Chapter 7. Linguistic Socialization: More Than "regular talk," "paraphrase and stuff"

Brian D. Carpenter

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Reflect Before Reading

Imagine you meet someone who has never set foot on a college campus, is years removed from their secondary education, and has never heard the term "academic writing." They ask, "What is academic writing?" How would you reply? How would you explain what readers of academic writing value?

~ ~ ~

"I feel like a research paper is more academic than the others because you have to paraphrase and stuff."

—*Marie*

"Do you remember like that first day when you had us write like the words we talk, because in my paper I said 'balling' when I talked about basketball, and I didn't know how to translate that to like regular talk like for playing basketball because it just sounds weird to me. . . . "

—*Charles*

Hopping into the way back machine, we set the dial to stop at 1978 and spy on my dining room table a little blue grammar book—my tenth grade grammar class book, which was a compendium of exceptions and rules. Maybe my attraction to working with novice writers stems from that little blue book. I let the book drive me to distraction, and angst. Now, as a professional, I hold the book tightly to remind me of how not to think about grammar and writing. Writing, particularly a basic writing course, needs to explicitly mark valued choices for particular contexts. Students need to manipulate and deconstruct the language and genres of collegiate writing in order to succeed. This manipulation and deconstruction are important for the success of all students, but particularly for multilingual students (see Achugar and Carpenter; Carpenter et al.; Gibbons; Schleppegrell).

This chapter, much like Ashley Ritter's chapter in this collection, hopes to shed light on what it means to be literate and to belong to a particular discourse community, in this case, a basic writing community. My little blue book would ruin this community, as the book demanded tests on rules, structures, and conventions. This community needs access and the tools to begin changing their life chances, not grades on comma usage.

The community in question here resided in a decrepit building and had as two of its members Charles and Marie. Both have Puerto Rican backgrounds to add to their United States urban experience. Marie is comfortable communicating in Spanish or English. Charles understands a lot of Spanish, but prefers to respond in English. Both would loathe the little blue book. In spring 2015, all three of us would be part of a community that tried to be explicit about valued choices in collegiate writing. All three of us would engage in reflection on this course. None of us, though, would pick up the little blue book during our journey.

For Charles and Marie, and two other students, Santiago and Janie, who we will meet shortly, one of their first dedicated attempts to enter the academic writing community in the university came in the spring of 2014 during my English 100 Basic Writing class. According to the course description in Indiana University of Pennsylvania's undergraduate catalog, in ENGL 100, "The student develops the basic English skills necessary for clear and effective communication" (*Undergraduate*). The syllabus of record for this course states that clear and effective communication is for both oral and written skills.

The syllabus states that Basic Writing is designed to "Develop coherence, unity, fluency, and stylistic control [of students'] written language—through shorter written assignments as well as by drafting, revising, and polishing several extended pieces of writing" as a way to develop "skills requisite for academic success." In other words, the class is designed to aid novices as they begin participating in the academic discourse community of the university. As Roz Ivanič notes, entry into this community, even for monolingual university students, can evoke feelings of strangeness.

This class and this group of students were charged with learning about academic discourse where the work "is not just a site of entry but a social, cognitive, and rhetorical process and an accomplishment, [but also], a form of enculturation, social practice, positioning, representation and stance-taking" (Duff 170). In short, my students were asked to adopt the practices and stance taking valued in academic writing, so they could assume the mantle of "college writer," or in other words, the identity of a writer in the university. Reflecting Ken Hyland's notion of identity, identity here is viewed as a social and collective enterprise created in and around interactions and text creation within the institutional practice of and performance in Basic Writing. As Len Unsworth points out, in addition to helping students develop as writers, an explicit connection to academic discourse allows students to expand on a linguistic repertoire valued in the academic discourse community.

Access to academic language and discourse and creation of this writerly identity are necessary for students if they want to participate in schooling and may even allow them to "challenge or support current institutions and social forms as they come to understand how language functions to establish and maintain social practices to articulate different ideological positions" (Schleppegrell 163). In other words, developing access to and revealing formations of academic discourse may not just allow students to succeed in schooling, but may also allow students a site of potential challenge and change to their very position within these worlds.

