark.
I have no idea about the director’s intentional settings but the surrounding of movie is see[Ming]ly out of date for example, parker’s old-fashioned hair style, dimmed rooms of Peter and Harry’s and classical mood’s of Mary Jane’s job. These things make me feel like this movie is made at least 10 years old ago.

The color of use in the movie characterized protagonists in the movie. Spiderman series movie has been wearing red and blue, which is a good mix of two different opposite colors. Red and blue symbolize peace and advance in east-Asia culture. Traditionally, black color has represented as dark, evil and uncovered things. For example, two villains black spider man and Harry act bad things during whole movie. Black Spiderman illustrates the dark side of Spiderman. By wearing the black color of the clothes, Spiderman became more arrogant and do showing off in the movie. This typical effect let viewers easy to understand determining what movie is going on further. As all we know, spider man plays the best role for the society and everyone likes him in the movie. In the movie, Thomas Haden Church who acts as a Sandman has been wearing same clothing, stripe brownie black and toilet paper white. By wearing same T-shirt during the movie, his image is maintained as a prisoner and I think that colored effect has some roles against opposite side such as peace, angel and love.
I like this 3rd spider man without hesitation because this movie series usually give us some messages for the human being. At the end of movie, Peter parker narratives that ‘Everyone can choose something what they think right things.’ I agree this statement with one hundreds percent. In our life, people have innumerable choices and determine themselves how to go and construct our life better. Even though every viewers know the movie’s theme that ‘Encouraging good and punishing evil’, but this message is really meaningful for us since good and evil are not much different and It always depends on what we stand and choose every time in our life.
APPENDIX D

JOON’S SAMSUNG PAPER
Global Strategies

Today, many firms find it necessary to develop global strategies in order to compete effectively. A global strategy represents a worldwide perspective in which the interrelationships between country markets are drawn on to create synergies, economies of scales, strategic flexibility, and opportunities to leverage insights, programs, and production economies. Samsung Electronics Company is one of the leading consumer electronics brands in the world and has performed a great global strategy over the past decades. In 2006, Interbrand, the world’s leading brand consultant ranked Samsung as the fastest growing brand in the world and the company has ranked 25th on the Global Brand Scoreboard according to the Business week Magazine.

Global Innovation

Being global means that innovation around brand building, new product, and product improvements can be sourced anywhere. Samsung Electronics is committed to make new products and services by applying unique technologies. It generates new kinds of added value. Today, Samsung Electronics’ core technologies, core components, marketing and brands are generating greater added value. One great example was Samsung camera phone, which made sales all around the world. Even though Nokia had established greater market share of mobile phone industry, the legend was broken by Samsung’s innovative ideas. At that time when Nokia was still selling its normal mobile phone at higher price, consumer could buy a latest model of “Samsung camera phone” with additional feature. It was natural for consumers to leave older model and try Samsung products, which offered additional features yet more affordable. Samsung Electronics brings creativity as the spark for innovation and the driver of growth. They continue to create technologies and products people never imagined before. Samsung Electronics remains dedicated to giving society new reasons to hope and endure. In this way Samsung Electronics is rising as one of the world-leading companies.

Global Brand Management

According to our text, every country manager needs to use the same vocabulary and planning template when developing strategies and this planning template should include some basic elements of strategic analysis, self-analysis, a business strategy, tactical plans, and goals and measurement. Samsung electronics has approached to develop several
strategies for different regions, but guided by one unified Samsung brand image building strategy. The branding strategy started in 1996 by Chairman Kunhee Lee. His aim was to launch a coordinated global program to make Samsung an international brand. Over the last one decade, Samsung has executed its comprehensive brand building strategy. Financially, Samsung’s annual investment in branding and marketing is about $3 billion, which has been spent to increase its brand awareness around the world.

Creating Cross-Country Synergy

To achieve significant global synergies comes with a global brand team, with cross-country representation that can play either a leadership or supporting role. Samsung Electronics has opened up and recruited talented employee from various countries. These globally selected people bring their own perspectives and experiences together at one table and design the best products. This trend boosted company perception and made it a global brand among the consumers. The strategy paid off and in past five years, it has achieved the biggest gain among major brands, even surpassing Sony.

