Processes of Identity Construction for Generation 1.5 University Students in Canada

by

Timothy Norman Mossman

M.A. (English Education), University of British Columbia, 1996
B. P. E., University of British Columbia, 1983

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in the
Languages, Cultures and Literacies Program
Faculty of Education

Timothy Norman Mossman 2018

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Spring 2018

Approval

Name:	**Timothy Norman Mossman**
Degree:	**Doctor of Philosophy (Education)**
Title of Thesis:	***Processes of Identity Construction for Generation 1.5 University Students in Canada***
Examining Committee:	**Chair:** Joel Heng Hartse Lecturer

Steve Marshall
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor

_____

Ena Lee
Supervisor
Senior Lecturer

_____

Steven Talmy
Supervisor
Associate Professor
Department of Language & Literacy Education
University of British Columbia

_____

Danièle Moore
Internal Examiner
Professor

_____

Julie Byrd Clark
Associate Professor
Faculty of Education
Western University

_____

Date Defended: April 5, 2018

Ethics Statement

SFU

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

    a.   human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

    b.   advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

    c.   as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

iii

Abstract

The number of adolescent children accompanying their immigrant parents to Canada has steadily increased since the 1990s. Much of the applied linguistics literature on these so called "Generation 1.5" youth (Rumbaut & Ima, 1987; Harklau, et al., 1999) has focused on their deficiencies as academic writers in US Rhetoric and Composition and ESL contexts in higher education (Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999; Harklau, 1999; 2000) and the stigma of ESL in US K-12 contexts (Talmy, 2009). However, the literature on Generation 1.5 students and identity in Canadian higher education is limited (Kim & Duff, 2012; Marshall, 2010; Mossman, 2012, 2013). This qualitative study investigates the processes of identity construction of eleven Generation 1.5 students studying at a university in Metro Vancouver to find out what types of identities and representations of self and other they make relevant, the meanings they attribute to their identities, and what motivates them to construct these identities. In analyzing the accounts and experiences of the participants in interviews, focus groups, and texts and as "culture-in-action" (Hester & Eglin, 1997), I posit that they constructed identities as social categories associated with the languages and social practices of their countries of birth, in liminal spaces among a continuum between Canada and their countries of birth, and a spectrum of related cultural representations. Ideas and beliefs associated with broader "macro" social structures in Canadian society related to language, culture, legitimacy, immigration, power, distinction, and racism were shown to be transcended in and through their representations of themselves and others. Data suggest that moving to Canada caused participants to experience discontinuities between their cultures, languages, and social practices (Kim & Duff, 2012), and in some cases a conflicting sense of self. The study brings implications for finding ways to understand the complexity of immigrant students, avoid reifying and generalizing about them, and not see them as stuck-in-between or lacking.

Keywords: Generation 1.5; identity; culture; membership categorization analysis; representation; culture-in action

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my wife, Eiko. Thank-you for your love, endless patience, and support.

Acknowledgements

I am thankful for all those who have helped me along my Ph.D. journey of almost ten years—my wife Eiko, and sons Yusuke and Taira, my classmates and faculty members in the *Languages, Cultures and Literacies* program at Simon Fraser University, the graduate students I met while taking courses in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of British Columbia, and the staff members in the Writing Centre at CPU. I would like to thank my pro tem Dr. Huamei Han for helping me "bloom" as a scholar and to Dr. Dolores Van der Wey for disrupting my Whiteness and privilege and helping me understand how I might use my gifts to serve others. I would also like to acknowledge the help I have received from my committee members. I owe a great deal of gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Steve Marshall, for taking me on and for his ongoing guidance and support. I also would like to thank Dr. Steven Talmy for introducing me to the fascinating world of discourse analysis, especially to conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis, which transformed my understanding of talk-in-interaction, and for helping me see interviews as social practice—as places where knowledge is communally constructed and negotiated. I would also like to thank Dr. Ena Lee, who was always willing to meet and talk with me, especially during the tough times. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I would like to acknowledge the strength I have received from my firm faith in Jesus Christ, a faith that has guided me throughout the long journey of this thesis.