I begin this chapter by defining linguistic socialization and describing how my Basic Writing course serves as one entry point for the process of linguistic socialization. The chapter continues with an introduction to four focal students and includes excerpts of their writing work from the class, an explanation of class work, and finally data from interviews with these students as evidence for their processes of linguistic socialization. I show that a focus on schooling-valued language choices as a tool to develop academic literacy and as an explicit part of teaching and curriculum helps equip students, particularly multilinguals, with an expanded linguistic repertoire that is needed to succeed in schooling culture and in academic discourse communities.[1]

Linguistic Socialization

For the work I share in this chapter, I use Patricia Duff's definition of linguistic socialization that recognizes language and interactions around language as the central process through which socialization, or enculturation into the community of academic discourse, occurs. As M.A.K. Halliday notes, language is viewed as a social semiotic that allows one to view learning language, learning about language, and learning through language as a simultaneous endeavor. Thus, as both Basil Bernstein and Lev Vygotsky contend, at the center of linguistic socialization is work with language and its cultural practices focused on interactions with more proficient peers or authorities in creating culturally situated and valued oral or written text.

Frances Christie asserts that linguistic socialization puts language and interaction at the forefront of learning to override the assumptions that students enter university with the requisite skills necessary to succeed, while Caroline Coffin and Jim Donohue contend that simply teaching students about language is sufficient to engender success in higher education settings. Linguistic socialization, then, allows learning language, learning about language, and learning through language to situate appropriate language choices as inherent in revealing "worldviews, ideologies, values and identities of community members" (Duff 3).

---

1. For additional scholarship that suggests the importance of teaching valued language choices to promote the development of academic literacy, see Achugar and Carpenter; Carpenter et al.; Duff; Schleppegrell.

Briefly, my Basic Writing course, which was the site of the linguistic socialization that I examine in this chapter, is based on the premise that expanding the linguistic repertoire of learners allows them to create academic texts and to make new meanings of and about their world, thus helping them develop novel ways of seeing, thinking, and enacting within the higher education community. Basic Writing is housed in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences and thus values academic texts, which are seen as being primarily about persuasion where writers "[make] choices to gain support, express collegiality and resolve difficulties in ways which fit the community's assumptions, methods, and knowledge" (Hyland 5). The course consistently orients learning to not only the immediate environment of Basic Writing but also to the wider community of the university, be it criminology or communication media (two popular majors for the students in the course), and to the other worlds of jobs and life. The course situates and gives prominent value to the creation of written texts, and thus students must enact an identity as a college writer who can acquire "college success" as the course is designed to do. Not only are the students asked to enter into a contract to improve their college readiness, but they are also asked to develop an understanding of how college writers behave and what valued discourse choices college writers make when asked to produce written texts in the university.

Four Basic Writing Students

The four Basic Writing students whose processes of linguistic socialization I examine in this chapter were first-year students in their second semester, 18 to 19 years old, and enrolled in an ENGL 100 course I led during spring 2014. Three of the students, Charles, Marie, and Santiago, identified with their Puerto Rican heritage, and two of these students, Marie and Santiago, considered themselves bilingual in Spanish and English. Charles noted that his mother was from Puerto Rico but that he only spoke household Spanish with his *abuela*. The fourth student, Janie, was a monolingual English speaker.

About My Course

The course assignments concerned readings and interactions with Winifred Gallagher's *The Power of Place*. This book is loosely about "the relationship between people and places" (7) and the power our place has on our physical, emotional, and psychological well-being. While not an academic textbook, it still relies heavily on the incorporation of other people's ideas and work to substantiate Gallagher's claims about the power of place. It was an accessible reading about a topic my students could relate to, as they had all just relocated and changed places in physical, emotional, and psychological ways.

Linguistic socialization for students begins the moment they enter a classroom, but for us in English 100, the first explicit concept related to linguistic

socialization we focused on in class was cohesion. The concept of cohesion I use in this chapter is rooted in Halliday's concept, which is concerned with the textual metafunction where "creating relevance to the context" is its main function (36). Cohesion, in short, allows the writer to construct discourse and make explicit the relationship across clauses independent of grammatical structure and is essential for successful academic writing. Stephen Witte and Lester Faigley find, for example, through an analysis of 90 first-year essays, that higher-rated essays are "more dense in cohesion than low-rated essays" (195). Carmel Cloran explains that cohesion is tied to thematic progression and uses František Daneš' "simple," "continuous," and "derived" patterns to show thematic progression (387). In short, simple cohesion is when the topic/comment or theme/rheme is built in. In this pattern, the rheme/comment becomes the theme/topic for the following sentence and builds meaning in a highly connected fashion. The "continuous" pattern is when theme/topic remains consistent but the rheme/comment is different and usually expanding or building meaning into the theme. "Derived" refers to the instance of picking up aspects of the theme, for example, a synonym or a date within a range, as a way of continuing to build cohesion.

As an English education professor and someone who works with pre-service and in-service English teachers, I find many English teachers use these ideas stated earlier, but wrap their meaning into the term "flow" as a way to describe cohesion. In fact, Martha Kolln explains, "the topic of cohesion is about the connection of sentences to one another, to the 'flow' of a text, to the ways in which a paragraph of separate sentences becomes a unified whole" (26).

