Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2010), **30**, 169–192.
© Cambridge University Press, 2010, 0267-1905/10 $16.00
doi:10.1017/S0267190510000048

Language Socialization into Academic Discourse Communities

Patricia A. Duff

Although much has been written about academic discourse from diverse theoretical perspectives over the past two decades, and especially about English academic discourse, research on socialization into academic discourse or literacies in one's first or subsequently learned languages or into new discourse communities has received far less attention. Academic discourse socialization is a dynamic, socially situated process that in contemporary contexts is often multimodal, multilingual, and highly intertextual as well. The process is characterized by variable amounts of modeling, feedback, and uptake; different levels of investment and agency on the part of learners; by the negotiation of power and identities; and, often, important personal transformations for at least some participants. However, the consequences and outcomes of academic discourse socialization are also quite unpredictable, both in the shorter term and longer term. In this review I provide a brief historical overview of research on language socialization into academic communities and describe, in turn, developments in research on socialization into oral, written, and online discourse and the social practices associated with each mode. I highlight issues of conformity or reproduction to local norms and practices versus resistance and contestation of these. Next, studies of socialization into academic publication and into particular textual identities are reviewed. I conclude with a short discussion of race, culture, gender, and academic discourse socialization, pointing out how social positioning by oneself and others can affect participants' engagement and performance in their various learning communities.

INTRODUCTION

Academic discourse, and especially English academic discourse, has been examined from a number of theoretical perspectives over the past two decades in applied linguistics, particularly at the postsecondary level (e.g., Hyland, 2006), socialization being one of the more recent. Basic questions this latter work addresses are the following: How do newcomers to an academic culture learn how to participate successfully in the oral and written discourse and related practices of that discourse community? How are they socialized, explicitly or implicitly, into these local discursive practices? How does interaction

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with their peers, instructors, tutors, and others facilitate the process of gaining expertise, confidence, and a sense of authority over those practices over time?

A perusal of the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* the *Journal of Second Language Writing, English for Specific Purposes,* and other publications reveals that research on *academic discourse* has generally been associated with two sets of topics: (a) the linguistic and discursive structure and conventions of different kinds of written texts or genres, as determined by corpus-based studies (e.g., Biber, 2006; Connor & Upton, 2004) or other types of analysis; and (b) challenges involved in first language (L1) and second language (L2) writing at the postsecondary level, both undergraduate and graduate, in composition courses, mainstream content courses, and students' thesis or dissertation writing (e.g., Johns, 2005; Starfield & Ravelli, 2006).

Important research, to be sure, has been conducted on aspects of academic discourse not centrally considered here, such as the cognitive and rhetorical processes of composing and assessing writing; the effects of feedback on the quality of writing (e.g., Hyland & Hyland, 2006); textual borrowing, citation, and plagiarism (e.g., Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Pecorari, 2008; Shi, 2004, 2010); metadiscourse (Hyland, 2004); and various other topics in L2 writing (e.g., Casanave, 2004). (For a synthesis of research on L2 writing in the North American context, see Leki, Cumming, & Silva, 2008). However, insufficient research has examined, in an ethnographic or otherwise in-depth, longitudinal, and qualitative manner, the nature and effects of scaffolding and enculturation on students' acquisition and production of target genres and of the tacit cultural knowledge represented by such genres. The 2002 issue of the *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* on discourse and applied linguistics, for instance, which was otherwise quite comprehensive, had no article on discourse socialization. Yet a central concern of educators, learners, and applied linguists is how best to help novices participate effectively in new academic discourse communities and their practices. The development of novices' own voices and identities as budding scholars in academic and professional disciplines, whether in speech or writing, over time, has not been examined fully enough either, especially from sociocultural and anthropological perspectives.

Academic discourse is not just an entity but a social, cognitive, and rhetorical process and an accomplishment, a form of enculturation, social practice, positioning, representation, and stance-taking. Identity work and the negotiation of institutional and disciplinary ideologies and epistemologies are core aspects of the production and interpretation of academic discourse. Academic discourse is therefore a site of internal and interpersonal struggle for many people, especially for newcomers or novices. Considerable emotional investment and power dynamics may therefore be involved. In short, it is dialogic, not monologic (Molle & Prior, 2008). Affective issues and tensions, commonplace in writing but just as pervasive in oral discourse, may be especially acute in intercultural contexts—in which local and global (or remote) language codes, cultures, and ideologies of literacy may differ; furthermore, the expectations of students producing academic language and those assessing it (instructors, journal editors, or reviewers) may be at odds (Reder & Davila, 2007).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Problems of academic discourse and the processes of being socialized into it are not new though. Bourdieu, Passeron, and de Saint Martin (1994), in a piece that first appeared in French in the mid-1960s, described some of the challenges for French university students and also suggested that the inaccessibility of academic discourse to novices is perhaps deliberate: It serves to perpetuate the distance between experts and novices to some extent, to the experts' advantage.

ACADEMIC LITERACIES, ACADEMIC (DISCOURSE) SOCIALIZATION, OR ACADEMIC ENCULTURATION?

Several literacy theorists in the United Kingdom distinguish between *academic literacies* and *academic (discourse) socialization* on the grounds, they claim, that the former takes into account issues of power relations, identity, institutional practices, and contestation in a way that the term *socialization* does not (e.g., Ivanič, 2004; Lea & Street, 1998; Lillis, 2003). In this view, academic literacies represent a higher-order, value-added perspective. However, language and literacy socialization experiences and accounts will almost inevitably involve the negotiation of power and identity, and especially when examined within a larger sociopolitical and sociocultural context. Macro-social dimensions, by definition, are constituted in the very micro-social practices that novices are being inducted or socialized into (Duff, 1995, 1996, 2002), and vice versa. As a noun phrase, *discourse socialization* places more emphasis on social processes, negotiation, and interaction than the (arguably) more static noun *literacies* suggests. One seems to be about process, and the other about what is learned and the wider contexts of learning (e.g., literacy events, multiple forms of literacy), although that is an overly simplistic distinction, especially given current conceptualizations of literacy(ies). Both, in effect, are concerned with learning processes, with macro and micro contexts for language development, forms of knowledge and practice valued, material products or tools involved in literacy, and outcomes. *Socialization,* as currently used by applied linguists and linguistic anthropologists, does not denote a mindless, passive conditioning that leads invariably, with exposure or feedback or practice, to desired homogeneous responses, competencies, behaviors, and stances on the part of novices engaged in them (Duff, 2003, 2007a). On the contrary, the socializers may also be socialized by their junior associates or peers; that is, socialization is a bi- or multidirectional, contingent process (e.g., Duff, 1995; Talmy, 2008). Those being socialized have agency and powers of resistance, innovation, and self-determination and are not likely to simply reproduce or internalize the complete repertoire of linguistic and ideological resources in their midst (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004); even if they wanted to, it would likely not be possible, at least not right away (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002). Full mastery of target genres may not be their goal or expectation in any event.

