L2 Writers Construct Identity through Academic Writing Discourse Socialization

Wenqi Cui
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA

Abstract

In the past decades, interests in L2 (English as a second language) students' language socialization in academic communities have increasingly grown since more and more L2 students have enrolled in universities in the Western world. Previous studies centered on L2 students' attempts to obtain academic discourses as well as linguistic and cultural repertoire to establish their membership in new academic communities. This study took the sociolinguistic lens to explore the impact of English ideologies and unequal power relations on L2 students' identity construction through examining their academic writing socialization with their writing instructor, teaching assistants, peers, and their professors of other disciplines. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was employed to analyze the collected data to recognize the ideological nature of language practices and to uncover power relationships between mainstream academic communities and L2 students. The findings indicated that the English ideologies held by the L2 students and academic community members shaped their understandings of linguistic varieties and language practices as well as their attitudes to language users. Accordingly, these L2 participants' identities were constructed and co-constructed as insiders, outsiders, and commuters in relation to other members in this academic community. Finally, this article concluded with pedagogical suggestions regarding resisting inequality and bias against L2 writers in educational practices as well as how to help L2 students construct their identities and establish their membership in western academic communities. This study does not mean to generalize its findings to other contexts or language learners. Instead, it contributes to current conversations by reflecting L2 students' voices and perceptions of socializing with various academic community members under the influence of the macro-level English ideologies.

Keywords: Language socialization, academic writing discourse, L2 writers, Critical Discourse Analysis

Introduction

There have been a large number of studies on language socialization and exploring how an individual socializes with other community members through language to learn to think and behave appropriately and get accepted by a specific community (Lee & Bucholtz, 2015). In the process of socializing, newcomers are exposed to and engaged in "language-mediated social activities"

(Morita, 2000, p. 281). Language socialization (LS) functions not only as a tool to develop novices' or learners' linguistic and cultural competence, but also to acquire their knowledge of sociopolitical ideologies of a specific community. The study of language socialization has been traditionally applied in children's L1 (English as a first language) acquisition and socialization, centering on how children learn to become competent members of their societies (Clancy, 1999; Heath, 1983; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1986). Later on, research on language socialization extended to L1 adults who internalized not only socially and culturally constructed conventions and practices of a community but also its embedded beliefs, values, and ideologies (Duff, 2010; Morita, 2000; Ochs, 2000; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012; Talmy, 2009). In the meantime, individuals "construct and evolve his/her identity [and membership]" (Bhowmik, 2016; Godley & Loretto, 2013) accordingly to fit into the expectations of the community.

In the past decades, many scholars have become interested in L2 (English as a second language) students' language socialization in academic communities such as universities and writing classes since more and more L2 students have enrolled in universities in the Western world (Duff, 2003; Johns, 2005; Starfield & Ravelli, 2006; Zuengler & Cole, 2005). To become competent members, L2 students need to learn academic discourses and conventions acknowledged in western academic communities. Importantly, when L2 students learn academic discourses and conventions that belong to these academic communities, they also imbibe the macro-level English ideologies implanted, "disseminated and reinforced" in academic discourses (De Costa, 2011, p. 350) through language socialization and interactions. Language ideologies are defined as "the ideas with which participants and observers frame their understanding of linguistic varieties and map those understandings onto people, events, and activities that are significant to them" (Irvine & Gal, 2000, p. 35). Originated in political and social contexts, language ideologies also serve as "the mediating link between social structures and forms of talk" (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 55). In academic communities, mainstream discourses privilege Standard English language, while marginalizing other language varieties. The practice of privileging particular linguistic practices while stigmatizing others "conflate[s] certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 150). As a result, L2 students' languages and cultures, their English learning practices, micro-level linguistic features, and even themselves are likely to be put at a disadvantage.

Prior literature enriched our understanding of L2 students' academic discourse socialization by shedding light on how L2 students identified themselves or were identified as experts or novices in their attempts to acquire linguistic and cultural repertoire and then become competent members of new academic communities. However, it is not clear how English ideologies held by L2 students affect their construction and negotiation of their memberships in academic writing contexts. It also remains equivocal how mainstream academic

community members co-construct L2 writers' identities and impact their discourse practices under the influence of macro-level English ideology. This study attempts to address that gap by articulating the voices from L2 writers, particularly looking at how L2 students describe the influence of macro-level ideology on their perceptions of themselves and on their micro-level linguistic practices. This practice is executed by asking why the students feel this way and probing into how they identify themselves in relation to the mainstream academic community members.

The goal of this paper is twofold: the first is to explore what identities L2 writers construct and negotiate when socializing with other academic community members including their writing instructor, teaching assistants, peers, and their professors of disciplines; the second goal is to adopt a sociolinguistic lens to delve into the relationship between linguistic practices and language ideology in a mainstream academic discourse community, hence, unearthing the impact of unequal power relations on marginalized groups in institutional settings. This study does not intend to generalize its findings to other contexts or language learners. Instead, it contributes to current conversations by reflecting L2 students' voices and perceptions of socializing with various academic community members under the influence of macro-level English ideologies. Hopefully, this article will inspire more research on this issue, enabling voices from more L2 students or other diverse groups as well as resisting inequality and bias against L2 writers in educational practices which is significant, especially in this growingly linguistically and culturally diverse academic environment.