Table of Contents

List of Excerpts

List of Figures

Transcription Symbols

Sequencing	
[oh I see [what	A single left bracket indicates the point of overlapping onset.
=	Equal signs, one at the end of one line and one and at the beginning of a next, indicate no "gap" between the two lines.
Timed Intervals	
(0.4)	Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time in silence by tenths of second, so a (1.2) is a pause of one second and two tenths of a second.
(.)	A period in parentheses indicates a tiny 'gap' within or between utterances.
Characteristics of speech production	
no bu-	A dash indicates a cut off of a prior word or sound.
.hh	A dot-prefixed row of *.hs* indicate an audible in-breathe. Without the dot the *hs* indicates an outbreath.
las::t	Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound; the speaker has stretched the preceding sound or syllable. Multiple colons indicate a more prolonged sound.
WORD	Upper case indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk.
↑ word ↓ word	Arrows indicate marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance–part immediately following the arrow.
hehehe	Indicates laughter.
wh(he)at	Indicates laughter within words.

<u>under</u>	Underlining indicates speaker emphasis.
° °	Degree signs indicate decreased volume.
>fast<	Inward-facing indents embed talk which is faster than the surrounding speech.
<slow>	Outward-facing indents embed talk that is slower than the surrounding speech.
yes.	A period after a word indicates falling intonation at turn completion.
yes?	A question mark indicates rising intonation; it does not necessarily indicate a question.
so,	A comma indicates a continuing intonation.

Transcriber's doubts and comments

( )	Empty parentheses indicate the transcriber's inability to hear what was said. The length of the parenthesized space indicates the length of the untranscribed talk.
(( ))	Double parentheses contain the transcriber's descriptions rather than, or in addition to, transcriptions.

Chapter 1.   Introduction

> If I think about what a typical Canadian would look like, that's not me. I don't fit that. (Kerstin interview excerpt)

> In Canada, one of the most noticeably resistance is the resistance of getting along with classmates from other race. Given that Canada is a multicultural society, schools are often occupied with many students around the globe. Many of us have different rituals and habits. One of the concerns for many to adapt a new status in a new country. Another word, many of us are resisting losing our own culture and accepting new ones. (Fragment from Chloe's essay)

> I felt easier talking to people who immigrated to Canada and have medium understanding of the Canadian culture. As a result, I find myself interacting more to non-Asians in Taiwan and interacting more to Asians in Canada. (Fragment from Tiffany's journal)

> Like I stay in Vancouver for a couple of years, right, and so like I always hung out with all ESL people. So we all dressed a little bit different from the local, like I used to have really long hair too. I mean I can see myself being a FOB back then. (Wayne focus group excerpt)

> I want to work hard to make sure that I speak perfect Créole before I go back home because I don't want them thinking that I've changed, like I'm still who I am years ago but I don't want them to think that I've forgot that I'm Mauritian. I haven't forgotten that I'm Mauritian. I haven't forgotten my identity. (Samantha interview excerpt)

As I write this introduction to my thesis, I decided to begin with five participant excerpts from the study that will hopefully allow my readers to begin to think about the contexts of my work and of the participants in my study. As a doctoral candidate doing research in the Languages, Cultures, and Literacies doctoral program at SFU, I have thought a lot about identity and the philosophical questions it raises. I am struck by the way the world is becoming increasingly interconnected, creating fundamental changes in the way we live. Mass migration, shifts in the global economic order, transnationalism,

and multilingualism have deeply impacted people's lives (Darvin & Norton, 2015; De Fina & Perrino, 2013; Duff, 2015; Wei & Hua, 2013). Cultural and economic globalization have significantly impacted Western education in both K-12 and post-secondary classrooms as rising immigration leads to increasing numbers of students for whom English is an additional language (EAL).