Finally, in terms of terminology, other scholars, describing very similar processes, frame their work in terms of *academic (disciplinary) enculturation* (e.g., Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Casanave, 2002; Casanave & Li, 2008; Prior, 1998),

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

using *enculturation* and *socialization* as synonyms (cf. Casanave,1990). Others may use the nouns *induction* or *initiation* (Berkenkotter, Huckin, & Ackerman, 1991), or alternatively, the verb *inculcate,* to refer to the same process as socialization (e.g., Barnard & Torres-Guzman, 2009; Mertz, 2007). In what follows, I use *academic (discourse) socialization, academic literacies,* and *academic enculturation* more or less synonymously, but I prefer the first term. I focus mainly on work done in the past 5 years but must also lay the foundation for current developments in this area by citing some important earlier work.

EXAMINING SOCIALIZATION INTO ORAL AND WRITTEN DISCOURSE ACROSS EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

Although researchers have examined issues in postsecondary written academic discourse to a great extent, and especially at the undergraduate and doctoral levels, fewer have examined the academic discourse demands of L2 or multilingual school-aged writers (see Johns & Snow, 2006; Schleppegrell, 2004, for some current directions). Similarly, too little attention has been paid to oral academic discourse; the intermodal and intertextual relationships between oral and written discourse; multilingual, multivocal (heteroglossic) academic discourse; or the sometimes blended modes of communication found in online academic discourse, such as in course-related discussion forums. In this article, I therefore examine work that directly examines social processes in the apprenticeship of oral, written, and online or networked language for academic purposes. However, rather than review or repeat the substantial work on academic discourse itself, I examine the intersection of language socialization and academic discourse research. I begin by providing a brief description of language socialization and academic discourse.

Language Socialization

Language socialization, as an area of study, represents an orientation to language and literacy development in particular communities and settings that is informed by anthropology, sociology, (socio)linguistics, and education (Duff, 2010, in press; Duff & Hornberger, 2008). It also draws on cultural psychology and especially neo-Vygotskyan sociocultural theory (Duff, 2007a). A language socialization perspective, of which discourse socialization is but one (sub-) focus, sees development as culturally situated, as mediated, and as replete with social, cultural, and political meanings in addition to propositional or ideational meanings carried or *indexed* by various linguistic, textual, and paralinguistic forms. The core theoretical premise of language socialization is that language is learned through interactions with others who are more proficient in the language and its cultural practices and who provide novices explicit and (or) implicit mentoring or evidence about normative, appropriate uses of the language, and of the worldviews, ideologies, values, and identities of community members. Major early intellectual forces in the development of this theoretical focus from anthropology, sociology, and linguistics were Dell Hymes (see

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

review of his work in Ervin-Tripp, 2009), Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), and Bernstein (1972). Halliday (e.g., 1980/2003) examined language development (socialization) in terms of (a) learning language, (b) learning *through* language, and (c) learning *about* language. Finally, Heath's (1983) seminal book *Ways with Words* demonstrated the relationship between language and literacy socialization practices in the home, at school, and in work contexts and was therefore another important precursor to contemporary work on language socialization into academic discourse.

According to language socialization theory, as learners gain knowledge of language and an ability to participate in new discourse communities by using language appropriately, they gain various other kinds of information or cultural knowledge about ideologies, identities or subjectivities, affective orientations, linguistic and nonlinguistic content (history, mathematics) and practices valued by the local community (Ochs, 1986). For example, students in classrooms are often socialized into and through discourses of (showing) respect (and self-control, decorum) to teachers, to one another, and to the subject matter itself (e.g., Howard & Lo, 2009; Talmy, 2009); that is, they are not just socialized into the pragmatics or sociolinguistics of showing respect but also into ideologies of respect, including aspects of social stratification, ranks, roles, and values—which they, in turn, may either internalize or, rather, challenge or resist. In elementary school classrooms, classroom discourse can provide clear evidence of other types of ideologies, too, such as the need for autonomous and independent academic work versus collaboration and shared knowledge production and ownership (e.g., Toohey, 1998). In bilingual, diglossic, or multilingual contexts, the language or code used in classrooms, and the norms related to whether, when, and with whom other linguistic codes are allowed are themselves important aspects of socialization.

Textbooks and other publications (e.g., journals) often have a clear socializing or enculturating role as well, regarding the objectivity or objectification of science (Viechnicki & Kuipers, 2008), for example, or ideologies of "perseverance, seniority, the importance of education and modesty," in the case of Chinese heritage-language textbooks (Curdt-Christiansen, 2008, p. 100). In U.S. law schools, students are socialized to the authority of legal texts. Mertz (2007) demonstrated how the ability to use past legal cases (legal precedents) for current purposes is a crucial component of legal education. Socratic classroom questioning often centers on the legal cases and related notes and reports in textbooks, with a focus on facts, technical legal vocabulary, and prior legal decisions or opinions (i.e., hierarchically layered legal authority from different levels of courts or legislatures). Such classroom discourse also serves to socialize students into adversarial, doctrinal courtroom discourse and also into how to "build analogies between the case before them and earlier cases" (p. 61).

Numerous overviews of language socialization exist. Duff and Hornberger's (2008) edited volume includes a 30-year historical review of language socialization as a subfield of linguistic anthropology (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008), a chapter on academic discourse socialization in university mainstream content areas (Morita & Kobayashi, 2008), another on language socialization and schooling (Baquedano-López & Kattan, 2008), and a chapter looking at the intersections

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

between language socialization for higher education and for professional work (Duff, 2008). Bronson and Watson-Gegeo (2008), in the same volume, emphasized the need for studies of language socialization that incorporate critical theoretical perspectives; using the example of one writer, a Japanese doctoral student in California, they also argued that the student, Keiko, deliberately resisted certain grammatical forms in English (definite articles) as a way to preserve her identity and voice as a Japanese person (see also Bronson, 2004, and the discussion that follows here). Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002) provided a very comprehensive earlier review of language socialization and issues of cross-generation reproduction versus transformation in norms of language use and code choice across transcultural contexts and Bayley and Schecter's (2003) edited volume includes studies of school-based or postsecondary language socialization as well. Finally, Zuengler and Cole (2005) reviewed 17 studies taking a language socialization perspective, a number of them dealing with school language and literacy.

Elsewhere, I have considered various dimensions of language/discourse socialization into academic communities, based on research in both L1 and L2 settings. I have also problematized certain aspects of academic discourse socialization by examining some of the misconceptions often held about it, such as that so-called experts are necessarily good, competent socializers (e.g., good presenters, writers, mentors) or that the biggest challenge for students in academia is formal technical or academic written discourse rather than other more interpersonal forms of discourse and communication found in class discussions or other informal academic interactions (Duff, 2004, 2007b; see also Bunch, 2009).

Socialization into academic discourse, especially in middle-class Anglo-European families, typically begins in the home during early childhood as children are prepared for the kind of school-related literacies and language practices (e.g., show and tell, picture book reading interactions, reader response, discussions about current events, problem solving, and hypothesizing in North American schooling). This preparation affects one's ability to engage in more sophisticated literacy activities later, which in turn affects subsequent workplace, professional, or vocational socialization and performance (Duff, 2008; Heath, 1983; Ochs & Taylor, 1992). Language socialization research now focuses more than before on both older learners in a variety of activity settings (rather than young children) and on socialization into academic literacy practices and not only, or primarily, oral ones (e.g., Séror, 2008; Zappa-Hollman, 2007b). The newer research on postsecondary academic literacy socialization extends scholarship on genre and written composition produced nearly two decades earlier (e.g., Berkenkotter, Huckin, & Ackerman, 1988; Casanave, 1990).