In what follows, I will first review the literature on academic discourse socialization and social identity. Afterward, I will report my findings from the collected interview data, illustrating the impact of English ideology on L2 students' identity construction and discourse practices. Finally, I will offer pedagogical suggestions regarding resisting inequality and bias against L2 writers in educational practice as well as how to help L2 students construct their identity and establish their membership in western academic communities.

Literature Review

Academic discourse socialization

Socializing with expert members allows newcomers to construct their identities in a community. Individuals possess numerous social identities in response to certain communities, and each type of identity is shaped through meeting particular expectations when interacting with other individuals in that community. Similarly, in academic contexts, newcomers learn and practice academic discourses, defined by Duff (2010) as "forms of oral and written language and communication—genres, registers, graphics, linguistic structures, interactional patterns" (p. 175), and they then participate in academic communities through interactions with their professors, peers, and other

experienced members (see Anderson, 2017; Bernstein, 1972; Halliday, 2004; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). There is a body of studies on L2 or multilingual students' socialization in academic discourses. Some studies explored how L2 learners achieved academic success and increasingly became competent members in a new academic community. For example, some first-year multilingual doctoral students at North American universities learned the rules of their new academic communities through socializing in class interactions and out-of-class contexts (Anderson, 2017; Seloni, 2012). In a like manner, some L2 undergraduates and graduates performed successful oral academic presentations after they mastered the oral academic discourses (Kobayashi, 2003, 2006; Morita, 2000; Yang, 2010; Zappa-Hollman, 2007). Nevertheless, in both secondary and post-secondary contexts, L2 students inevitably encountered various language and literacy challenges when socializing in classroom discourses to earn their membership in a new academic community (see Duff & Anderson, 2015; Mohan & Marshall-Smith,1992; Morita, 2002, 2004).

Other studies took a cross-cultural perspective to investigate the construction of L2 learners' identities when they engaged in culturally, politically, and socially situated language socialization (Duff, 2002; Ho, 2011; Lee & Bucholtz, 2015; Morita, 2004; Séror, 2011). These studies revealed that identity construction is culturally related and is a fluid and dynamic process in various socialization contexts. For example, in their study, Lee and Bucholtz (2015) illustrated that the youth, who were racially, linguistically, and/or economically marginalized, could be both experts and novices depending on what expertise they had when socializing within different local contexts—the school, the peer group, the home, and the local community. Likewise, Ho (2011) discovered that English L1 and L2 postgraduate students in a TESOL course shifted their identities between "NES/NNES, a person of a certain cultural background, a foreign/second language learner, an experienced or novice teacher, and so on" in small groups during their in-class academic discussion. Like Ho (2011), Morita (2004) investigated a group of L2 graduates who "constructed various identities that were often based on their changing sense of competence … [and] proficiency in English" (p. 583) in an academic community of a Canadian university. The findings from the above studies conform to the typical language socialization models which "assume that 'novices' will learn to participate like 'experts' or more proficient peers" (Duff, 2002, p. 314). It seems that newcomers, including L2 students, can earn their legitimate membership in the academic communities as long as they become like the expert members, being proficient in standardized spoken and written English and following their forms of communication.

However, identity construction is complicated when language socialization involves individuals from different cultures or classes who have already had different linguistic, discursive, and cultural repertoires as well as the embedded values, ideologies, and tenets from their prior communities. On the one hand, L2 students need to learn new practices and performances

expected from new academic communities, whereas their active agent may drive them to resist, challenge, partially accept, or reconstruct the repertoire of the new community (Duff, 2010). Though it is unlikely that L2 students would internalize the entire repertoire of language, culture, and ideologies of the new community, this newly-developed linguistic and cultural knowledge, as well as its ideology, will potentially impact how L2 students perceive themselves, how they reconstruct their identities, and how they practice academic discourse activities. On the other hand, language ideologies shared by the new community members such as how they perceive L2 students and their linguistic practices, will also exert influence on these L2 students' identity construction and establishment of membership, especially when the new community is privileged over those L2 students in terms of their language, values, and ideologies.

Social identity

Identity is defined as "an individual and/or a collective aspect of being while social identity focuses on aspects of a person's self-image derived from group-based categories" (Allen, 2011, p. 11). This study discussed how the participants constructed their social identities when socializing in academic writing settings rather than their personal characteristics. Individuals define and position themselves in opposition or in relation to others (Allen, 2011; Godley & Loretto, 2013). In other words, people construct their identities based on how they sense themselves by identifying differences from other people as well as finding commonalities with others. People position themselves in various communities where they share something in common and in this way, they identify the "social identity groups" they belong to (Allen, 2011, p. 10).