Delivering Brilliance in Brand Strategy Implementation

Global brand leadership, especially in these days of media clutter, requires implementation brilliance. Once again, Samsung has invested huge amount of money in intensive advertising campaign and brand marketing strategy to create awareness of its brand name toward the world customer. This brand strategy creates its branding in multiple ways, ranging from traditional ways of advertising to billboards, racing, Olympics games, and marathons wherever it can be seen by the crowd. It can communicate Samsung message by presenting itself as a leader of innovation with more familiar images.

Historically, Samsung enormously invested in sports which get the attention from millions of people. In Athens 2004 Olympic Games, for example, it was named as Worldwide Wireless Communications Partner of the Olympic Games and at that time Samsung provided 14000 mobile phones and also supported equipment during the games. They also showcased their products for 17 days to the visitors at Olympic eve and also allowed 30,000 minutes of free calling grabbing the audience to its brand. Samsung has
also been sponsoring Dubai Marathon for 3 years from 2001 to 2004. The campaign has been effective to rise above other brands in the Middle East. Also during April 2007, the Beijing Organizing Committee signed Samsung Electronics as the presenting partner of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Torch Relay at the China Millennium Monument.

**Strategic Alliance**

Strategic alliances play an important role in global strategies because it is common for a firm to lack a key success factor for a market. It may be distribution, a brand name, a sales organization, technology, R&D capability, or manufacturing capability. Samsung has committed great strategic alliance with mature leaders such as IBM, Sony, Apple and other global brands to achieve strategic goals. The company established the first overseas plant in Portugal in 1982 and also promoted a marketing subsidiary in Germany. In 1988, Samsung Electronics established a sales joint venture in France and China for manufacturing VCRs and display products. During 2000 and 2001, the company formed a strategic alliance with Yahoo to deliver new version of mobile phones and develop digital household electronics with Microsoft. Samsung Electronics joined a strategic semiconductor technology development partnership with IBM and Dell for co-developing nano-logic process technologies and supplying multi-functional laser printers respectively in 2004. In 2007 Nokia and Samsung Electronics announced an exclusive agreement to share knowledge on co-developing technologies for handset and Digital Video Broadcasting standardization solutions. Also same year, Samsung Electronics and Time Warner Cable started working together for building two-way interactive-compliant television sets and cable infrastructure.

"Samsung Electronics." Wikipedia. 3 August. 2008

“Major Strategic Alliance.” Samsung.com. 1 August. 2008

“Samsung Electronics.” Adobe Success Story. 1 August. 2008

Dr. Tanvir Orakzai. “Samsung Successful Branding Strategy: Samsung approach is holistic reaching the world customer.” American Chronicle. 11 May. 2006


External Analysis: Customer and Competitor Analysis

An external analysis needs to be directed and purposeful because the amount of information that could be used is endless. Some of the objectives include knowing what the business should do with existing businesses, what are potential new business areas to enter, what are the value propositions, current trends and events, threats and opportunities and much more. It is important to understand who your customer is and what is important to them. Another important aspect of an external analysis is to understand who your direct and indirect customers are. You must understand their strengths and weaknesses and many other dimensions. The following is the application of these concepts as applied to Yark Automotive Group which includes Yark Nissan and the Service Department.

**Significant Trend: Yark Nissan**

Although a trend across the whole market is cost of fuel, this section will focus exclusively on its effect on Yark Nissan. A side effect of this trend is that people are shifting from truck and SUV’s to smaller vehicles. This brings an initial opportunity for Yark Nissan because they have very desirable and economical cars which include the Altima, Sentra, Rogue, and Versa. These cars have a good image for their fuel efficiency. Yark Nissan needs to take advantage of this opportunity because there is a long term threat for Nissan. The threat is that hybrid technology also plays a role because of this fuel problem. Nissan has not established a hybrid image. Currently Nissan is using technology from Toyota for their hybrid. Another problem with Nissan’s hybrid is that they are only sold in a few states. Nissan is trying to work on this problem and is trying to come up with an electric car by 2010. This is a problem for Yark because as time goes on, if the trend towards hybrids continues and people are not as satisfied with regular economical cars, they will not be a strong competitor with other hybrid dealers.

**Strategic Uncertainties: Yark Automotive Group**

Yark Automotive Group is affected by a strategic uncertainty that is affecting all car manufacturers that trickle down to the dealers. Currently Yark Automotive Group is faced with trying to figure out which manufacturers are going to be successful and which are not. All manufacturers are trying to come up with an innovative product that will change the market and not all of them will be successful. In the end there will be winners and there will be losers because some of these cars will be great successes and others will
not. If Yark chooses a franchise then they are stuck with these cars even if they are not a huge success. Yark Automotive Group needs to decide which franchises to invest in and which ones they should spend less resources managing or just sell off.