Regardless of the age of learners or the context involved in (academic) language socialization research, much of it has also incorporated the notion of apprenticeship (Rogoff, 1990) into the ways of thinking and acting in a particular community of practice (CoP; Lave & Wenger, 1991), while also (increasingly) noting the limitations of the CoP construct in classroom discourse studies (Duff, 2007b; Haneda, 2006; Zuengler & Miller, 2008). Zappa-Hollman (2007b) suggested that a social network approach (what she called *individual networks*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of practice) may account for students' simultaneous engagements with richly distributed human, material, and symbolic resources and relationships (their individual networks) better than the typically narrower, more immediate, apolitical, and tightly circumscribed sense of discourse socialization associated with CoP.

Academic Discourse

Academic discourse (or academic language, academic literacies) refers to forms of oral and written language and communication—genres, registers, graphics, linguistic structures, interactional patterns—that are privileged, expected, cultivated, conventionalized, or ritualized, and, therefore, usually evaluated by instructors, institutions, editors, and others in educational and professional contexts. (Professional discourse is subsumed here under the cover term of academic discourse because generally professional socialization has a strong academic component prior to or concurrent with internships and other field experience in the professions and because academia itself is a professional site.) Martin and Rose (2007) described discourse as "meaning beyond the clause. . . . the social as it is constructed through texts, . . . the constitutive role of meanings in social life" (p. 1). Academic discourse is usually connected with specific disciplines or professional areas and is embodied both in texts and in other modes of interaction and representation. It is normally inculcated within academic communities such as school or university programs and classrooms. Some students, in postcolonial or lingua franca settings, for example (Duff, 1996; Moore, 2008), may have opportunities to be socialized bilingually or multilingually into academic discourse(s). However, in English-dominant immigrant-receiving settings or other multilingual contexts, students may be expected to develop proficiency in English academic discourse but not in their home languages and literacies, or not to the same extent. Regardless, academic discourse is a complex representation of knowledge and authority and identity that comprises language(s), ideologies, and other semiotic or symbolic resources, often displayed in texts, but one that has strong social, cultural, institutional, and historical foundations and functions (Leki, 2007). As Fairclough (1989) put it, discourse is text, interaction, and context.

Academic discourse is continually evolving, and many new, sometimes experimental and highly personal, creative genres exist (e.g., Kouritzen, Piquemal, & Norman, 2009), some of which complement—even transgress—traditional norms of standard academic discourse(s), such as those requiring that research articles follow the structure of introduction, methods, results and discussion, commonly referred to as IMRAD. Nevertheless, applied linguists usually associate academic discourse with particular genres, genre sets, and registers, and often a relatively formal register, with subject-specific (or disciplinary) linguistic, discursive, and multimodal conventions (see, e.g., Biber, 2006). Studies of academic discourse and the socialization of students to engage with it and to participate in new discourse communities have tended to be associated primarily with written or visual texts and their production although that more limited notion is changing (Molle & Prior, 2008). Despite sometimes being

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

described as such, academic discourse or even individual genres are not homogeneous, singular, pure, or static forms of discourse; they often contain hybrid and multimodal features and change over time and across contexts and are enacted within the constraints and contingencies of each local setting (Prior, 1998).

Students entering academic institutions have different amounts and kinds of prior experience with academic discourse, even when their home language is the same as that of the educational institution. Mature English-speaking students entering English-medium higher education after some years of absence may experience "change, difficulty, crises of confidence, conflicts of identity, feelings of strangeness, the need to discover the rules of an unfamiliar world" (Ivanič, 1998, p. 7). For students coming from disadvantaged or minority languages and backgrounds, the challenges become particularly salient. Leibowitz (2005) described black isiXhosa-speaking students' socialization into academic discourse in an English-medium South African university. Students' discomfort often stems from an acute awareness of differences across the worlds of their homes, communities, or prior school experiences and those in the current educational setting. Starfield's (2002) ethnographic case studies in a South African first-year university sociology program illustrated similar disjunctions.

However, students' discomfort is often not simply a perception on their part, an internally generated form of anxiety or a lack of immediate identification or familiarity with the new target discourses and community practices. It is also coconstructed through interactions and other social practices, by dominant power structures and prevailing discourses of exclusion, including gendered discourses (Morita, 2004, 2009; Tracy, 1997). Thus, also affecting students' experiences of socialization is the way newcomers and their histories and aspirations are viewed and by how they are positioned—by themselves, by others, and by their institutions—as capable (or incapable), as worthy, legitimate, showing potential for fuller participation or membership (or not), as insiders (or outsiders), and so on. Unfortunately, as many language socialization researchers have found, some programs, activities, and instructors are more effective socializing agents or mediators than others (Casanave & Li, 2008; Morita, 2004, 2009; Séror, 2008; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a, 2007b). Those who are most successful not only display, but also make explicit, the values and practices implicit in the culture and provide novices with the language, skills, support, and opportunities they need to participate with growing competence in the new culture and its core activities (Duff, 2007b, 2010). With students coming from a range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds and variable levels of out-of-school support for their academic literacies, the challenges are typically magnified (Morita, 2000). As Heath (1983) and others (e.g., Hawkins, 2005) have demonstrated, young children from minority cultures must learn academic or "school" discourse very early on in order to succeed, particularly if they do not come to school with the vaunted cultural, symbolic, and discursive capital and social practices of mainstream educational culture. Older newcomers have less time to catch up and have a very steep linguistic, discursive, and cultural learning curve once mainstreamed in content or professional areas.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION AND ACADEMIC DISCOURSE ACROSS MODALITIES

Oral Academic Discourse Socialization

As much research has demonstrated (e.g., Biber, 2006), oral and written academic discourse are quite distinct and so too are the ways in which students are socialized into target practices, genres, registers, and speech events. Oral academic discourse is normally much more spontaneous and public than written discourse, the latter often produced in relative isolation by a writer (student, professor)—although with a great deal of social academic experience leading up to the writing—and then submitted to someone else for private assessment or comment. Yet the two modalities, oral and written, are not completely distinct, because oral presentations or lectures typically draw on a variety of written texts and may also incorporate visual texts by means of PowerPoint, handouts, or other media, to facilitate communication (e.g., Kobayashi, 2003, 2004). Similarly, any given text, oral or written, is not a stand-alone construction because, especially in academic discourse, it normally draws on and interweaves many other texts. Nevertheless, in this section I consider issues in oral academic discourse socialization first, since it has been the most neglected in studies of academic discourse.

There is more to academic socialization than just learning to read and write standard academic discourse, which is nevertheless a crucial form of knowledge construction, representation, and assessment. For example, learning to participate effectively in initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) exchanges, which are a staple in many teacher-fronted classes around the world, may pose challenges for many learners but must be mastered (Mehan, 1979). IRE has therefore been researched a great deal from many theoretical and methodological approaches, including language socialization. Contributors to Barnard and Torres-Guzman's (2009) volume illustrated how students in elementary and secondary schools in different parts of the world are inducted or socialized through oral classroom discourse, including IRE, into locally sanctioned knowledge and practice.