1.1. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the qualitative study is to explore the processes of identity construction for immigrant students (the so-called "Generation 1.5") (Rumbaut & Ima, 1987; Harklau et al., 1999) at Canadian Pacific University[1] (CPU), a post-secondary institution located Metro Vancouver. Although the research category Generation 1.5 has been variously defined (see Marshall & Lee, 2017 for a comprehensive review of how this label has been interpreted in the applied linguistics literature in both US and Canadian contexts), throughout this thesis, I refer to the category Generation 1.5 as multilingual English language learners who have immigrated to a host country with their first-generation parents during childhood or adolescence. They would normally obtain the first part of their education in their first language(s) in their countries of birth and the latter part in English in K-12 contexts. Generation 1.5 students arrive at university with various levels of English language proficiency which are often at odds with institutionally constructed profiles of students. This is because they often do not fit the traditional binary paradigm of native and non-native speakers of English, on account of their diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In terms of identity formation, this distinction allows me to investigate whether participants imagine themselves in multiple sites of belonging, which ones, how, and why.

---

[1] I have anonymized the location of the study and study details.

Much of the applied linguistics literature on Generation 1.5 has focused on their deficiencies as academic writers in US Rhetoric and Composition and ESL contexts and the impact being positioned in-between international ESL students and white American culture has on their learning (Harklau, 1999, 2000) in higher education (Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999; Harklau, 1999, 2000). Other studies have highlighted the stigma of ESL in US K-12 contexts (Talmy, 2004). However, the literature on Generation 1.5 students and identity in Canadian higher education is limited (Kim & Duff, 2012; Marshall, 2010; Mossman, 2012; 2013). This thesis seeks to fill this research gap by harnessing the "culture-in-action" (Hester & Eglin, 1997) notion of conversation analysis (CA) and membership categorization analysis (MCA) (Sacks, 1992) to examine what types of identities the participants invoke or make relevant in the processes of being and becoming a Canadian university student. I undertake an analysis of talk and text to examine the processes by which Generation 1.5 student identity is constructed in interviews, formal and informal writing, and visual contexts.

1.2. Statement of Researcher Positionality

The worldviews of the researcher are an integral part of doing qualitative research. At the heart of this interpretive process is developing a reflexive attitude, which involves "critical self-reflection of the ways in which researchers' social background, assumptions, positioning, and behaviour impact on the research process" (Finlay & Gough, 2003, p. ix). My background impacts this study in terms of, *inter alia*, the decisions about what and who to study, what research questions to ask, the theoretical frameworks on which to frame my study, what methods I use to collect data, and how I will analyze, interpret, and publish that data. I enter this research as a culturally and historically positioned researcher, a product of my race, gender, societal position, and language, which, in the contexts of my research, affords me certain privileges in a Western context: I am a White, Canadian male. I am also a Christian and English is my first language. I am middle-class and work at a university. In these spaces, I juggle various socially situated identities, each entailing different, yet somewhat overlapping, responsibilities and practices. These identities can

be understood as "the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past" (Hall, 1990, p. 225).

However, I do not feel that my positionality is always one of privilege, but changes depending on location and context. While my status as a PhD student at SFU gave me the opportunity to teach courses in the Faculty of Education and the concomitant prestige associated with a (albeit temporary) faculty position, as a sessional instructor I had no power within the Faculty. As a PhD student I was eligible to apply for (and received) scholarships and conference funding, but at conferences I often felt insignificant around other established scholars. Also, while living in Japan as an English teacher I was admired as a "native" English speaker in my classrooms, but was positioned as an "outsider" in Japanese society. Like all foreigners who work in Japan, I was fingerprinted and was required to carry my "alien" registration card with me at all times and produce it if requested by police officers. I became a marked "*hen na gaijin*" or "weird foreigner," an identity positioning further compounded by my marked Whiteness and inability to speak Japanese, which in some contexts, further isolated me. Likewise, at language school in Japan, I became the student; I struggled to learn Japanese and often felt inept. Instead of the one in control when I taught English, I was a struggling beginner.