**Segmentation: On the Service Level**

Many segmentation decisions for dealers are made at the manufacturer level. A place where Yark Automotive Group can segment the market is with service. YAG (Yark Automotive Group) segments the market by loyalty and profitability. Customers that are very loyal and profitable are always treated with great care. YAG makes sure to not only do a quality service check but also takes great interest in their car. If there is a problem with these customers YAG will take a loss to make sure these customers stay satisfied.

The loyal but unprofitable customers, barnacles, are customers that YAG tries to turn into customers. These customers are customers who only come in for cheap oil changes and warranty work. They never come in for maintenance where a service department makes money. YAG tries to show them the value of taking better care of their car and the benefits, such as better fuel economy, so that their car won’t break down on them, better resale value, and many other benefits. To differentiate themselves the service writer with do a walk around. This shows that YAG cares about your car and can avoid a customer from leaving the dealership and a week later returning because something broke. By showing YAG cares about your car they hope the people will take better care of their car and get the necessary services done to their car.

**Identifying Competitors—Customer-Based Approaches: Yark Nissan**

Yark Nissan will focus on other dealers carrying Nissans. Examples of these primary competitors include Thayer in Bowling Green and Gerwick in Monroe, Michigan. There was Mann in Adrain, MI but Yark dominated their market and put them out of business.

Nissan breaks down the market based on primary market area (PMA) which is done by zip code and population. Now Yark is responsible for most of Mann’s PMA and the Jackson dealer also took some. There are also other primary competitors who compete with Yark Nissan like the area Toyota and Honda dealers; Brown Honda and Jim White Toyota. Mazda could also be considered a direct competitor because they are all Japanese manufacturers but strategically Mazda is not quite the same.
The indirect competitors are almost all the other manufactures because they all compete with Nissan with at least one vehicle line. These manufacturers are Ford, Chevy, Hyundai, Saturn, Mitsubishi, Pontiac, Subaru, Suzuki, Volkswagen, Jeep, Dodge, Chrysler, Kia, Buick and Mercury. A more general competitor could be public transportation but in a city like Toledo public transportation is not a very good option because there is not a good bus system. Other general level competitors would be a bike, scooter, motorcycle or plane.

Yark Nissan looks at this issue of competition based on market penetration. There are reports that show all the competing cars with each Nissan vehicle and then a breakdown of sales for each. These reports show if you are increasing your penetration based on zip code. They also show which markets are growing and which are not. This helps the dealers understand that just because you are increasing your penetration if it is in a segment that is not growing it is still a waste of money.

Understanding Competitor- Yark Nissan

Yark Nissan needs to look at image and positioning of its competitors. Currently, Toyota and Honda both more advance technologically in hybrid development. This is a strength of competitor that Yark Nissan has to try to bypass. Another strength of Honda and Toyota is that their products has an overall higher quality rating. A way to try to get around this is to show that some Nissans are ranked ahead of its competitors cars in quality. People will pay a premium for perceived quality so it important for Yark Nissan to improve these weaknesses or at least be able to make them seem less important.

Yark however has a strong position strategy. It is positioned as the better facility at the better location where it has the most inventory, allowing it to have the most competitive price. Yark Nissan’s position is bigger is better. It is seen as the big fish in the small pond. The weaknesses of other dealers are that they cannot compete on all these levels and that provides opportunities for Yark Nissan. Price is a very important factor when people are buying a vehicle. Pricing is a strategic competency for Yark because they are always able to find a way to offer their customers a good price.

Yark Nissan also tries to understand others past strategies that were unsuccessful. One example of a strategy that was very unsuccessful at another dealership was that the dealer would go after people with bad credit and target them for business. This drove away
people with good credit because it drove down the image of the business. People did not feel good about going in and buying a car there because they felt like they weren’t valued for working hard to have good credit.