Oral communication skills displayed in presentations, mini-lectures, group project work, and class discussions are now being stressed and assessed by instructors and peers more than before and are therefore being researched more by language socialization scholars as well (e.g., Duff, 1995, 2009; Duff & Kobayashi, 2010; Kobayashi, 2006; Morita, 2000; Tracy, 1997; Zappa-Hollman, 2007b). This emphasis on orality reflects, in part, the amount and quality of collaboration and communication (and not just textbook knowledge or theory) that are now required in real-world knowledge building and knowledge sharing in a variety of professional and academic fields—from medicine to engineering, pharmacy, education, social work, and clinical psychology (Duff, 2010). The students themselves in these new discourse communities may be asked to evaluate their own and others' participation in these highly oral, collaborative activity settings, normally on the basis of participants' social interaction skills as well as their knowledge of academic discourse. Although oral academic discourse has not received as much attention in the relevant research in applied linguistics

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as written discourse has to date, new research demonstrates just how socially, cognitively, and discursively complex and variable a standard oral activity such as oral presentation can be, whether in the context of a classroom or boardroom, a thesis or dissertation defense theatre, or a conference.

Tracy (1997), a professor of communication, was a participant observer in a 2-year study of a weekly academic colloquium series in communication departments at two U.S. universities. She documented the academic discourse socialization and related identity work taking place for members of the department: graduate students, visitors, and professors of different rank and gender, for whom every week a colleague was scheduled to make a formal presentation on their work. The socialization practices were associated (potentially) with conflict, tensions, the loss of face, and dilemmas, as her book's subtitle, *Dilemmas of Academic Discourse,* reveals. Furthermore, the colloquium involved a complex merging of oral and literate practices and of less contextualized, impersonal language as well as more contextualized, interpersonal language and interaction.

Unlike most written discourse, oral presentations are often commented upon publicly immediately after the speaker has finished, which makes them potentially face-threatening to both presenters and audience members who are expected to provide commentary, critique, and stimulating questions and points for follow up discussion (e.g., Duff, 2009). In a study of doctoral students and postdoctoral fellows in physics, Jacoby (1998) examined the functions served by the conference talk rehearsal, as part of the discursive and professional socialization of physicists in physics labs with fellow graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, supervisors, and others. One significant part of Jacoby's analysis was the problem-solving comment sequences and complaints (based on what she called *indigenous assessment*) following the practice sessions. She described these as being specifically "designed and heard as not only concerned with particular problems in particular presentations, but also as communicating general lessons about the alleged conventional and moral expectations of a conference talk presentation, as a genre and as an event, in the communication of science" (p. 364).

Kobayashi (2003, 2004, 2006) examined how undergraduate Japanese exchange students at a Canadian university were socialized into required practices in support of their final group project presentations (see also Beckett, 2005, for research on socialization through project work at the secondary school level). He traced the in-class and out-of-class development of the project, a kind of living, organic process, as students became co-agents of socialization, coaching one another through a variety of meetings and rehearsals and strategies, using both Japanese and English, in order to ultimately deliver an effective English presentation. They also worked together to produce grammatical PowerPoint slides and concoct pragmatic strategies to engage their audience and teacher in appropriate, sometimes humorous, ways.

Zappa-Hollman (2007a) and Morita (2000) examined the very different specifications and characteristics of oral presentations across disciplines (e.g., applied linguistics, neuroscience, history, and engineering). In addition, each presentation they observed was not viewed as independent of the others but was

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contingent upon prior experience and moment-by-moment developments. Students often chose strategies for their own implementation of the activity based on what they perceived to be successful, unsuccessful, original, or unoriginal in previous presentations by themselves and by peers in the same courses. Elements of reproduction were reported but so too were innovation and experimentation by students, precisely to showcase their originality, considered to be a valuable trait by some students and a way of distinguishing themselves from other graduate students.

Vickers (2007) conducted ethnographic research on L2 socialization in electrical and computer engineering team meetings at an American university, during which engineering projects were designed by student teams. A sample project was a device to render sound-producing devices mute. The instructors socialized students into the "industry" culture of teamwork in the engineering profession beyond university as well as within their program. "Efficiency, clarity, and engagement" (p. 628) in the design process were valued attributes of engineering students—and competent engineers—in the local academic and professional communities. Explicit advice to that effect was therefore pervasive. Vickers analyzed participation and relative expertise in managing the conversational floor in the design meetings, demonstrating how, linguistically, the more technically expert students initially assumed the role of information providers or explainers (socializers) to the novices, whose role it was to ask questions seeking technical information. With time and observation, experience, scaffolding, confidence building, and control over the content, the novices had learned enough technical content to themselves become information providers and to "think, design, and talk like a competent engineer" (p. 637). One new student had to "position himself as a competent, expert, core member of the team before he could take on the language behaviors typical of such team members" (p. 637).

Turning now to socialization within public school content classroom discourse, my research in grade 10 high school content-area classrooms in Hungary and Canada revealed how students were socialized into multimodal, intertextual, heteroglossic literacies and ways of knowing and speaking about history and social studies, respectively (Duff, 1995, 1996, 2002, 2004, 2009; cf. Maybin, 2003). I examined teacher-fronted discussions and also student recitations and presentations in the form of mini-lectures. In the dual-track Hungarian-English bilingual schools in Hungary, the discourse in Hungarian-medium classes socialized students into a highly ritualized form of oral recitation similar in some ways to the sometimes nerve-wracking Socratic discourse practiced in law classes described in Mertz's (2007) book. In the English-medium programs in Hungary, however, new, ostensibly more democratic discourse practices were being introduced, involving not only a different code choice (English) but also new genres (e.g., voluntary student mini-lectures, small-group discussions on historical topics such as the Russian Revolution, and only some years later, written essays) by means of which students could present their knowledge and teachers could assess it.

The most valued components of oral academic discourse became very clear in each setting, often in the form of feedback from the teacher. However, for many of the English language learners in the mainstream social studies classes who were

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

analyzed, the vernacular discourse and pervasive extracurricular references (to *The Simpsons* and other iconic pop culture TV programs) were especially perplexing, and students were seemingly being socialized into the appropriation of two (diglossic) registers and not just one. Furthermore, students needed to learn how to make logical connections between topics from the news and other content and their academic material and also contribute to these discussions meaningfully, a very challenging prospect for newcomers to Canada without a strong command of English.

Socialization into Written Academic Discourse and (Inter)Textuality

Much of the early work on written academic discourse socialization, particularly at the postsecondary level, is not based on language socialization theory and research practice as developed by Ochs, Schieffelin, and others (e.g., Ochs, 1986; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986) but on compatible work in sociology, rhetoric, the history and sociology of science, and other traditions.

In-depth case studies and ethnographies have been conducted of individual learners and their interlocutors negotiating the textual requirements, and especially their own writing processes and struggles, across courses, or throughout the dissertation writing or publishing experience, in some cases longitudinally over one or more years (e.g., Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Berkenkotter et al., 1988, 1991; Casanave, 1992, 2002; Casanave & Vandrick, 2003; Spack, 1997). Leki (1995) examined the challenges faced by international students from Europe and Asia in their first semester at a U.S. university and their coping mechanisms including, in some cases, their resistance to professors' demands or requirements rather than their accommodation.