Next, I highlight two students' work on cohesion, as cohesion, as a distinct and purposeful focus of the class, is a concept integral to students' linguistic socialization in the process of creating valued written texts for the university. Cohesion, as a valued concept in writing, becomes a material representation of the act of linguistic socialization. Socialization is not just an oral process but is demonstrated in texts and course materials that students generate for class.

This writing occurred prior to the fourth class meeting, where the previous three had been about syllabus introduction, university systems at their disposal (e.g., the writing center), and about two classes working on meaning from the introduction to Gallagher's book. The following two excerpts come from papers by Marie and Santiago,[2] the two self-identified bilingual students, and were written and posted in Desire2Learn (D2L), an online learning platform, prior to the fifth class meeting.

Figures 7.1 and 7.2 show the first two paragraphs from the students' writing and were selected to help show cohesiveness in writing. The analyses that follow focus on choices these students made to create cohesive links in service of creating coherent texts.

---

2. All names are pseudonyms.

1   In life most people have experienced a change that has impacted them
2   some sort of way. Some experiences can even turn out to be life-changing
3   experiences. I have experienced an environmental change that has made
4   be become the person I am today.
5   … After living in Florida till the age of five, I moved to Puerto
6   Rico for 2 ½ years. These environmental changes did not create much of
7   an impact on me. I still lived across the beach and remained speaking
8   Spanish, my first language. The weather and culture was also no different
9   among each other and what I was already familiar with.

Figure 7.1. Excerpt from Marie's early-semester writing.

Marie's excerpt begins by using repetition as a cohesive device to talk about "change" and "experiences" (lines 1 & 2), which led to "an environmental change" (3). She then moves to writing about herself at the beginning of the second paragraph (5 & 6), and in the interest of space, I have included only the last sentence of this narration. The cohesiveness of her writing breaks down a bit as she moves from "I moved to Puerto Rico for 2 1/2 years" (5 & 6) to the referent "these environmental changes" (6). This breakdown, I believe, occurs because earlier we read a focus on duration and her age, as well as a change of location, and thus to label both of those factors "environmental changes" creates a repetition that is not wholly accurate. Her repetition of "environmental changes" in line 6 is expanded on in lines 7, 8, and 9. Marie's choices resemble the "continuous" or "block" type of cohesion attributed to Daneš earlier.

1   When I first got to Puerto Rico the air was fresh and I was still upset that I
2   had to leave my friends, so I wasn't really social at first. Seeing my family
3   provided me comfort and sleeping at night without hearing any kind of
4   disruptive noises from the outside helped me relax. Though the positive
5   change ends there. I started developing allergies, which was never an issue
6   for me. My mom, who is a nurse, told me that the reason being was
7   because of the climate change. Then at school my spanish wasn't so good
8   so the students mocked me and told me to stop speaking english because
9   this wasn't America

Figure 7.2. Excerpt from Santiago's early-semester writing.

Santiago heads the majority of his initial clauses with the theme "I" (1 & 2) and uses the rhemes to expand what he was thinking or doing. "Seeing my family" as the theme for his second sentence allows him to expand on why he was "still upset" (1). The familiar connection takes on the role of "positive change" (4 & 5) and gets expanded by the next sentence with the theme of "I" (5). However, a bit of a disruption with the choice of the theme "my mom" (6) breaks from "I" and thus makes this less cohesive than the previous examples. And, it struck me as more oral in its construction than written, as the references (i.e., from allergies to mom to nurse) seem to rely heavily on the reader/listener to make the connections ex post facto versus having the lexical and grammatical choices making clear the relations across the text.

Ruqaiya Hasan notes that working with students and reflecting on the valued idea of cohesion is part of the process of linguistic socialization (see "Ways," "What"). The examples in figures 7.1 and 7.2 help to demonstrate Marie's and Santiago's current understandings, or current developmental levels, of how to use cohesion and serve as evidence for their understanding of the concept of cohesion. For Vygotsky and others, it is at this level where teachers must begin the process of concept development. These examples from the students help us, students and teacher, to begin the process of developing a mutually shared understanding of the concept of cohesion and allow us to be explicit about the concept's place in our developing sense of valued academic terms. Without this initial instance and assessment, teachers can only focus on prescribed components of a curriculum, but for linguistic socialization to be successful, we must start with students' initial understanding of the concepts upon which we will focus.