Furthermore, people's identities are multifaceted and evolving through socializing with other people or groups and use of language (Godley & Loretto, 2013; Bhowmik, 2016). To put it another way, social identities are dynamic and contextual rather than static and fixed because the processes during which people explore their relationships with others are recursive and continual. In addition, people's identities are continuously co-constructed by other community members through social interactions. On the one hand, individuals are active agents in "position[ing] themselves in relation to those others" (Schiffrin, 1996, p. 197), thus constructing, negotiating, or resisting their identities. On the other hand, an individual can belong to numerous social identity groups and each social identity is socially and culturally shaped and co-constructed through using language to "produce, interpret, and share meaning[s]" (Allen, 2011, p. 10) and beliefs with other group members.

Likewise, L2 writers' social identities are dynamic and contextualized depending on how they position themselves in relation to other academic community members as well as co-constructed by the shared values and discourse practices in academic communities. When socializing with expert members including instructors, institutions, editors, and others in education and professional contexts, L2 students learn Standard oral and written English

which is "privileged, expected, cultivated, conventionalized, or ritualized" by English ideology (Duff, 2010, p. 175). Hence, L2 students could construct their identities and legitimate memberships in this academic community. Therefore, studying L2 students' academic discourse socialization allows us to see the impact of macro-level language ideology on L2 students' language practices and identity construction.

Methodology

The primary purpose of this article was to better understand how L2 writers constructed and co-constructed their identities in various academic writing activities. The data analysis and discussion were guided by the following research questions:
1. What identities do L2 students construct through academic writing socialization?
2. How do their identities influence L2 students' participation in academic writing socialization?
3. How do L2 students perceive their experiences of academic writing socialization?

Participants

The participants were recruited from a group of multilingual student writers who had some experiences of socializing with members of academic communities. At the Mid-Atlantic university in America where the study was conducted, each semester, there is one writing class for freshman multilingual students and one for sophomore multilingual students respectively. Considering students' availability and their writing experiences with academic discourses, sophomore multilingual students were selected for this study. After obtaining approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and permission of the instructor, I went to the multilingual writing class to recruit participants. Two students volunteered to participate in this study. They were two female undergraduates from a second-year writing class. One of the participants was from China and the other was from Puerto Rico. The Chinese girl, Lee (pseudonym), was an exchange student from a college in Beijing, China, majoring in Accounting and she will study at this American university for two years. The participant from Puerto Rico was Marsha (pseudonym), majoring in Respiratory Care. Both of them were in their first year at this university when this study was conducted and enrolled in a second-year writing class for multilingual students. Lee had never been to America before, while Marsha had been in America for about eight years since she was in middle school. Lee's native language is Chinese, while Marsha's is Spanish; English is their second language.

Research context

The exchange student program that Lee participated in required her to study the first two years at a college in China and junior and senior years at the American university. Before she came to this American university, she had taken some major-related courses and English classes in China. The main purpose of the English classes Lee took at the college in China was to help students prepare for the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). Lee got a grade high than 5.5 in IELTS test. Therefore, she could study in a first-year composition class (ENGL 101) rather than through the American Language Institute (ALI), which offered noncredit English classes for international students and visitors.

Marsha had been in America for around eight years during which she went back and forth between America and Puerto Rico, finishing her middle and high school education. In her high school, she was taught English, but she was placed with other Spanish speakers in a class where there were not any native speakers of English. She did not have chances to practice English with native speakers, which she believed restricted her language development.

After entering this American university, Lee and Marsha took English 101 and English 202, designed to improve multilingual writers' writing abilities. Both writing classes involved activities such as in-class lectures given by their writing instructor, class discussions with their peers, and peer reviews of their writing with the teaching assistants. In addition to writing assignments in these two specific writing courses, they had writing tasks in the General Education courses they took and their disciplinary courses.

Data collection

Data used in this study included interviews with the two participants. A 45-60 minute, one-to-one, individual semi-structured interview was conducted with each participant respectively. In the interviews, I inquired about participants' experiences with their writing class, group discussions, and peer reviews when they interacted with their instructors, peers, and teaching assistants. For example, their feelings and perceptions of their interactions with different people (professors, multilingual/American peers, and teaching assistants) and how they see themselves as language users. And these interviews were audio recorded.

Before I transcribed the interviews and conducted data analysis in NVivo, I replaced participants' names with pseudonyms and removed identifying information before transcribing and importing the data into NVivo. The interview with Lee was conducted in Chinese, the native language Lee and the researcher share. Lee requested to speak her native language during the interview because she felt more comfortable with her native language and she could fully express her opinions and thoughts. I first transcribed the interview with Lee in Chinese and then translated the transcript into English, during which

I tried to stick closely to Lee's original ideas. Afterward, I employed member check with Lee to make sure my translation accurately represented her views and thoughts. The interview with Marsha was conducted in English, and I also carried out member check with Marsha after transcribing the interview with her.