Casanave (2002) focused on academic and professional writing socialization at the postsecondary and professoriate levels. Dozens of key case studies in the field of L2 writing were reviewed, both those conducted by her (e.g., Casanave, 1992, 1998) and by others (e.g., Ivanič, 1998; Prior, 1998; Spack, 1997). The studies dealt with such topics as plagiarism, agency, authority, authorship, authenticity in writing, doctoral student mentoring, article revising strategies, silence, power and (textual) identities, voice, disciplinary enculturation, experiences of multilingual writers, and resistance. The changing cultures and practices within and across disciplines such as sociology were also examined.

Academic enculturation or discourse socialization is viewed by Casanave (2002) as a set of "writing games" (the title of her book) for which students and new professionals must learn the rules—or learn how to bend the rules—in order to participate and succeed. Several of the students profiled were in the field of sociology. Most of the studies look at the processes involved in writing papers as single-authors (acknowledging, however, that even single-authored papers blend many different voices and texts and may be coconstructed through interactions between supervisor and student or larger research team and students). A few studies (see Prior, 1998) also deal with the processes involved in co-authored academic discourse, by groups of students and/or professors. Prior underscored the importance of textual practices and activities to disciplinary enculturation: "providing opportunity spaces for (re)socialization of discursive

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

practices, for foregrounding representations of disciplinarity, and for negotiating trajectories of participation in communities of practice" (p. 32).

Too often it is taken for granted that language learners (and other newcomers) will be fully accommodated and apprenticed within their new communities and will also have ample access to the target discourse practices they are expected to emulate (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007b; Haneda, 2006). Such assumptions of facile apprenticeship, accommodation and access are problematic in the light of evidence to the contrary (e.g., Belcher, 1994). Research has found, not surprisingly perhaps, that many instructors do not provide explicit and appropriate scaffolding, modeling, or feedback to support students' performance of oral assignments (e.g., presentations, critiques, projects; e.g., Zappa-Hollman, 2007a, 2007b). It is simply expected that most students are already familiar with the genres required for academic essays or presentations and the criteria for evaluating them, even though these attributes and criteria may vary greatly from one context to the next.

Two dissertations demonstrate this point. Both examined academic literacy socialization from, or in, the margins—that is, the kinds of messages, intended or not, provided by instructors to nonnative English-speaking students, typically in the margins or at the end of their assignments or written drafts and their impact on the students (already at risk of being marginalized linguistically) who read the comments. Séror (2008) reported that the Japanese undergraduate students in his yearlong study in Canada were often deeply disappointed, confused, or simply not helped by the comments on their assignments, which were illegible and incomprehensible to many students; but beyond that, comments were often negative, terse, global, and uninstructive. He also observed how students were sometimes positioned disadvantageously by the instructors' comments (e.g., as nonnative speakers and writers), denying the students any sense of legitimacy in their courses—or any possibilities for other identities, such as successful writer or insightful scholar or someone with a strong background in the content area.

Bronson's (2004) multiple case study, also using ethnographic methods and language socialization theory, reached a similar conclusion, but by focusing on graduate students' academic literacy socialization at a university in California. Both studies reported that the feedback provided was contingent on many other sociopolitical and socioeducational factors, such as the value and reward structures in place for teaching (as opposed to research) at the university, the instructors' status and rank at the university, the number of students per course, the availability of teaching assistants, and other considerations, such as whether instructors felt qualified or obligated (able or willing) to assist students in their courses to become better writers (in both form and content) and whether students could locate good (peer) proofreaders or tutors. In some cases, it was reported, students received only a grade, but their articles were never returned. Opportunities for meaningful enculturation into written academic discourse were thus lost, to students' great disappointment and detriment.

Zappa-Hollman (2007b), referred to earlier, examined the importance and density of Mexican undergraduate exchange students' individual social networks and the other institutional resources they availed themselves of in both

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mexico and Canada for their socialization into literate practices valued in the Canadian university context she studied. She also contrasted the academic cultures and modes of academic discourse socialization surrounding literacy and higher education in universities in the two countries as a way of explaining some of glaring differences and difficulties that students encountered. She then followed the students back to Mexico to determine what effect their English (Canadian) experiences had on their subsequent academic discourse socialization and performance in Mexico (e.g., they now felt the instruction in Mexico was unchallenging, required too many weekly assignments, and did not acknowledge them as mature and independent thinkers; they also reported transferring some process writing practices from Canada to their assignments in Mexico).

In a study summarized briefly in Duff (2007a), I found that, for many of the Korean undergraduate exchange students in a similar study, accessing suitable English-speaking or English-supporting networks was not at all straightforward for a variety of reasons (social, cultural, pragmatic). Most ended up seeking the assistance of bilingual and bicultural Generation 1.5 Korean Canadians or other Asian students as their socializing agents or cultural and linguistic brokers rather than local, native English speakers. The latter were often unable to provide the support needed. Their Asian-background peers, on the other hand, socialized them not into a local Anglo-Canadian university CoP so much as a Pan-Asian, transnational, multilingual one, a kind of hybrid/third space. Korean-Canadian Generation 1.5 university students, for their part, may also experience complicated, nonlinear trajectories as they are socialized into English academic discourse and communities; and as their investments in maintaining their bilingualism and biculturalism, and their identities, dominant languages, primary linguistic networks, and academic goals change over time. Kim's (2008) dissertation demonstrates this point very well with longitudinal data from seven Korean-Canadian case study participants.

In her discussion of the socialization of first-year law students into American legal discourse and into the law profession, Mertz (2007) argued that the process entails not simply learning to write or read or speak like a lawyer, essential though these skills and discourses are for lawyers. Rather, the novice law students or initiates, as she called them, must learn, first and foremost, to *Think Like a Lawyer*—the subtitle of her book. The epistemologies, worldviews, and language ideologies underlying the behaviors she observed (e.g., the Socratic method of teaching) in her study of language use and interaction in contracts classes at eight different law schools strongly favored distancing oneself morally and emotionally from cases, tragedies, or conflicts. Instead, students were socialized into dispassionately interpreting and applying the letter of the law in what was presumed and claimed to be a neutral and technical manner. Philips's (1982) earlier study examined the discursive socialization of U.S. law students into the legal cant, that is, the specialized, complex, and often publicly inaccessible or impenetrable legal terminology and discourse patterns, both oral and written, associated with appellate (case) law and practice.

Similar processes occur in other advanced degree and professional programs such as medicine. Using a discourse socialization perspective, Hobbs (2004) analyzed medical residents' and doctors' handwritten progress reports

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(treatment notes) as well as physicians' implicit socialization into these practices and genres by means of their supervisors' reviews and their concurrence on cases. The physicians' progress reports she examined used a mixture of Latin, English abbreviations, and other symbols. To produce and interpret such reports accurately, and to develop their clinical judgment and expertise, physicians had to have considerable theoretical and clinical experience and enculturation.

The criteria for genres of writing in graduate school courses and for later writing may sometimes differ from actual practice requiring that people continue to be socialized or apprenticed into new target discourse practices in the professional workplace. Studies by Parks (2001) and Parks and Maguire (1999) analyzed the important and pervasive genres of nursing reports and care plans taught in nursing programs for use by nurses during or at the end of their hospital shifts. However, the texts Francophone student nurses (in Quebec) had been socialized to produce in their study actually differed from those expected in either Francophone or Anglophone Montreal hospitals, requiring further socialization into workplace literacy practices.