Yark Nissan is always analyzing its competitors based on their size, growth and profitability. One example previously mentioned was when Mann Nissan entered the market. Yark was able to take their PMA because of their price advantage. This did not allow Mann to grow and forced them to close. Yark Nissan has a very strong market position and continues to grow. Yark Nissan does get data monthly from Nissan to make sure they are meeting Nissan’s expectation so that Yark Automotive Group can continue to be a Nissan dealer.
“The similarities between Sant’Andrea al Quirinale and other Bernini’s works we have seen in the lecture”

When we observe the similarity between Baroque church of Sant’Andrea al Quirinale designed by the Giovanni Lorenzo Bernini and other his works such as Saint Peter’s and Cornaro Chapel, it is important to understand the arts by the two viewpoints: the historical background and his way of representation, that is, total work of art. During this period, Roman Catholic Church, which was major artistic patron, embraced Counter-Reformation in response to the Protestant-Reformation, and it resulted in the art to be dramatic, magnificent scale and glamorous in order to compare with the Protestant and recall the populace to the Catholic. Bernini himself was devout Catholic, and he contributed to support this idea through his total works of architecture, sculptures and paintings.

First, the architectural similarities between Sant’Andrea al Quirinale and other Bernini’s architectures are huge dome, which describes high facade, and grandiose columns. Both of Sant’Andrea al Quirinale and Saint Peter’s have huge dome, and they are designed to get in light efficiently thorough the windows. This efficient spotlight enables huge space of altar to show not merely brightly but majestically as if the symbol
of the authority. The gorgeous colored columns which surrounded altar are common characters of Sant’ Andrea al Quirinale, Saint Peter’s and Cornaro Chapel. Especially, both columns of Sant’ Andrea al Quirinale and Cornaro Chapel are made of polychrome marble. Because of these colored materials including bronze in Saint Peter’s, the contrast with white marble sculptures stands out. These two characters give people the powerful images of the Roman Catholic Church.

Second, the characters of sculptures within the three Bernini’s total works are similarly divided into three categories: material, appearance, and allocation. As mentioned previously, Bernini used white marble for sculptures in these churches and these sculptures are emphasized by the contrast of colors. The sculptures which Bernini designed for these churches are all decorative and express Italian Baroque spirit. In addition, Bernini utilized the space by putting sculpture, for example, he put his sculptures insides the dorms or the space above the entrance.

Next, when it comes to paintings of Sant’ Andrea al Quirinale, there seems to be two similarities between Sant’ Andrea al Quirinale and Cornaro Chapel. He expressed
religious drama with pictures and their arranging. For instance, he dramatically arranged
the altar space in Cornaro Chapel as if there were the theater. Moreover, in the Sant’
Andrea al Quirinale, he put drawings in turn in order to trace the Christ life. Particularly,
he took into light above altar in both of those two churches, where he put the spiritual
works, and thus it suggested the radiance of Heaven.

Lastly, when he designed these three churches, it seems that he represented his
patrons’ religious intent with his composite arts, in other words, he contributed to
Counter-Reformation thorough his works. In Saint Peter’s, he designed the distinguished
two diverging wings that illustrated the welco[Ming] arms to the Roman Catholic. In the
case of Cornaro Chapel, he arranged the space like heavenly drama and added the patron
family there. In addition, in the Sant’ Andrea al Quirinale, he designed the patron’s crest
on the floor.

Given these points, these three Churches embrace not only decorative arts but
also didactic rules though Bernini’s total works of art: architecture, drawings and
sculptures.
APPENDIX G

NANA’S JAPANESE 251 PAPER
Asakiyumemishi is a series of manga which is a modern adaptation of Tale of Genji. It was created by Waki Yamato, one of the leading comic artists in Japan. It consists of thirteen volumes: first ten volumes narrate from chapter one, Kiritsubo, to forty-one, the death of Genji called Kumogakure, and following three volumes narrate other thirteen chapters from Niou-no-miya, a grandson of Genji, to Yumenoukihashi.

Waki Yamato illustrates Tale of Genji considerably accurate. For example, because Asakiyumemishi includes original fifty-four chapters, it approximately provides sufficient information such as almost all characters, their personality, human relationship in the community, and various scenes in the original work. However, the author revised some particular scenes with her own interpretation. For instance, she created the scene in which Kiriiiiiiiiitsubo Emperor encountered with Kiritsubo for the first time. In the scene, the author depicted that the Emperor met Kiritsubo by chance in his garden (Yamato 1: 1-15).

In terms of target audience, Asakiyumemishi was originally published in the lady’s monthly manga magazine which targets women from teenager to middle twenty. However, it was prevalent among not only young women but also all generations in spite
of genders. This is because the original work is difficult for Japanese today to understand
due to the verbal and grammatical differences between classic and current Japanese.