Data analysis

This study utilized the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach (Fairclough, 1992; Emery, 2016) to analyze data. CDA is used to address social inequality and injustice issues as well as uncover power relationships via analysis of texts and subtexts (Emery, 2016). In addition, CDA offers the theoretical and methodological framework to recognize the ideological nature of educational practices and their social, historical, and political contexts in which they are situated and reinforced (Rogers et al., 2005). My study aims not only to reveal injustice but also to encourage actions to reduce and eliminate inequality in educational practice. Through investigating and uncovering visible and invisible inequalities towards L2 writers in education, I attempt to bring the issue to light and advocate an action to resist injustice and bias against L2 writers when they were involved in academic socialization with their professors, teaching associates, and peers. Therefore, CDA fits my research purpose and enables people in academic contexts to deepen their insights into the macro-level social practice that is mirrored by micro-level linguistic features.

The CDA employed in this study is Fairclough's Three Dimensional Model (1992, p. 73) of Critical Discourse Analysis which entails three elements: "a text (writing, talking, images, symbols); a discursive practice (the production, distribution and consumption of the text); and the social practice (the social events and activities taking place in the society which the discourse represents)" (Emery, 2016, p. 8).

Text. In the textual analysis, I examined linguistic features in my interview data, focusing on the participants' use of pronouns (I, we, you, they, he), rather than "undertake an in-depth linguistic analysis" (Emery, 2016, p. 9). In this study, the participants mainly used these pronouns to construct their identities in various academic writing socializations. Therefore, through examining their feelings and perceptions when using these pronouns, I could see how they constructed and negotiated their identities, which will be discussed in-depth later.

Discursive Practice. According to Fairclough (1992), "discursive practice focuses on processes of text production, distribution, and consumption" (p. 71). Discursive practice is particularly concerned with how texts (both verbal and written) are interpreted, used, and reproduced. In my study, from participants' interviews, I identified and analyzed interview extracts about how participants described their feelings and experiences in different academic socialization contexts when they used different texts—personal pronouns.

Social Practice. Social practice is the final element of the Three Dimensional model. "This stage is referred to as the explanatory stage for it

allows the analyst to draw conclusions on how the discursive practice both constitutes the social world and is constituted by other social practices" (Emery, 2016, p. 10). In this part, I connected the discursive practices of the participants to the socially constructed academic practices which are embedded with ideology and power of the mainstream class. In other words, the participants' identities were shaped and positioned by the ideology of the dominant class. The prevalence of the ideology in academic socialization reinforced the marginalization of L2 writers as well as the privileged position of the dominant class. Social injustice and inequality are unconsciously enforced in education.

Findings

The first step of CDA is textual analysis during which I utilized AntConc freeware, a corpus analysis tool, to run instances of personal pronouns—I, we, you, they, he—and the contexts where the participants utilized these pronouns (see Table 1). After running AntConc, I got the total numbers of words in the interviews and the numbers of each pronoun, based on which I then calculated the percentage for each pronoun by using the number of each pronoun to divide the total the number of words in the interviews.

Table 1
The occurrences of pronouns in the interviews

Pronouns	Freq (%)	Examples
I	276 (24%)	"we both in the same shoes";
We	69 (5.2%)	"English is a second language we struggle with the English barrier";
You	102 (8.9%)	"you read stuff, *you* don't know some words"; "They don't make *you* confuse, they talk clearly"; "If *you* have question, he would answer";
They	82 (5.9%)	"They try to explain like everything to us"; "They try to guide us like to the right path"; "They quickly judge you"; "They are some racists";
He	136 (13.4%)	"he made us write essays"; "He tries to be specific"; "He gives me feedback about my paper";

When participants used "I" and "we", they referred to themselves and other L2 writers; "you" sometimes referred to the participants themselves in the socialization they were involved in. "They" could be teaching assistants or native speakers; while "he" was their professors or writing instructors (their professors and writing instructors mentioned in the interviews were males). The

participants expressed different feelings and experiences in the academic socialization when they used "I, we, you, they, he," which implied how they construct and negotiate their identities.

In order to study L2 writers' social identities, I will follow Fairclough's Three Dimensional Model, continuing to examine participants' discursive practice to answer the research questions:

1. What identities do L2 students construct through academic writing socialization?
2. How the identities influence L2 students' participation in academic writing socialization?
3. How do L2 students perceive their experiences of academic writing socialization?

I analyzed the participants' interviews focusing on language (negative or positive words) they used to describe their emotions and feelings (e.g. happy, comfortable, unsetting, mad) when they utilized various personal pronouns. Based on the discourses they applied to describe their experiences with academic writing socialization, the participants identified themselves as insiders, outsiders, and commuters. Their experiences with academic writing socialization and how their constructed identities affected their participation in these socializations were illustrated by the direct quotations from the participants, depicted as follows:

Identity as an insider: "I, we, you" pronoun

When the participants, Marsha and Lee, talked about themselves as L2 writers in the interviews, they had mixed feelings and perceptions: they could not understand the English spoken by other L2 students very well because of their limited English ability, but they felt they belonged to the same community— insiders of their group who could speak more than one language. For instance, both participants asserted that they "are in the same boat" (Marsha & Lee, personal communication, March 23 & 27, 2017) and encountered similar hardships and challenges in socializing with other people such as language barriers. Therefore, they understood each other's situations. In the interview, Marsha said, "I feel more comfortable with other multilingual students because we understand each other… English is a second language we are struggling with the English barrier" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017). Similarly, Lee admitted that when she saw other L2 students, she wondered if "they have the similar language problems such as expressing their ideas accurately or understanding what others say" so she felt "I'm not alone hence I feel relieved" (Lee, personal communication, March 23, 2017).