In general, substantial discussion has focused on postsecondary language and literacy socialization, particularly in work coming out of academic writing. An edited volume by Australian scholars, *Learning Discourses and the Discourses of Learning* (Marriott, Moore, & Spence-Brown, 2007), highlighted many of the challenges associated with academic discourse socialization in a variety of program contexts in that country.

To date, less research has examined written academic discourse socialization at the elementary or secondary levels than at the postsecondary level. Poole (2008) illustrated the competing discourses of (so-called) decontextualized and contextualized language use in the literacy socialization of grade 5 students in reading groups in which nonfictional, illustrated essayist (expository) texts about dinosaurs, for example, were being discussed. Other work has looked at socialization into scientific discourse (e.g., Huang, 2004) and religious as opposed to secular schooling contexts for school-aged learners. A special issue on the "spirit of reading ... sacred texts" (Sterponi, 2008) features work on Talmudic, Koranic, and Catholic (*doctrina*) text recitation and related code choice issues, particularly in multilingual contexts, as well as gender norms, the socialization of morality, and related issues (see Baquedano-López & Kattan, 2008; Fader, 2001, 2006; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Moore, 2008).

In summary, a substantial body of new research exists on language socialization into oral and written discourse across an increasingly wide range of academic and educational discourse contexts. In the next section I consider emergent, blended, digital modes of communication.

Blurred, Blended or Hybrid Modes of Academic Discourse Socialization

Much academic discourse that takes place in the written mode is now mediated by electronic networks, and some genres represent a blend of oral and written discourse that permits the inclusion of graphics and hyperlinks as well. With an increasing number of mixed-mode courses offered at universities, involving both

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

face-to-face and online discussion components, students and teachers have opportunities to participate in new kinds of discourse communities and new genres mediated by these new technologies. In her research in Canada on computer-mediated communication (CMC) in mixed-mode graduate courses in education, Yim (2005) found that students, both native and nonnative speakers of English, needed to learn appropriate roles, registers, and technological skills to participate in asynchronous, threaded, bulletin-board discussions related to course content. In one course, the instructor insisted on highly academic discourse and carefully formulated responses to course content, which all students struggled with to some extent. In another course, however, the instructor provided a more informal, interactional forum for discussion, and in that discourse community, students were socialized into different kinds of language use, pragmatics, and role-taking. The CMC speech functions there involved conveying knowledge and expressing opinions (initiating and reacting to postings), making requests for additional information and commands, and then using a range of social formulas or speech acts, such as greeting, thanking, acknowledging, and apologizing. Although the instructor set up the online component and offered suggestions for how the students would engage with it, the students really learned how to participate through observation of their peers' interaction styles and registers. In the course that required less formal academic discourse, students produced more postings on average and reported feeling more ownership over their writing and also others' writing. In the more formal environment, on the other hand, there was tension between the instructor's preferred style of communicating online and that of students, and an attendant lack of social formulas and positive appraisal of one another's messages. There was also resistance to this mode and register of socialization.

Potts (2005) also examined CMC discourse in mixed-mode graduate courses in language and literacy education and, similarly, reported on the bidirectional or multilateral socialization taking place as everyone in the discourse community over time, in response to others' forms of participation, learned together how they wanted to communicate with one another. They negotiated, typically online, how to participate most meaningfully and also how to project their (desired) identities as intelligent, informed graduate students. One nonnative English speaker in the course reflected on her academic discourse socialization as follows: "I try to learn how ... other participants post their message, and then I try to cite their postings into my posting, not exactly the expression, I try to imitate their style, their writing style and then I try to imply [apply] the way of writing into my posting" (p. 151). Deliberately analyzing, borrowing, and imitating certain others' postings was commonly reported, reflecting their jointly achieved enculturation into a new educational mode for which the norms and conventions were still under negotiation (cf. Lu & Nelson, 2008).

Finally, Warschauer (2002) and Lam (2008) have looked at the role of online discussion and participation in other forms of electronic networking on students' well-being and especially as it affects their academic literacies and identities. Clearly, research in this area will be of increasing importance in the future as greater collaboration in project work, report writing, presentations within and across communities and disparate mediating networks, and electronically mediated education becomes the norm rather than the exception.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SOCIALIZATION INTO ACADEMIC PUBLICATION AND TEXTUAL IDENTITIES

In a series of articles based on her dissertation, Li (2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2007) conducted a multiple case study of the experiences of Chinese doctoral students at a university in Nanjing, China, learning to publish in international journals in English, typically as a PhD requirement. She noted the complex and arduous processes of enculturation experienced by the participants, science students who might not have a strong background in academic English writing. Li also described the multiple community memberships the doctoral students were simultaneously negotiating, in their departments, their disciplinary fields in China, and the international scientific community mediated by English. She carefully documented their enculturation (socialization) into the world of English scholarly publication, which required, among other things, grappling with editors' and reviewers' comments on manuscript submissions and the revising process.

Turning now to academic literacy socialization at more advanced levels, many articles and chapters provide authors' personal perspectives on how they, as new professors (or from even earlier stages), were socialized into valued academic writing practices leading to scholarly publication, tenure, and esteem or acknowledged authority. Well-known applied linguists have published their personal reflections on their own multilingual literacy development or socialization along their academic journeys as graduate students and now professors (e.g., Belcher & Connor, 2001; Casanave, 2002; Casanave & Vandrick, 2003; Pavlenko, 2003) or have described the tensions when scholars trained in one linguistic and/or discourse community (e.g., the United States) later return to their home country (e.g. China), where other academic discourse traditions prevail (Shi, 2002, 2003).

Belcher and Connor (2001) edited narratives by 18 other established applied linguists, many of whom are known for their research on L2 literacy and writing and contributed chapters about their own formative bilingual or L2 literacy experiences and their current "multiliterate lives," as professors in North America, Asia, Israel, or Scandinavia, and elsewhere. They described their experiences of discourse socialization across languages, text types, and contexts, illuminating the many factors affecting emerging professionals.

RACE, CULTURE AND GENDER IN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE SOCIALIZATION

Although much research has examined gender in relation to first and second language socialization in everyday, mostly oral, language contexts (e.g., Gordon, 2008; Howard, 2008; Kyratzis & Cook-Gumperz, 2008; Pavlenko & Piller, 2008), particularly from a poststructural perspective, relatively few studies have examined it explicitly in relation to academic discourse socialization. Morita's (2009) research on gender, language and culture is a longitudinal case study of a Japanese international student at a Canadian university. The stances her participant, Kota, took in interactions with his female professor indexed certain gendered expectations, both on his part and hers (cf. Schleef, 2008, on gender and academic discourse; Casanave, 2002; Mertz, 2007). Morita determined that "[w]hereas feminism, critical theories, and issues of minority education were

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

popular in the department, Kota was interested in exploring university–industry collaboration from a perspective of economics—a viewpoint that he felt might be considered as 'a male perspective'" (p. 453). His professor, a feminist scholar, resented some of the behaviors and attitudes of the male international students in her class, which she attributed to a lack of respect for the teaching/learning situation and for her as a female instructor. Morita interpreted the gendering practices, identities, and (perceived) membership in the new academic community as highly coconstructed, situational, and based on several interrelated contextual factors.