In figures 7.1 and 7.2, the student voices heard in the excerpts from their writing lead us to the next section on class work and to the work done on cohesion and choices writers can make to create more cohesive texts with the thought in mind and clearly marked in class that the more cohesive texts are the more likely they are to be coherent, as Witte and Faigley argue.

Additional Coursework

The work presented in the following examples is part of what was done with the whole class and recorded in notes after the class. This is by no means meant to represent the only work done on the concept of cohesion, but this was work presented to and worked on by the entire class during a class meeting. The first example came after the first essay had come in and occurred during the seventh class meeting. The following is an example I generated to exemplify one way writers can create cohesion in their texts:

> Directions: Here are two claims with examples. Underline the words that help connect the sentences. For example, in the sentences, I like pizza. It is good. I would underline "pizza" and "it" as they represent the connection across the two sentences.

> I like <u>pizza</u>. <u>It</u> is good.

The goal of this work was for the students to see that connecting sentences can be purposeful, and we used paragraphs A and B shown in Figure 7.3, which were student postings to a homework assignment in D2L, to expand the discussion of the ways writers can connect ideas across sentences.

During the discussion of the first paragraph, students brought up that "I" (1) connects the first and second sentence, but that the reference of "that deployment" (1) was hard to follow because the writer had not provided an earlier use or marking of "deployment." The class decided that the "it" (4) in the final sen-

tence was from the phrase "from being in" (2) because "I" was implicit in who was "being in," and thus appropriate when used before "really opened my eyes" (3). Reference, then, is missing in one connection with "that deployment," yet somewhat appropriate for the final "it" reference. Further, the students noted the lexical repetition from the first to the second sentence with the choice of "I" as being a positive choice for this writer.

Example A
1   I gained a lot of good life experience. After that deployment I had a lot of
2   world cultures from being in so many different countries, from European to the
3   Middle Eastern countries. It really opened my eyes and I look at the world in a
4   better way with some of those countries knowing how good we have it here at
5   home in America.

Example B
1   There was a major change in diversity from my small town compared to the
2   large student population at SU. For example, in my small town the ratio is
3   close to 97% white 1% African American 1% Hispanic, and 1% Asian.
4   Throughout the week you would see someone of a different ethnicity than
5   yourself maybe once. At SU I have someone of a different gender sitting next
6   to me in every single class. Different ethnicities on each side nonetheless. The
7   ethnic backgrounds are on a much broader spectrum to that of my hometown.

Figure 7.3. Two example student paragraphs.

For paragraph B, the class came to the conclusion that the writer was trying to achieve cohesion by using expansion with "for example" (2) where the writer first introduces the "diversity" (1) of her high school, and then her current situation in her university setting, SU (2). There is also lexical repetition where "diversity" gets encoded as "different ethnicity" (4 & 6), "different gender" (5) and "ethnic backgrounds" (7) as the writer finishes this paragraph.

In all, these examples demonstrated the three areas we focused on in the class: reference, expansion/elaboration, and lexical repetition.

Learning through Language

These activities and classroom discourse highlight Halliday's idea about learning language, learning about language, and learning through language as a simultaneous endeavor. My students were discussing language choices and were negotiating meaning with not only peers but also with the teacher. This discourse allows the students to become socialized into not only the concept of cohesion but also to the very idea that discourse choices are, in fact, choices. Both Hasan and Duff point out that this engagement in productive talk about and with language valued in this discourse community is important for learners and classrooms in order to develop an expanded linguistic repertoire and thus participate in acts of linguistic socialization.

Similar discourse surrounding valued academic choices occurred when discussing the final essay for the course. These excerpts come from week 14 of the

15-week semester and are derived from an assignment that asked the students to summarize Gallagher's ideas from a chapter of their choosing. This assignment was designed to present the students with an opportunity to practice a valued concept in English, summary,[3] and to provide the students with a glimpse into the writing demands of the next course in the series, Composition I, ENGL 101.

By this moment in the semester, students had completed weekly writing in D2L, had completed two essays with rough draft and final draft components, and had done the two in-class activities focused explicitly on cohesion provided earlier. Classroom discourse and peer interactions had occurred on the concepts of summary and cohesion. This socialization into the valued choices involved in summary and the continuing talk about cohesion continued the students' work on and development of academic discourse. These examples are from a prompt designed to elicit summary, a type of academic writing that students would be expected to produce across the university curriculum.