On the other hand, the participants acknowledged that their limited language ability restricted their writing development as well as socialization with other L2 students who do not share the same native language. Marsha said

"[writing] is so hard for me since English is my second language… I have problem with vocabulary… that's so hard" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017). Lee explicated that her limited language ability was one of the reasons that prevented her from interacting with others, especially other L2 students. Meanwhile, she also mentioned that she sometimes could not understand other L2 students due to their accents. Therefore, "multilingual students don't communicate with each other a lot mostly we like to talk to students speaking our native languages" (Lee, personal communication, March 23, 2017). Additionally, Marsha noted that vocabulary was another factor that hindered effective communication among L2 students and she felt "more comfortable when speaking [her] native language" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017).

In a word, the participants, Marsha and Lee, viewed themselves as insiders of the L2 writers' group where they felt comfortable and reassured. However, because of restrictions of their English ability, they were inclined to interact with those L2 writers who could speak their native languages.

Identity as an outsider: "they" pronoun

When interacting with some native speakers of English, the participants felt they were outsiders because they were rejected or discriminated against in terms of their accents or their nonstandard English. This finding echoes previous literature (Duff, 2002; Talmy, 2008, 2009) in which immigrant students were identified as outsiders. Marsha described how she was laughed at because of her accent: "Sometimes people judge you make fun of your accent" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017). Once, in one of her disciplinary courses, her accent was corrected by her professor because "it is not the way we say [the word]" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017). Since then, feeling upset and hurt, Marsha resisted participating in class discussion or speaking in front of the class and explained "I am scared to participate because they may not be able to understand me [because of my accent] all the people can make fun of you" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017). Marsha's response echoes Duff's (2002) finding that "non-local students were afraid of being criticized or laughed at in class because of their English, [so] silence protected them from humiliation" (p. 312).

Both Marsha and Lee, the two participants, always used "they" to refer to native speakers of English, implying they were outside of native speakers' group, though they acknowledged that some native speakers of English were nice, helpful, and caring. In the interview, Marsha recounted that "some natives are good they understand your struggle they know sometimes you don't know the word the professor are saying so he was try to help" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017). In a similar vein, Lee contended "native speakers of English tend to speak very fast but they will slow down when talk to [me] considering that English is my second language" (Lee, personal communication, March 23, 2017). Communication with native speakers of

English was more effective, but nevertheless, the participants felt they are outside of the community of native speakers of English since "[the native speakers of English] don't speak other languages they can't understand you fully [and] completely" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017).

What is worth noting is that though Lee felt that she was an outsider and she could not communicate with other people well, she put the blame on herself and felt guilty about her limited English proficiency. To answer the question "Has interacting with peers, teaching assistants, and instructors at this university influenced the way you see yourself as a language user?", Lee responded, "I feel my English is too poor when I speak to others no matter they are my instructor assistants or peers I always feel sorry because I cannot express myself clearly" (Lee, personal communication, March 23, 2017). Contrary to Lee's reactions, Marsha was confident that she was clear and intelligible when she spoke English. Marsha was proud of herself because she could speak two languages and she had to work harder compared with native speakers of English "I know two languages … because English is second language we have to work hard to understand materials professor gave us we able to talk to express ourselves in another language we are not comfortable" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017).

Both Lee and Marsha felt that they were outside the group of native speakers of English for different reasons. Marsha thought she was rejected because she was stigmatized by her accent; therefore, she was scared to speak in class. Alternatively, Lee felt she could not express herself clearly, so she was reluctant to speak in the discussion. However, language ability may not necessarily be the only factor that prevents L2 students from participation in class discussion. Duff (2002) asserts that "multilingual students did not need to participate because they had other multilingual repertoires, literacies, expertise, and identities to draw on and use in multiple discourse communities they belonged to locally and internationally" (p. 314). Unlike monolingual language speakers, L2 students have multiple linguistic resources and communities from where they could obtain various types of support. Therefore, they may feel it is not entirely necessary to be participants in the group of native English speakers. Like Marsha said in the interview, "we have us we don't need them" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017).

Identity as a commuter: "they, he" pronoun

The participating L2 writers were positioned in a quandary. On the one hand, they could not be entirely accepted and become a legitimate member of the academic community no matter how long they have been in America or how good they were at speaking and writing in English. On the other hand, L2 students have to work hard to align themselves in those "privileged, expected, cultivated, conventionalized, or ritualized" (Duff, 2010, p. 175) conventions of the academic discourses so that they could become legitimate and competent members of the community (Duff, 2007; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Morita, 2002,

2009; Godley & Loretto, 2013). Like professional commuters, every day they commuted between their own community and writing classes which could equip them with skills that allow them to be competent writers in academic communities.