Moreover, almost all high school students tend to read this adaptation of Genjimonogatari
because the novel is so popular and distinguished classical work that the content is
frequently on the exam. Given these points, the significance of this new work is that this
manga provides opportunity to start reading a classical arduous masterpiece.
APPENDIX H

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS
nonverbal communication

Increased stress

increased length

reported speech

translation

overlap

pause

long pause

undecipherable

upward intonation

downward intonation

Korean

inserted phrase to make meaning clear in the context

deleted portion
APPENDIX I

HOSOO’S FIRST WRITNG
In chapter one in the book, Illiberal Education, Dinesh D’Souza discusses diversity based on race and gender. D’Souza writes about what brings the change for minorities. Some remarks discriminating black people made Americans think over about diversity in America. Because the society did not want to discriminate minorities, many universities started with making preferential treatments for minorities. Actually, the diversity is quite important in America, because there are a lot of races in America. That is why Americans are trying to get the equality in their society. In this point, the thing we should remember is that a remedy for discrimination can make another type of discrimination. That could happen to the preferential treatment in universities. The preferential treatment can be applied to admission policy or scholarship. Many minority students can get admission more easily and more opportunities to get scholarship. Even though the preferential treatment makes better opportunities to minority students, the treatment could bring other discrimination to nonminority students.

The preferential treatment on admission policy proves that minority students get many advantages by the treatment. Many changed rules for admission allow minority students to go into Universities more easily. According to examples from D’Souza, even though Asian American applicants and minority student applicants have the same
qualifications, minority student applicants get admitted twenty times more than Asian Americans at the University of California at Berkeley (3). This implies that someone who had studied really hard during high school could not get admitted into the universities that the person wants to go into. Some people can refute against my opinion, saying that the preferential treatment is to relieve minorities. We cannot just leave qualified students, for relieving the minorities. Qualified students have possibilities to make better results than unprepared people. Instead of giving admission for unprepared students, universities should offer an equal right to get admitted into universities.

Scholarships for minorities which are easy to get can be considered as preferential treatments. They enroll in universities with a guarantee to get some money for their tuition. In the book, the author explains that every black student who gets admission to Florida Atlantic University is given free tuition (4). These financial aids are not used properly, though. Money for less qualified students can be wasteful. Someone can say what if there are some minorities who are qualified. Of course, if they are qualified, they can get scholarship. What I am saying is that the money that is for students who are not interested in studying can be used for other students who would like to study in the university. Because I am an international student, I know international students
have few opportunities to get scholarships at The Ohio State University. If universities give some scholarships to international students, instead of giving scholarships to less qualified students, many students in other countries who really want to study abroad can study in America and contribute to the growth of universities. International students can be considered as financial help for U.S. economy, but desire for studying should not be interrupted.

What I want to say is that we need to think about the diversity in universities carefully. If there is a student who wants to study in a university, the student should get same opportunity, regardless of their race or gender. Universities should not give an exclusive right to minorities for the fact that they are minorities. Non-minorities who are qualified should not lose their chance. We should always remember that every student should get the same rights in universities. Universities must think through which way can give real equality.
APPENDIX J

HOSOO’S FINAL WRITNG
Affirmative Action for Asian

There are several kinds of discrimination in race, religion, and gender in the world. Among those subjects, discrimination against African Americans has been the biggest problem in American society, so Americans have tried to get rid of racial discrimination. To respect human’s rights, all kinds of discrimination should vanish through the efforts which are like what Americans have done. One of their efforts to eliminate segregation is Affirmative action for African American in University. Affirmative action in university means to give preferential treatments to African American students in getting admission or getting scholarship. Many African American students can get admission more easily and more opportunities to get scholarship through the preferential treatments. Even though the preferential treatment gives better opportunities to African American, it is not enough to relieve other minority student such as Asian. Many Asians have played a great role in American Society. Some Asians who studied in the United States brought development in every area in American society. Until Asians make the achievements, Asians should put up with a lot of discrimination and prejudice in their life. Even though they should be considered minority in the United States, Americans do not offer preferential treatments to them. Asian students should be able to get advantages from preferential treatment in American universities as minority students.