Final Essay Examples

The excerpts in figures 7.4 and 7.5 are exactly as they were turned in by the students, as were the previous student writings. The cohesive devices deployed in these summaries resemble the types the students used in the early examples, though, I will argue, there are some differences in the choices they have made.

```
 1   In chapter 3, North versus South, she elaborated how climate shapes our
 2   behavior to a certain extent. At first a professor taught that people from
 3   southern regional climates ("sun people") had a more of a communal and
 4   collective culture. While on the other hand people from northern regional
 5   climates ("icy people") originated a society of dominance, destruction and
 6   death believing the difference in climate shaped them become that (52).
 7   This controversy later goes on into how climate doesn't only influence
 8   ones performance, but how your body responds to it. She informs no
 9   matter where you are from you have the ability to adapt to a new
10   environment. For example, Eskimo, black or white, when in extreme cold
11   temperatures everyone is going to freeze equally. The Eskimo is just not
12   going to be affected much due to their few physiological adaptations to
13   the cold. The newcomer will only develop increased circulation after 6
14   weeks (55-56). This behavioral modification is triggered from settings in
15   which humans come into contact with.
```

Figure 7.4. Excerpt from Marie's final essay.[4]

To start, Marie uses her entire paragraph as an analysis or an expansion of her initial sentence to show how Gallagher "elaborated how climate shapes our behavior" (1 & 2). Marie does this by first using expansion as her first theme in

---

3. For more about summary as a valued concept in academic writing, see Brown, Campione, and Barclay; Brown, Campione, and Day; and Kintsch and van Dijk.

4. No changes have been made to grammar, punctuation, or content.

the second sentence by choosing "At first" (2) as another way to mark "for ex-ample." Marie continues to elaborate on this subject with "while" (4) and then encodes both of the ideas in sentences two and three in the reference and en-coding of the ideas as "this controversy" (7) to help her support her initial claim about "how climate shapes our behavior." The theme of the fifth sentence breaks the cohesiveness of this paragraph by using the pronoun "she" (8) as a reference to Gallagher, which is problematic, as between the initial Gallagher reference in sentence one we are presented with "professor," which could in fact be the "she" the writer is referencing. But this assumption is dispelled as we read forward to see how Marie continues elaborating on what the readers were inform[ed] (8) of with the "for example" (10) as the theme for the sentence following. This is fol-lowed by the theme of "Eskimo" (11) as a lexical repetition from the "for example" sentence. This repetition pattern is repeated, as "the newcomer" (13) theme is a repeated marking of "black or white" (10) as not native to Eskimo climes and thus are newcomers, who like "Eskimos" undergo "behavior modification" (14) which is the last repetitive cohesive moment, but one which I believe is a bit of a misreading from "physiological adaptations" (12). The type of expansion and elaboration (e.g., "at first" and "for example") and referencing with nominaliza-tions "controversy" (7) and "modifications" (14) Marie is demonstrating here are not as pronounced in her first writing sample.

1   Gallagher mentions a mother and infant emotional bond before
2   differentiation. She brings up several points that supports that emotion has
3   a structure on environment by talking about the mother/infant bond. She
4   talks about a biologist whom took infants with a naturally aggressive
5   strain in mice, and placed them with a foster mother that was easygoing,
6   which they grew up to be nice (119). This provides information on the
7   bond between infant and mother can structure the emotion of the infant.
8   The aggressive mice have the instinctual of being aggressive but were
9   raised to be nice habitually. She also uses another example of grandparent
10 monkeys being placed with younger male monkeys and the grandparents
11 started to put on weight, grow hair back and the male's sperm count went
12 up (119). This shows that grandparent monkeys had an instinctual
13 emotional reaction to the younger monkeys which caused the grandparents
14 to have a different emotional structure. However, Gallagher also talks not
15 just about structure but emotional addictions.

Figure 7.5. Excerpt from Janie's final essay.

Similarly, Janie uses reference as her main cohesive choice in her final writing. "Gallagher" (1) starts the paragraph and then is the theme for the majority of the remaining sentences (2, 4, and 9). Janie also uses themes of reference pronouns (e.g., "this provides" (6) and "this shows" (12)) as markers to coalesce the previ-ous information and then uses rhemes (e.g., "provides" (6) and "shows" (12)) to elaborate on Gallagher's ideas. The final "however" (14) theme is used as a way to connect the current paragraph with the preceding paragraph and expand on Gal-lagher's ideas. Janie's choices in this example are similar to her choices in the first

example, in that she had control of cohesive choices throughout these examples and indeed throughout the semester.

Both examples show first-year composition students demonstrating changes in choices involving cohesion and also show production of the concept of summary discussed and framed in classroom discourse. The choices they made while creating these texts, and their texts as representative of their burgeoning academic voices, are linked to and demonstrate understanding of valued academic discourse. The options they exercised as writers indicate their growing linguistic repertoire, a repertoire that will provide them pathways to enter the university discourse community.