The participants in my study valued and appreciated what they learned from their writing instructor and teaching assistants. When the participants talked about their socialization with their writing instructor and teaching assistants, they used "helpful, nice, responsible, talk clearly." Marsha commented on her writing instructor: "[our composition teacher] is really good he's really helpful" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017). Lee delineated how the teaching assistants helped her with writing "he pointed out where I did not make clear and suggested that I should use a citation to back my argument to make my writing strong" (Lee, personal communication, March 23, 2017). What is most impressive is that both participants concurred that their writing instructor and teaching assistants treated them impartially and without discrimination.

Their writing class created a space where the participants were treated fairly and they could socialize with writing instructors and teaching assistants. L2 writers had good interactions with their instructors and assistants from whom they got help and support; they were not afraid of asking questions or asking for help. Their writing instructors and teaching assistants functioned as veteran members to relay historically and socially established academic conventions as well as the beliefs, values, and ideologies that are embedded in the discourses. As a result, L2 writers would acquire linguistic and cultural competence as well as ideological knowledge which assisted them to be accepted by academic communities, regardless of the fact that they could never be accepted as legitimate members not because of the English they spoke, but because of their assigned inferior status on the basis of "ethnicity-based" hierarchy (Allen, 2011, p. 14).

Discussion

This study explored L2 writers' identity construction through their socialization with other academic community members including their writing instructor, teaching assistants, peers, and professors in other disciplines. Based on their linguistic practices and how they positioned themselves in opposition to other members in various academic contexts, the L2 participants identified themselves as insiders with other L2 students; outsiders in relation to native speakers of English; and commuters when they commuted to writing classrooms to learn about the norms, conventions, and expectations of academic communities. Additionally, L2 writers' identity construction and socialization with other academic community members were impacted by English ideologies that shape group members' attitudes and beliefs about language and how they are expected to use the language (Lee & Bucholtz, 2015). This study indicated that the L2 writers, as novice members, tried to align themselves with acceptable

discourses and language practices (Kubota, 2003) so as to become legitimate members, while expert members in mainstream academic communities employ these conventions of discourse and language as criteria to spurn L2 writers' membership. It is worth noting that English ideologies and social practices are historically constructed and related to "macro-level social and political power dynamics" which are "reproduced" and enhanced by discourses (Emery, 2016, p. 8).

One kind of power that is reflected in discourse is from the outside—the social and political power of dominant classes: the "standard language and non-accent myth" (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 44). L2 students are marked because of their less standard English and their accents. Marsha's professor's critical reaction to Marsha's accent is not uncommon; "studies consistently demonstrate that educators manifest a generally negative reaction to the 'less familiar dialect' in favor of *SAE (Standard American English)" (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 84). Everyone has an accent, but only Marsha's was marked. In effect, only people from nondominant groups are marked because of their accented English, while those from the mainstream group are perceived as speaking standard English (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Lippi-Green, 2012; Matsuda, 1991). Marsha, one of the participants in my study, was discriminated against not because of what varieties of English she spoke but because she was not from the mainstream class. In other words, language per se is neutral, while people's beliefs and ideologies about language use result in the fact that "individuals and groups are denied recognition" (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 67). The statement of Marsha's professor— "this is not our way of speaking [the word]" (Marsha, personal communication, March 27, 2017)—suggests that the "non-accent English myth" was applied to judge Marsha's English and Marsha as a language user. The professor used their way as the normal and standard way, which actually leads to another issue which is "who has authority to decide what is good" (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 3). Obviously, a benchmark that "privileges dominant white perspectives [is taken as an authority to judge] linguistic practices" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 150). The implementation of "non-accent myth" in an educational context shaped the identity of Marsha as an outsider. It also impeded Marsha from talking in class because she had been called out for her accent.

The other type of power is from L2 writers—their inner perception of "the perfect English myth" (Kubota & Okuda, 2016, p. 170). Kubota and Okuda (2016) explained that "Perfect language myth assumes that the ideal use of language should demonstrate a complete knowledge of the language system" (p. 170). In my study, though neither Lee nor Marsha were obsessed with "accent myth", they were concerned about "perfect English myth" because they were unsatisfied with their English ability of academic writing and both wanted to conform to the conventions and traditions in the academic writing community. However, when L2 writers attempt to conform to the appropriate use of genre and language, they are "marshaled [towards] purist language ideologies" (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 60) and internalizing dominant

values, expectations, and their class, race, gender, and ethnicity-based hierarchical relationships. This can "reproduce the inequality that characterizes the language and cultural globalization of English" (Liu & Tannacito, 2013, p. 356) as well as "facilitate the social construction of inequality, result[ing] in favoritism and privilege for some groups and disadvantage for others" (Allen, 2011, p. 14). Accordingly, multilingual writers who are devalued and stigmatized may become "complicit in its [dominant class] propagation against themselves, their own interests and identities" (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 68). This "perfect English myth reflect[s] and reinforce[s] the apparent 'superiority' of inner circle mainstream English, while assigning an inferior status not only to other varieties of English and other languages but also to the speakers of those varieties and languages" (Kubota & Okuda, 2016, p. 172). "The perfect English myth" justifies the marginalization of people who speak varieties of English as well as legitimizes the privilege of the mainstream English speakers. Concurrently, it specifically shaped the way Lee, the participant in my study, defined what good English is as well as how she identified herself as a problem and burden to other interlocutors.