Globalization can explain why Asians who immigrate to America and study in the United States as international students are important in the United States. In the book, The Local and the Global: The anthropology of globalization and Transnationalism, M. Kearney refers that globalization which could be interpreted as modern world view has been led by migration, commerce, finance, tourism, communication technology, etc (549). The trends which are the movements of information or people from somewhere to other area bring up globalization and trans-nationalism. We can say that the small globalization happens in American. The United States have developed by melting pot patterns which mean that many people from other countries immigrate to the U.S. The people made the United States of America and they are the parts of the United States. Asians started to immigrate to America, because American had the shortage of labor before. They have made a great contribution to development of America. In these days, Asians make a contribution for the U.S. society by getting a good quality of education in U.S. As one of results of the good education, many Asians work for big companies which play a significant role in American economy. That is globalization in America which is the trend
of all over the world. In case of North Korea, they do not accept the concept of globalization. They do not make any interchange with other countries. On the other hand, Americans try to accept all the good things from other countries. The efforts with many kinds of people made them developed. If Americans think immigrants contribute to America’s culture and everything, they should respect all the immigrants in the U.S.

Although many kinds of people play an important role in America, not all of them get same opportunities. They have two types of group of people, minority and non-minority who has the power in American society such as whites. African Americans have been minorities, but international immigration from other country increasing the population of minorities in United States made another type of discrimination. At first, discrimination against African Americans has been the biggest problem in American society. African-Americans have struggled against discrimination in society. Those efforts affect to their life, so some African-Americans as an influential person lead the society. Although their life improved a lot, they still experience invisible discrimination. For Asians, discrimination also gives them a lot of difficulties. In the book, Interpersonal Discrimination against Hmong Americans: Parallels and Variation in Microlevel Racial Inequality, Jeremy Hein refers that they not only have experienced discrimination, but they also suffered from prejudice which is experience of being treated as foreigners (415). Some non-minorities neglect Asians by the fact that they look like Asians and they look like they cannot speak English well, even though some Asian can speak English well. For Asians as international students, they also have a lot of difficulties in their life in the U.S. In daily life, they can get discrimination from everywhere. For example, when I went to McDonalds, the clerk was kind for the guy who ordered before I ordered. However, the clerk got my order with making fun of me with his co-worker and with laughing. It hurts my feelings and that was my first bad memory that I got at the first day in the United States. Like these, not only African Americans suffer from discrimination, but Asians in America also suffer from discrimination. As African Americans are considered as minority, American society should consider Asian as minority, to get affirmative action.

To get rid of discrimination, Americans made affirmative action for minorities. Affirmative action in Universities is to give preferential treatment to minorities. The purpose of affirmative action indicates that because non-minorities got more opportunity in many areas than minorities did, people try to help minority by some systems. In the book, Affirmative Action at Harvard, John B. Williams mentions affirmative action in
Harvard to increase the number of applicants (207). The affirmative action brought some change in increase of women and black employees. That refers that the affirmative action for minorities affected a lot in university. Not everyone, however, agree with affirmative action. Affirmative action is not supported by prejudice of unqualified applicant, week support of leader of the school, and the opposition of minority employees. In the book, *Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action As a Function of Racial Identity Among African American College Students*, Anke Schmermund, Robert Sellers, Birgit Mueller, and Faye Crosby refers that several investigation from between blacks and whites show that while blacks feel good with affirmative action, whites feel uncomfortable with affirmative action (760). Though whites think American society does not need affirmative action and affirmative action can bring up reverse discrimination, American society needs affirmative action for minorities. If minorities do not get affirmative action to give them preferential treatments, they will stay as minority forever. Whites should think about what can make everybody live well.

Affirmative action in University helps minority students by many types of preferential treatments. African American students get admission more easily and they get more opportunities for scholarship. The preferential treatment on admission policy proves that African American students get many advantages by the treatment. Many changed rules for admission allow African American students to go into Universities more easily. In the book, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*, Dinesh D'Souza indicates that even though Asian American applicants and African American and Hispanic student applicants have the same qualifications, African American and Hispanic student applicants get admitted twenty times more than Asian Americans at the University of California at Berkeley (3). For this case, the preferential treatment gives a big help for African American student to get advantages in admission process. The preferential treatment protects African American in getting admission. That would be good for relieving African American students who have not had many opportunities to get a good quality of education, but that would not be applied to Asian students who should be considered as minority. They must be able to get advantage from the preferential treatment, because Asian American students have studied with enduring many invisible discrimination and difficulties as much as African American students did. American University should let Asian students be able to get admission by the preferential treatment. Someone can say that we cannot just leave qualified students for relieving the minorities. Then, I would repute the opinion by insisting that they just did
not have enough time and opportunities to study and that’s why they are less prepared than non-minorities. Minority students would have a lot of possibilities to be qualified in University.