What Charles, Janie, Marie, and Santiago Had to Say

The following fall I spoke with Charles, Janie, Marie, and Santiago about their experiences in my Basic Writing class. Each interview lasted about 20 minutes and covered ground that ranged across the class, outside into the university, and into their personal lives. What I share in what follows are those parts of the interviews that touched on these students as writers and as writers and learners in my Basic Writing course. These data indicate these students' ideas about who they are as writers and how the experience we had in the spring might have affected them as writers in the university.

Marie shared she felt "scared" coming into the class and she "didn't feel like a good writer." But now when it comes to academic writing, she knows she has to "paraphrase and stuff . . . because I know I have to do it [and] we have to have facts to support our stuff and it's expected." For the Basic Writing course, she felt like we had "to do a persuasive paper, and things like that" and when asked how the genre of persuasive writing differs from other genres she stated, "like the structure and word choice" are different. And when asked about how cohesion works, she recalled it is "that flow thing and where you're not jumping around . . . that you write your stuff so it flows, like you don't want to write like an irrelevant sentence that's not going to make sense and stuff."

When Janie was asked about the class, she was positive and exclaimed, "I approach every class like I'm here to learn something and I'm going to learn something." When asked what she took away from the class, she mentioned how she is able to work on not repeating herself so much and that her vocabulary had improved to the point "like even my father has noticed how my language has changed and he makes fun of me." As for cohesion, she stated how prior to the class, she had been taught about it one way but now even at the writing center "when I am working with students, particularly 100 [level] students, I think about how they are connecting their sentences together" where they can "use similar words to connect sentences together . . . like they might have 'water' in one sentence and then 'H_2O' in the next."

Similar to Janie's reference to her father, Charles mentioned how his under-

standing and use of language have changed. He referenced the first time we spoke in class about "talk language" and how this type of language is different from written language:

> Do you remember like that first day when you had us write like the words we talk, because in my paper I said "ballin'" when I talked about basketball, and I didn't know how to translate that to like regular talk like for playing basketball because it just sounds weird to me, so that kinda helped out too . . . and I can't remember what it's called the concepts of it (R—one of the things I talked about was the difference between everyday—) [Charles] yeah, that's it, I just kept saying regular talk but yeah everyday language but I knew it was something like that.

When asked about what he took away from the Basic Writing course, he recalled how the class talked about "academic language like when we talked about saying like 'talk' but instead like use 'states' and stuff like that . . . oh yeah and like cohesion with like the sentence structure and where it's like no run on sentences." Asked to follow up on cohesion, Charles said the following:

> It's like you start with a topic and you stay on topic like for example, "I went to the funeral" and you can't just jump and then say like "I went to the funeral—period" and then like "we got something to eat." Like you just can't say that and then say, "the funeral was sad" like you just can't jump like that you got to like stay on topic instead saying that "I went to the funeral. It was sad and I felt terrible" or something like that you have to stay on topic.

Here, Charles references the idea of cohesion where themes can be linked across sentences or where cohesion allows the writer a chance to begin expanding a topic as in his example of how he felt at the funeral.

Santiago's view of his coursework mirrors Janie's, and when asked what it meant to be in Basic Writing, he was pragmatic and said:

> I mean I look at college and I'm paying tuition so I want to take advantage of every opportunity so I was like "okay, let's see what this class has to offer" [and] this is how I deal with every class. Like I want to publish some books, so I was like "alright let's do this" . . . either way I like to see what new ideas it could bring and it had like new ideas for me to think about, it gave me some new ideas, and like was like you gave us this research part and I was like okay, like I knew I wasn't good at this part but I was like "okay let's do it" and then our first peer review came in and I was like "well, at least these people are honest" which I love, then you responded, and at the end of the day I was like "okay, I

can see where I can improve and get better."

Santiago's recollection here shows a student with a positive attitude toward writing, as he wants to publish in the future. He also demonstrates how integral community was to his development during the class, suggesting the role the class community takes in the linguistic socialization that occurs during these writing classes.

He also commented about how the course makes connections across the curriculum. When asked to remember a concept, which came out of our summary work from the class, he said, "The big thing was the paraphrasing, that is a big thing, like I use that in my psych class . . . like we have to use paraphrasing and quoting." Santiago referenced aspects of the Basic Writing course that he now finds useful for other aspects of his university experience. In short, he is mapping one set of ideas and concepts, paraphrasing and quoting, and demonstrating how this knowledge is useful for a novel context in the university. As Coffin and Donohue point out, this type of knowledge building is important for students' success at the tertiary level.