Morita (2002, 2004) also conducted a larger, longitudinal, multiple case study that examined six Japanese women's academic discourse socialization into graduate and senior-level undergraduate courses at a Canadian university, focusing on the women's variable levels and forms of participation (including silence) in class discussions. Many factors influenced the way they performed their multiple identities in different course contexts: their status as English teachers, nonnative English speakers, non-Canadians, older versus younger Japanese nationals, women, and so on, and their positioning by teachers and classmates in particular ways (as "outsiders," MA not PhD students). They each negotiated these positionings and their sense of agency (e.g., to receive assistance) within each class over time leading to variable outcomes. These two studies illustrate the value of taking a nuanced, nonessentialist perspective on issues connected with race, culture, and gender to see how students and instructors, through various kinds of socialization, experiences, and contestation, negotiate their legitimacy and identities in academic discourse communities. More research of this sort is needed.

CONCLUSION

Language socialization is a dynamic, socially and culturally situated, multimodal, and often multilingual process with unpredictable uptake, intentions, behind-the-scenes power plays, investment on the part of learners, and outcomes. Such dynamics are particularly visible in academic communities. Some implications of this overview are that applied linguists need to better understand the actual discursive practices and requirements of various fields and the ways in which students, instructors, and scholars are positioned by academic discourse, by institutions, and by interactions within them. Greater attention must be paid to the process of developing intersubjectivity in academic activity settings among participants and developing new knowledge, competencies, and textual identities in these learning communities through appropriate mediation and scaffolding. Instructors, students, and colleagues also have a joint responsibility to serve as better agents of one another's socialization and development as writers, speakers, and scholarly thinkers. The successful socialization of both nonnative and native writers worldwide has, it seems, become a higher-stakes enterprise as assessments for scholarships, grants, degrees, and jobs require more strategic and visible output with greater perceived impact than ever before. Therefore, schools, universities, and other sites for socialization

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

into academic discourse and into academic discourse communities need to increase the metadiscursive support made available to students and instructors to enhance the quality of language and literacy socialization in their midst and to accommodate and support newcomers—from all language backgrounds—within these discourse communities more satisfactorily and seamlessly as well.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I acknowledge, with thanks, the very helpful and detailed editorial suggestions of an anonymous reviewer. Unfortunately, due to space constraints, I could not elaborate on some of the points raised.

REFERENCES

Baquedano-López, P., & Kattan, S. (2008). Language socialization and schooling. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 161–173). New York: Springer.

Barnard, R., & Torres-Guzman, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Creating communities of learning in schools*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Beckett, G. H. (2005). Academic language and literacy socialization through project-based instruction: ESL student perspectives and issues. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 15*, 191–206.

Belcher, D. (1994). The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate students and their mentors. *English for Specific Purposes, 13*, 23–34.

Belcher, D., & Connor, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Reflections on multiliterate lives*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Berkenkotter, C., Huckin, T. N., & Ackerman, J. (1988). Conventions, conversations, and the writer: Case study of a student in a rhetoric Ph.D. program. *Research in the Teaching of English, 22*, 9–45.

Berkenkotter, C., Huckin, T., & Ackerman, J. (1991). Social contexts and socially constructed texts: The initiation of a graduate student into a writing research community. In C. Bazerman & J. Paradis (Eds.), *Textual dynamics of the professions: Historical and contemporary studies of writing in academic and other professional communities* (pp. 191–215). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

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

Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J-C., & de Saint Martin, M. (1994). Students and the language of teaching. In P. Bourdieu, J-C. Passeron, & M. de Saint Martin (Eds.), *Academic discourse: Linguistic misunderstanding and professorial power* (pp. 35–79). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bronson, M. D. (2004). *Writing passage: Academic literacy socialization among ESL graduate students, A multiple case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Davis.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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.

Bunch, G. C. (2009). "Going up there": Challenges and opportunities for language minority students during a mainstream classroom speech event. *Linguistics and Education, 20*, 81–108.

Casanave, C. P. (1990). *The role of writing in socializing graduate students into an academic discipline in the social sciences.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

Casanave, C. P. (1992). Cultural diversity and socialization: A case study of a Hispanic woman in a doctoral program in sociology. In D. E. Murray (Ed.), *Diversity as resource: Redefining cultural literacy* (pp. 148–182). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Casanave, C. P. (1998). Transitions: The balancing act of bilingual academics. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 175–203.

Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Casanave, C. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Casanave, C. & Li, X. (Eds.). (2008). *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Casanave, C., & Vandrick, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Connor, U., & Upton, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Discourse in the professions: Perspectives from corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. (2008). Reading the world through words: Cultural themes in heritage Chinese language textbooks. *Language and Education, 22*, 95–113.

Duff, P. A. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 505–537.

Duff, P. A. (1996). Different languages, different practices: Socialization of discourse competence in dual-language school classrooms in Hungary. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language acquisition* (pp. 407–433). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive 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. A. (2004). Intertextuality and hybrid discourses: The infusion of pop culture in educational discourse. *Linguistics and Education, 14*, 231–176.

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

Duff, P. A. (2007b). Problematising academic discourse socialisation. In H. Marriott, T. Moore, & R. Spence-Brown (Eds.), *Learning discourses and the discourses of learning* (pp. 1–18). Melbourne, Australia: Monash University e-Press/University of Sydney Press.

Duff, P. A. (2008). Language socialization, higher education, and work. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 257–270). New York: Springer.

Duff, P. A. (2009). Language socialization in a Canadian secondary school: Talking about current events. In R. Barnard & M. Torres-Guzman (Eds.), *Creating communities of learning in schools* (pp. 165–185). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialization. In N. H. Hornberger & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 427–452). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Duff, P. A. (in press). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of language socialization*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
Duff, P. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization*. New York: Springer.
Duff, P. A. & Kobayashi, M. (2010). The intersection of social, cognitive, and cultural processes in language learning. In R. Batstone (Ed.), *Sociocognitive perspectives on language use and language learning* (pp. 75–93). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Ervin-Tripp, S. (2009). Hymes on speech socialization. *Text and Talk, 29*, 245–256.
Fader, A. (2001). Literacy, bilingualism, and gender in a Hasidic community. *Linguistics and Education, 12*, 261–283.
Fader, A. (2006). Learning faith: Language socialization in a community of Hasidic Jews. *Language in Society, 35*, 205–229.
Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied Linguistics, 28*, 440–465.
Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*, 339–361.
Gordon, D. (2008). Gendered second language socialization. In P. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 231–242). New York: Springer.
Halliday, M. (2003). 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. (Reprinted from *Oral and written language development: Impact on schools—Proceedings from the 1979 and 1980 IMPACT Conferences*, pp. 7–19, by Y. Goodman, M. Haussler, & D. Strickland, Eds., 1980, Newark, DE: International Reading Association)
Haneda, M. (2006). Classrooms as communities of practice: A reevaluation. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 807–817.
Hawkins, M. (2005). Becoming a student: Identity work and academic literacies in early schooling. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*, 59–82.
Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Hobbs, P. (2004). The role of progress notes in the professional socialization of medical residents. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 1579–1607.
Howard, K. M., & Lo, A. (Eds.). (2009). Mobilizing respect and politeness in classrooms [Special issue]. *Linguistics and Education, 20*(3).
Howard, K. M. (2008). Language socialization and language shift among school-aged children. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 187–199). New York: Springer.
Huang, J. (2004). Socialising ESL students into the discourse of school science through academic writing. *Language and Education, 18*, 97–123.
Hyland, K. (2004). *Metadiscourse*. London: Continuum.
Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes*. New York: Routledge.
Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Ivanič, R. (2004). Discourses of writing and learning to write. *Language and Education, 18*, 220–245.
Jacoby, S. (1998). *Science as performance: Socializing scientific discourse through the conference talk rehearsal*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
Johns, A. (2005). English for academic purposes: Issues in undergraduate reading and writing. In P. Bruthiaux, D. Atkinson, W. Eggington, W. Grabe, & V. Ramanathan

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Eds.), *Directions in applied linguistics* (pp. 101–116). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Johns, A., & Snow, M. A. (Eds.). (2006). Academic English in secondary schools [Special issue]. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*(4).