The preferential treatment in scholarship let minority students get scholarship easily. They enroll in universities with a guarantee to get some money for their tuition. The preferential treatment with consideration of their financial problem helps minority students who really want to study in University. In the book, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*, Dinesh D’Souza explains that every black student who gets admission to Florida Atlantic University is given free tuition (4). That is an example of the preferential treatment in scholarship. Many African Americans have their financial problems, so they are not capable to pay for the tuition in University. For the situation, scholarship is the best way to let them keep studying. For real, many universities in the United States are trying to give a lot of scholarship to African American. As I said, Asian should be considered as minority. Especially, for international students, the tuition is the biggest problem. International students pay the tuition three times more than non-minorities. This burden disturbs students who really want to study abroad in studying in the United States. International students have few opportunities to get scholarships at The Ohio State University. If universities give some scholarships to international students, many students from other countries who really want to study abroad can study in America and contribute to the growth of universities. Someone can insist that international students can be financial helps for U.S. economy. Universities can get benefits from international students, but I think Universities should invest to students for the future in the United States. By giving more opportunities to many students, Universities will get real benefits in the future. Universities should find other way to get money for their finance. I suggest for universities to increase the contribution admissions. That would help to fix the financial problem in universities. Through those solution, Asian students as international students ought to be able to get financial support as African American students do as minorities.

As globalization shows the trend all over the world, immigration to America affected a lot to make the United States as one country. Immigration is the most influential part to every single thing about the United States. According to these features, many races of people live together. With those melting pot patterns, immigrants have suffered from a lot of discrimination and prejudice. They have had to endure those hardships. In spite of the
hardship, they made many achievements in the United States Society. They should be considered as minority, when we think how difficult they endure discrimination and prejudice. Racial discrimination should vanish for the human rights, but that still remain by non-minority. For minorities, American society tried to offer affirmative action which is preferential treatment. However, Advantage of the preferential treatment was limited for particular group such as African American, even though more minorities should get good effects from affirmative action. Several preferential treatments in university are only given to African American students. Although African American students get advantage in admission by the preferential treatment, Asian students have not got advantage without considered minority student. Even though African American students can get financial support easily as minority student, Asian student, especially international students do not get any financial support. American Society should provide the preferential treatment to Asian students who are real minority. If Universities in the United States offer preferential treatment to Asian Students, it would be a chance to give more opportunities for more students to study in real good circumstance. That means that they invest to their own country’s future by supporting minority students. Minority students are possible to make significant achievement. Supporting minority would bring the country that everybody lives with good quality of life and The United States has the opportunity to make the country.
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APPENDIX K

ONLINE INTERACTION
7/19/2008 [Ming] No.1--- 88000
7/19/2008 [Ming] Sorry
7/19/2008 [Ming] it's a
7/19/2008 [Ming] understand
7/19/2008 [Ming] wait a second
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] 88000 that's what I got
7/19/2008 [Ming] i am going to bathroom
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] Ok
7/19/2008 [Ming] Back
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] Did you get 88000??
7/19/2008 [Ming] Yes
7/19/2008 [Ming] go on
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] No.2 ---133000
7/19/2008 [Ming] not sure
7/19/2008 [Ming] i am just telling you those questions i am sure
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] ok
7/19/2008 [Ming] no.7---97000
7/19/2008 [Ming] no.8--3000
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] omg
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] all the things are different
7/19/2008 [Ming] no.4---purchase of a copyright for cash(investing activity cash outflow)
7/19/2008 [Ming] proceeds from the sale of common stock(financing activity cash inflow)
7/19/2008 [Ming] purchase of supplies for cash(operating activity cash outflow)
7/19/2008 [Ming] cash received as interest from loans that were made to customers
7/19/2008 [Ming] operating activity cash inflow
7/19/2008 [Ming] collection of accounts receivable from sales to customers operating activity cash inflow
7/19/2008 [Ming] proceeds from the sale of land investing activity cash inflow
7/19/2008 [Ming] ok/that's all right now
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] hey
7/19/2008 [Ming] i will give others after discussing a little bit
cash received as interest from loans that were made to customers for that I thought that that's financing activity cash inflow because that's from loan from interest I mean the instructor said interest belongs to operating activity, wait a second oh thanks i will discuss with friends ttyl 6.65000? 53000 ...... 71000+12000-17000+8000-11000+5000-15000 what did I miss? ?? -11000,+8000,-20000,+5000,,+12000+71000 what is machinery? 17000 it's long term asset 15000? it's long term asset yeah right sorry i was wrong too hey Income taxes payable is it long term? i don't know
I found that that is current

Oh really?

ok

no5[[]

465000

??

no?

i got 468000, but one friend 462000

ah

first

what did you get

for 6

??

hello??

sorry

you are fine

i was talking to friends

ok

no.2

133000?

no again?