The external power from social practice and internal perception of English from L2 writers are operating in opposite directions. "The perfect English myth" held by L2 writers motivates them to comply with academic traditions to construct their identities as legitimate and competent members; while the prevalent beliefs about "*SAE (Stand American English) and attitudes to L2 writers tend to deconstruct L2 writers' newly-established identities through alienating and discriminating against them. The two opposing forces place L2 writers in a catch-22 situation, which may deprive L2 writers of opportunities to reconstruct their identities in the new academic community.

In order to help L2 students overcome the conflicts of following academic conventions to succeed in academia and meanwhile being disenfranchised by the ideology set in academic discourses, I propose a couple of pedagogical ideas. First, instructors could unpack and make visible English ideology not only to L2 writers but also to mainstream academic community members. For example, they can start from concepts like "Standard English myths" or "listening subjects' ideological perspectives" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 152), followed by investigating how discourse helped construct social identity historically and then how meanings of discourse change related to social identity groups as well as the ways that discourse produces, maintains, and/or resists systems of power and inequality (Allen, 2011, p. 10). In so doing, both professors and students, native and non-native English speakers, will be aware that discourse is constructed historically, socially, and contextually and can sometimes enforce social inequality and injustice. In addition, writing teachers could champion L2 students to use their multilingual resources to construct and negotiate their identities or "incorporate critical theoretical perspectives to encourage multilingual writers to preserve their identities" (Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008). For instance, composition teachers could utilize writing assignments such as narratives or autobiographies to have L2 students explore

34

their personal experiences or unique cultural and historical anecdotes, thus "develop[ing] an understanding of their identities" (Canagarajah, 2015, p. 126). Lastly, writing instructors could facilitate students to realize that mainstream discourses are dynamic, fluid, and negotiable; hence, they can be deconstructed, transformed, and reconstructed. However, there is no one-size-fits-all pedagogy. The methods of helping L2 students construct and negotiate their identities vary according to students as well as teaching contexts.

Conclusion

This study applied a sociolinguistic lens to explore the impact of English ideology and unequal power relation on L2 students' identity construction. The findings indicated that the English ideologies held by the L2 students and academic community members shaped their understandings of linguistic varieties and language practices as well as their attitudes to language users. Accordingly, these L2 participants' identities were constructed and co-constructed as insiders, outsiders, and commuters in relation to other members of this academic community.

Though this study did not intend to generalize its findings to other universities or L2 writers from other cultures, the number of participants and its research method could be limitations. Future research could include more participants and employ various research methods such as classroom observations and students' writing samples.

Despite the above limitations, the findings provide insights concerning how L2 writers co-construct and negotiate their identities in academic writing socialization under the impact of English ideology. First, this study confirms that L2 students are positioned or position themselves according to people's perceptions and beliefs of standard English, which is actually related to the ideology of mainstream class. Kubota and Okuda (2016) also observe that "this hierarchy of language speakers often mirrors a racial or ethnic hierarchy, constituting a further, racialization myth, which conflates legitimate English speakers with whiteness" (p. 172). In addition, this study uncovers that L2 writers are stuck in constructing new identities in an academic context. L2 writers commute to and socialize in writing class to construct their new identities as legitimate members of the academic community. Nevertheless, their identities are deconstructed in other academic situations when people utilize English ideology to discriminate against them and decline their membership in academic contexts. This issue is complex and involves many factors. Further research is needed on the deconstruction of L2 writers' identities and its impact on L2 writers' linguistic practices in the education field.

References

Anderson, T. (2017). The doctoral gaze: Foreign PhD students' internal and external academic discourse socialization. *Linguistics and Education, 37*,

1-10.

Allen, B. J. (2011). *Difference matters: communicating social identity* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.

Bernstein, D. (1972). Social class, language and socialization. In P. P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and social context* (pp. 157-178). New York: Penguin Books.

Bhowmik, S. K. (2016). Agency, identity and ideology in L2 writing: Insights from the EAP classroom. *Writing & Pedagogy*, *8*(2), 275-309. Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.1558/wap.26864

Bronson, M. C., & Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2008). The critical moment: Language socialization and the (re)visioning of first and second language learning. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 43-55). New York: Springer.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2015). "Blessed in my own way:" Pedagogical affordances for dialogical voice construction in multilingual student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 27*, 122-139.

Clancy, P. M. (1999). The socialization of affect in Japanese mother-child conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1397-1421.