During their interviews, students used terms such as "paraphrase," "topic," "everyday language," and "cohesion" to articulate their understanding of the course. These word choices resulted from interactions with the concepts and in their production in writing. Their use of these words also indicates that they connect discourse choices to the course and that they see the value of some of these concepts beyond Basic Writing as they meet other writing demands within the university.

Some Final Thoughts

These three areas of focus share student voices in text and oral interviews to demonstrate how these students changed their writing choices across time, and how, upon reflection, they recalled experiences in a writing course. Discourse, both written and spoken, gives us a picture of how the process of linguistic socialization affects students across time. Coffin and Donohue are clear in saying "[t]eaching and learning . . . hinge on developing the capacity of students and teachers to harness the meaning-making resources of language efficiently and effectively in relation to purpose and context and to expand their language and meaning-making repertoires as necessary" (2). This learning and expansion of meaning-making repertoires are in line with the university's goal that students develop skills that will ensure academic success. Furthermore, the development of these skills allows students to assume what James Paul Gee calls "the mantle" of basic writer, and by doing so, they will have what Duff refers to as the space and time to become enculturated into the community of academic discourse. This enculturation, or socialization, is evident as students begin to map concepts like cohesion, paraphrasing, or quoting from their Basic Writing course on to novel contexts, such as the writing center or a psychology class. Research (Achugar and Carpenter; Schleppegrell) asserts that, for multilingual students, this explicit focus on meaning-making resources such as those mentioned earlier is critical to their success.

One aspect of my students' linguistic socialization was the concept of cohesion, and for Janie and Santiago's writing, a focus on expansion, a component of cohesion, was a focal point. Marie and Charles similarly tried on how to elaborate and expand on an author's point of view. Not all incidents of meaning-making were clear, as we see in the tries at the pronoun repetition of "this," where a process or idea had not been clearly marked and thus was not able to be represented by the "this" pronoun. But changes in cohesive choices occurred in these students' writing. They moved from a series of personal descriptions, where breakdowns in cohesion occur more frequently, to a more academically valued writing, where interruptions occur in the service of expansion or reference, but largely hold up in the face of focusing on an author's ideas and clearly trying to persuade the reader of the writer's focus, a feature of successful academic writing as identified by Hyland.

The syllabus of record for English 100 notes that "drafting, revising, and polishing" writing are important to the students' development as writers. This directive could be amended to acknowledge the important role classroom discourse plays when working on the development of concepts needed to "develop coherence, unity, [and] fluency." Hasan states that the process of linguistic socialization during which talk and production are tied together allows the learner to not only orally negotiate meaning about the concepts of valued writing like cohesion, but also practice the concept and ultimately reflect on the concept, as students participate in the entire process of learning to create valued academic texts (see "Ways," "What"). As stated earlier, according to Schleppegrell; Achugar and Carpenter; and Christie, this explicit focus on language and choices is empowering to all students, but particularly multilingual students and basic writers as they engage in meaning-making in schooling.

My students were assigned the label of "basic writer" by the institution, but within what Gee calls an institutional identity and a discourse identity are individual traits recognized in their talk about how they view themselves. Janie was there "to learn something," and "work with students." And Santiago wants to "publish books" and Charles and Marie displayed talk about differences in "talk language" and written language. These identities, as Gee notes, "interrelate in complex and important ways" (101). For these students, this interrelation occurred under the guise of "basic writers," and we can see them developing along the continuum of academic writing. Their capacity to speak about differences in "talk language" and verb choice (e.g., "talks" and "states"), and their connections to new subjects (e.g., psych) and new environs (e.g., the writing center) mark aspects of the linguistic socialization process. My students took up concepts and terms and began orienting them outward and towards their continuing journey in the university.

Works Cited

Achugar, Mariana, and Brian D. Carpenter. "Tracking Movement Toward Academic Language in Multilingual Classrooms." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 14, 2014, pp. 60-71.

Bernstein, Basil. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. Taylor and Francis, 1996.

Brown, Ann L., Joseph C. Campione, and Craig R. Barclay. "Training Self-Checking Routines for Estimating Test Readiness." *Child Development*, vol. 50, 1979, pp. 501-12.

Brown, Ann L., Joseph C. Campione, and Jeanne C. Day. "Learning to Learn: On Training Students to Learn from Texts." *Educational Researcher*, vol. 10, 1981, pp. 14-24.

Carpenter, Brian, et al. "Working with Documents to Develop Disciplinary Literacy in the Multilingual Classroom." *The History Teacher*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2014, pp. 1-12.

Charles. Interview. Conducted by Brian Carpenter, 12 Nov. 2014.