19*7000

133000

then what did you get?

yes

133000

ok

no3?

next is 130000

i got 150000 for question 3

i will talk to friends about it now
7/19/2008 [Ming] hold on a second
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] ???
7/19/2008 [Ming] no3 130000
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] ok
7/19/2008 [Ming] cool
7/19/2008 [Ming] so far
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] good
7/19/2008 [Ming] how many questions we got different answers?
7/19/2008 [Ming] no9?
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] 8000
7/19/2008 [Ming] i got 61000, my friend got 27000
7/19/2008 [Ming] no.9 what's your way to figure it out?
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] wait
7/19/2008 [Ming] the vital thing is i calculate in different ways with my friend
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] give me a min
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] I got the investments during the year
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] 13000
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] and
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] plus
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] 35000
7/19/2008 [Ming] ok
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] and minus 40000
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] I'm pretty sure about that
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] ??
7/19/2008 [Ming] my friend got 8000
7/19/2008 [Ming] you are right
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] wow
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] that's cool
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] hey
7/19/2008 [Ming] yeah
7/19/2008 [Hosoo] I just wonder
7/19/2008 [Ming] what>?
why the n7-8 have the answers

wait

yeah

one of my friend got 97000 and 3000 like you did

ok, wait

no 7

yeah

to calculate cost of goods sold

we need to get inventory purchased money

yes

beginning balance is 74000

ending balance is 82000

and purchase is 120000

but we don't know the purchases money

then

what is 120000

is the cash paid to suppliers

ust accounts payable t-account

65000+x-120000=50000

x=105000

then we can the amount of purchase inventory

then we use inventory t-account

74000+105000-y=82000

y=97000

ok?

ok

oh

thanks

never mind

actually i used direct and indirect method

but got the 61000

what problem
i don't know really confused.

you mean for ??

no7

no9

not no.7

I don't think you need to use direct and indirect neither because Direct and indirect are only for operating activities

so

I should not use that for investing activities ??

ok i agree because the data on the balance sheet is not sufficient to use the direct and indirect method

they are not balance

never mind

thank you

have you submitted?

not yet

you??

ok final check

no9--8000

yeah

no8---3000

yea

no7---97000

yeah

no6---65000

??

50000

en.............
7/19/2008  [Ming]  no
7/19/2008  [Ming]  65000
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  you gotta take 15000 out which is income tax payable
7/19/2008  [Ming]  yeah
7/19/2008  [Ming]  wait
7/19/2008  [Ming]  -11000,+8000,+5000,-15000,+12000+71000
7/19/2008  [Ming]  right?
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  so
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  what about the machinery?
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  ah
7/19/2008  [Ming]  long term asset
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  I got it
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  so
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  65000?
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  ??
7/19/2008  [Ming]  yeah'
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  and then
7/19/2008  [Ming]  462000
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  I got 465000
7/19/2008  [Ming]  ....................
7/19/2008  [Ming]  i don;'t know
7/19/2008  [Ming]  we got the answer
7/19/2008  [Ming]  no.3 130000
7/19/2008  [Ming]  no2.133000
7/19/2008  [Ming]  no1 88000
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  41000+x-450000=56000
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  n2 133000
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  n3
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  130000
7/19/2008  [Hosoo]  for n5
7/19/2008  [Ming]  because the cash collections from customers include credit customers
and unearned revenue

336
so we should subtract 3000 from the 450000
and then got 447000
should we think about the unearned revenue?
yes
ok
so we submit
we did great job
i got a lot of wrong answers
i am losing confidence of acct.........
me too
:'(  
anyway
its so difficult to get answers
everybody is like that
I hope so
submit first
ok
not much time remain
very easy to make mistakes
ok, i am gonna go and get some food
ok
hungry.........................
ttyl~
me too
bye~!!