De Costa, P. I. (2011). Using language ideology and positioning to broaden the SLA learner beliefs landscape: The case of an ESL learner from China. *System*, *39*, 347-358. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.007

Duff, P. (2002). The Discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics, 23*, 289-322.

Duff, P.A. (2003). New directions in second language socialization research. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 3,* 309-339.

Duff, P. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching, 40*, 309-319.

Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 169-192.

Duff, P., & Anderson, T. (2015). Academic language and literacy socialization for second language students. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 337-350). Chichester UK: Wiley Blackwell.

Emery, C. (2016). A critical discourse analysis of the new labour discourse of social and emotional learning (SEL) across schools in England and Wales: Conversations with policymakers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *24*(104), 1-28.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Policy Press.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149-171.

Godley, A., & Loretto, A. (2013). Fostering counter-narratives of race,

language, and identity in an urban English classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 24*(3), 316-327.

Halliday, M. (2004). Three aspects of children's language development: Learning language, learning through language, learning about language. In J. Webster (Ed.), *The language of early childhood* (pp. 308-326). London: Continuum.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ho, M. (2011). Academic discourse socialization through small-group discussions. *System, 39*(4), 437-450.

Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity, (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities* (pp. 35-84). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Johns, A. (2005). English for academic purposes: Issues in undergraduate reading and writing. In P. Bruthiaux, D. Atkinson, W. Eggington, W. Grabe, & V. Ramanathan (Eds.), *Directions in applied linguistics* (pp. 101-116). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*(3), 337-368.

Kobayashi, M. (2006). Second language socialization through an oral project presentation: Japanese university students' experience. In G. H. Beckett & P. C. Miller (Eds.), *Project-based second and foreign language education* (pp. 71-93). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Kubota, R. (2003). New approaches to gender, class, and race in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*, 31-47.

Kubota, R., & Okuda, T. (2016). Confronting language myths, linguicism and racism in English language teaching in Japan. In Bunce, Pauline, Phillipson, Robert, Rapatahana, Vaughn, & Tupas, Ruanni (Eds.), *Why English? Confronting the hydra* (pp. 165-183). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lee, J. S., & Bucholtz, M. (2015). Language socialization across learning spaces. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*. (pp. 319-336). Chichester UK: Wiley Blackwell.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Liu, P., & Tannacito, D. J. (2013). Resistance by L2 writers: The role of racial and language ideology in imagined community and identity investment. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*(4), 355-373.

Matsuda, M. (1991) Voices of America: Accent, antidiscrimination law, and a jurisprudence for the last reconstruction. *Yale Law Journal, 100*(5), 1329-1407.

Mohan, B., & Marshall-Smith, S. (1992). Context and cooperation in academic tasks. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp. 81–99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*, 279-310.

Morita, N. (2002). *Negotiating participation in second language academic communities: A study of identity, agency, and transformation* (Order No. NQ75057). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305431130).

Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 573-603.

Morita, N. (2009). Language, culture, gender, and academic socialization. *Language & Education: An International Journal*, *23*(5), 443-460.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (2000). Socialization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 9*(1-2), 230-233.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2012). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1-21). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research,75*(3), 365-415.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15*, 163-246.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1986). Teasing and shaming in Kaluli children's interactions. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 165-181). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1996). Narrative as self-portrait: sociolinguistic constructions of identity. *Language in Society, 25*(2), 167-203.

Seloni, L. (2012). Academic literacy socialization of first year doctoral students in the US: A micro-ethnographic perspective. *English for Specific Purposes, 31*,47-59.

Séror, J. (2011). Alternative sources of feedback and second language writing development in university content courses. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14* (1), 118-143.

Starfield, S., & Ravelli, L. J. (2006). The writing of this thesis was a process that I could not explore with the positivistic detachment of the classical sociologist: Self and structure in the New Humanities research theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*, 222-243.

Talmy, S. (2008). The cultural productions of the ESL student at Tradewinds High: Contingency, multidirectionality, and identity in L2 socialization. *Applied Linguistics, 29*, 619-644.

Talmy, S. (2009). A very important lesson: Respect and the socialization of order(s) in high school ESL. *Linguistics & Education, 20*, 235-253.

Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *23*, 55-82. DOI:

10.1146/annurev.an.23.100194.000415

Yang, L. (2010). Doing a group presentation: Negotiations and challenges experienced by five Chinese ESL students of commerce at a Canadian university. *Language Teaching Research, 14* (2), 141-160.

Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007). Academic presentations across post-secondary contexts: The discourse socialization of non-native English speakers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 63*(4), 455-485.

Zuengler, J., & Cole, K. M. (2005). Language socialization and L2 learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 301–316). Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Note on Contributor

Wenqi Cui is a Ph.D candidate in the Composition and Applied Linguistics Program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA. Wenqi was also an Associate Professor at Beijing University of Chemical Technology in Beijing, China where she taught various English courses. Her research interests include transfer of learning, writing center research and administration, teaching writing and composition pedagogy, digital rhetoric, identity, and multilingual writers. Email: w.cui@iup.edu