Christie, Frances. *Language Education Throughout the School Years: A Functional Perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Cloran, Carmel. "Defining and Relating Text Segments: Subject and Theme in Discourse." *On Subject and Theme: A Discourse Functional Perspective,* edited by Ruqaiya Hasan and Peter H. Fries, John Benjamins, 1995, pp. 361-403.

Coffin, Caroline, and Jim Donohue. "Language, Teaching, and Learning: General Orientations." *Language Learning*, vol. 64, supp. 1, 2014, pp. 1-10.

Duff, Patricia A. "Language Socialization into Academic Discourses." *Annual Review of Applied Lingusitics*, vol. 30, 2010, pp. 169-83.

Gallagher, Winifred. *The Power of Place: How Our Surroundings Shape Our Thoughts, Emotions, and Actions*. Harper Perennial, 2007.

Gee, James Paul. "Identity as an Analytic Lens for Research." *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 25, 2000-2001, pp. 99-125.

Gibbons, Pauline. *English Learners, Academic Literacy, and Thinking: Learning in the Challenge Zone*. Heinemann, 2009.

Halliday, M. A. K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Edward Arnold, 1994.

Hasan, Ruqaiya. "Ways of Saying: Ways of Meaning." *Ways of Saying: Ways of Meaning. Selected Papers of Ruqaiya Hasan*, edited by Carmel Cloran, David Butt, and Geoffrey Williams, Cassell, 2015, pp. 191-242.

Hasan, Ruqaiya. "What Kind of Resource is Language?" *Ways of Saying: Ways of Meaning. Selected Papers of Ruqaiya Hasan*, edited by Carmel Cloran, David Butt, and Geoffrey Williams, Cassell, 2015, pp. 13-36.

Hyland, Ken. "Genre, Discipline and Identity." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 20, 2015, pp. 1-12.

Ivanič, Roz. *Writing and Identity: The Discursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998.

Janie. Interview. Conducted by Brian Carpenter, 12 Nov. 2014.

Kintsch, Walter, and Teun A. van Dijk. "Toward a Model of Text Comprehension and Production." *Psychological Review*, vol. 85, no. 5, 1978, pp. 363-94.

Kolln, Martha J. *Rhetorical Grammar: Grammatical Choices, Rhetorical Effects*. 4th ed., Longman, 2002.

Marie. Interview. Conducted by Brian Carpenter, 19 Nov. 2014.

Reder, Steve, and Erica Davila. "Context and Literacy Practices." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 25, 2005, pp. 170-87.

Ritter, Ashley. (this collection). "A Transition."

Santiago. Interview. Conducted by Brian Carpenter, 12 Nov. 2014.

Schleppegrell, Mary. *The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistic Perspective.* Erlbaum, 2004.

Undergraduate Catalog 2018-19. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, www.iup.edu/registrar/catalog.

Unsworth, Len. "Developing Critical Understanding of the Specialised Language of School Science and History Texts: A Functional Grammatical Perspective." *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, vol. 42, no. 7, 1999, pp. 508-21.

Vygotsky, Lev. *Thought and Language.* MIT, 1986.

Witte, Stephen, and Lester Faigley. "Coherence, Cohesion, and Writing Quality." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1981, pp. 189-204.

Questions for Discussion and Reflection After Chapter 7

1. Brian's chapter begins with an anecdote of a "little blue book" about grammar, and he describes his pedagogy as actively resisting the type of learning contained in that book. If you had to choose an artifact that, in metaphorical terms, your pedagogy either actively embraces or actively resists, what would that artifact be? Again in metaphorical terms, how is community in your FYC courses built in response to or in resistance of that artifact?

2. Chapter 7 introduces us to multilingual students, two of whom identify as bilingual. In what ways are students' multilingual abilities recognized in your FYC course? What opportunities might you create for students to draw on these abilities in their speaking and writing?

Writing Activity After Chapter 7

Choose a writing concept valued within academic discourse and design an activity that leads students to "zoom in" on their use of this concept in their own writing. What model or mentor texts would students read to see the concept in action? What texts of their own from FYC would they "zoom in" on to find evidence of or the need for revision in the area of the concept? What tips would you give students for employing this concept in their writing?

Further Reading

Bird, Barbara. "A Basic Writing Course Design to Promote Writer Identity: Three Analyses of Student Papers." *Journal of Basic Writing,* vol. 32, no. 1, 2013, pp. 62-95.

Duff, Patricia A. "Language Socialization into Academic Discourses." *Annual Review of Applied Lingusitics*, vol. 30, 2010, pp. 169-83.

Fernsten, Linda A., and Mary Reda. "Helping Students Meet the Challenges of Academic Writing." *Teaching in Higher Education,* vol. 16, no. 2, 2011, pp. 171-82.