Kim, J. (2008). *Negotiating multiple investments in languages and identities: The language socialization of Generation 1.5 Korean-Canadian university students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

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

Kobayashi, M. (2004). *A sociocultural study of second language tasks: Activity, agency, and language socialization.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

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.

Kouritzen, S., Piquemal, N., & Norman, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Qualitative research challenging the orthodoxies in standard academic discourse(s)*. New York: Routledge.

Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kyratzis, A., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (2008). Language socialization and gendered practices in childhood. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 145–157). New York: Springer.

Lam, W. S. E. (2008). Language socialization in online communities. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 301–311). New York: Springer.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lea, M., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*, 157–172.

Leibowitz, B. (2005). Learning in an additional language in a multilingual society: A South African case study on university-level writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*, 661–681.

Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 235–260.

Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A synthesis of research on second language writing in English*. London: Routledge.

Li, Y. (2005). Multidimensional enculturation: The case study of an EFL Chinese doctoral student. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 15*, 153–170.

Li, Y. (2006a). Negotiating knowledge contribution to multiple discourse communities: A doctoral student of computer science writing for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*, 159–178.

Li, Y. (2006b). *Writing for international publication: The case of Chinese doctoral science students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of Hong Kong.

Li, Y. (2007). Apprentice scholarly writing in a community of practice: An intraview of an NNES graduate student writing a research article. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*, 55–79.

Lillis, T. (2003). Student writing as "academic literacies": Drawing on Bakhtin to move from critique to design. *Language and Education, 17*, 192–207.

Lu, Y., & Nelson, G. (2008). Negotiating on-line postings and publication: Identity construction through writing. In C. Casanave & Y. Li (Eds.), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders reflections on academic enculturation* (pp.150–165). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Marriott, H., Moore, T., & Spence-Brown, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Learning discourses and the discourses of learning*. Melbourne, Australia: Monash University e-Press/University of Sydney Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Martin, J., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.
Maybin, J. (2003). Voices, intertextuality and induction to schooling. In S. Goodman, T. Lillis, J. Maybin, & N. Mercer (Eds.), *Language, literacy and education: A reader* (pp. 159–170). Stoke on Trent, UK: Trentham Books, Stoke on Trent.
Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Mertz, E. (2007). *The language of law: Learning to think like a lawyer*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Molle, D., & Prior, P. (2008). Multimodal genre systems in EAP writing pedagogy: Reflecting on a needs analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*, 541–566.
Moore, L. C. (2008). Language socialization and second/foreign language and multilingual education in non-Western settings. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 175–185). New York: Springer.
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.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*, 573–603.
Morita, N. (2009). Language, culture, gender, and academic socialization. *Language and Education, 23*, 443–460.
Morita, N., & Kobayashi, M. (2008). Academic discourse socialization in a second language. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 243–256). New York: Springer.
Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 1–13). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 3–15). New York: Springer.
Ochs, E., & Taylor, C. (1992). Science at dinner. In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 29–45). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
Parks, S. (2001). Moving from school to the workplace: Disciplinary innovation, border crossings, and the reshaping of a written genre. *Applied Linguistics, 22*, 405–438.
Parks, S., & Maguire, M. (1999). Coping with on-the-job writing skills in ESL: A constructivist-semiotic perspectives. *Language Learning, 49*, 143–175.
Pavlenko, A. (2003). The privilege of being an immigrant woman. In C. Casanave & S. Vandrick (Eds.), *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language and multicultural education* (pp. 177–193). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Pavlenko, A., & Piller, I. (2008). Language education and gender. In S. May & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 1. Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 57–69). New York: Springer.
Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*. London: Continuum.
Philips, S. U. (1982). The language socialization of lawyers: Acquiring the "cant." In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling* (pp. 176–209). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
Poole, D. (2008). The messiness of language socialization in reading groups: Participation in and resistance to the values of essayist literacy. *Linguistics and Education, 19*, 378–403.
Potts, D. (2005). Pedagogy, purpose, and the second language learner in on-line communities. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *62*, 137–160.
Prior, P. A. (1998). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Reder, S. & Davila, E. (2007). Context and literacy practices. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*, 170–187.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Schleef, E. (2008). Gender and academic discourse: Global restrictions and local possibilities. *Language in Society, 37*, 515–538.
Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Séror, J. (2008). *Socialization in the margins: Second language writers and feedback practices in university content courses.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
Shi, L. (2002). How Western-trained Chinese TESOL professionals publish in their home environment. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*, 625–634.
Shi, L. (2003). Writing in two cultures: Chinese professors return from the West. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*, 369–391.
Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second language writing. *Written Communication, 21*, 171–200.
Shi, L. (2010). Textual appropriation and citing behaviors of university undergraduates. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 1–24.
Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study. *Written Communication, 14*, 3–62.
Sterponi, L. (Ed.). (2008). The spirit of reading. Practices of reading sacred texts [Special issue]. *Text and Talk, 28*(5).
Starfield, S. (2002). "I'm a second-language English speaker": Negotiating writer identity and authority in Sociology One. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 1*, 121–140.
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 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 and Education, 20*, 235–253.
Toohey, K. (1998). "Breaking them up, taking them away": Constructing ESL students in grade one. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 61–84.
Tracy, K. (1997). *Colloquium: Dilemmas of academic discourse*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Vickers, C. (2007). Second language socialization through team interaction among electrical and computer engineering students. *Modern Language Journal, 91*, 621–640.
Viechnicki, G. B., & Kuipers, J. (Eds.). (2008). Objectification and the inscription of knowledge in science classrooms. *Linguistics and Education, 19*, 203–318.
Warschauer, M. (2002). Networking into academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes 1*, 45–58.
Yim, Y. K. (2005). *Second language speakers' participation in computer-mediated discussions in graduate seminars.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007a). Becoming socialized into diverse academic communities through oral presentations. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 63*, 455–485.
Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007b). *The academic literacy socialization of Mexican exchange students at a Canadian university.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
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.
Zuengler, J., & Miller, E. (2008). Apprenticing into a community: Challenges of the Asthma Project. In K. M. Cole & J. Zuengler (Eds.), *The research process in classroom discourse: Current perspectives* (pp. 129–148). New York: Erlbaum/Taylor & Francis.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048 Published online by Cambridge University Press