These experiences positioned me in what can be understood as in in-between spaces of being and becoming (Hall, 1997): between being a PhD student and a becoming a "professor;" between being a novice researcher and a tenured professor; between being a "celebrity" White English teacher from Canada and becoming an "alien" in Japanese society; between being the teacher and becoming a second language learner. Moving to Canada and starting a family with my Japanese wife, I continued to live in-between Japanese and Canadian worlds and words. I have become a father of two sons who, in many ways, reflect our two cultural worlds. The experiences of my biracial sons growing up in predominantly White neighbourhood was also to some degree associated with in-between-ness: as the Japanese say, they are "*hafu*" (half Canadian, half Japanese). Their sense of being different was also reinforced by the Japanese first names we gave to them,

which, in a Western context, are marked and often pose pronunciation challenges for their interlocutors (see Marshall & Mossman, 2010).

These experiences with in-between-ness in my own life and in the lives of my family have heightened my sense of what many immigrants to Canada likely experience. Thus, in my own research, I seek to advocate for marginalized groups, but am, nevertheless, a product of a dominant Western educational institution and "bear the handiwork of its imprint" (Levinson & Holland, 1996, p. 23). While I acknowledge I am part of the hegemonic machinery of schooling, I do not wish to allow critical theories to paralyze me, nor do I wish to "play it safe" and accept the status quo. Rather, using the power I have as a scholar, I look for "gaps, interstices, fissures,…where new ways of doing things may be invented" (Stroud & Wee, 2007, p. 34), which can potentially lead to change through the contestations of established conventions.

1.3.   Rationale of the study

1.3.1.   Personal Links to Research Topic

I began to see such gaps and interstices during the first course of my Ph.D. program, *The Politics of Difference*, co-taught by Dr. Özlem Sensoy and Dr. Elizabeth Marshall. In this course, I was introduced to the works of several feminists, including Iris Young (1990). As a trained English language educator, I made a connection between Young's "logic of identity" (p. 98) and categorization practices used in English language education. Young conceptualized the logic of identity as an expression of the positivism and the reductionism in contemporary (American) political theory. Young (1990) defined the logic of identity as expressing

> one construction of the meaning and operations of reason: an urge to think things together, to reduce them to unity. To give a rational account is to find the universal, the one principle, the law, covering the phenomena to be accounted for. Reason seeks essence, a single formula that classifies concrete particulars as inside or outside a category. Something common to all things that belong in the category. The logic of identity tends to

conceptualize entities in terms of substance rather than process or relation; substance is the self-same entity that underlies change that can be identified, counted, measured. (p. 98)

I began to think about the implications of Young's logic of identity for the mobilization of power and inequality in English language education and research vis-à-vis labelling, a process of social categorization which attempts to eliminate difference by privileging in-groups and essentializing out-groups. The practice of labelling multilingual students as, for example, English as a Second Language (ESL) or "non-native speaker" tends to reify multilingual students as members of predetermined, sociologically stable out-groups (Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997), which can lead to stereotyping and prejudice. Prior to starting my Ph.D., I spent almost 25 years as an English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher, mostly in post-secondary contexts. During this time, I regularly encountered many assumptions and stereotypes about English language learners— including my own—that tended to essentialize their heterogeneity. I accepted these labels unproblematically as a part of the collective "common sense" of being a ESL professional. I regularly invoked categories such as ESL, LEP (Limited English Proficient), ELL (English Language Learner), and terms such as "native" and "non-native" speakers of English. As I delved further into my readings, I realized how categories, such as the one I was most familiar with and identified myself with as a teacher of—ESL—is often associated with a remedial, deficit-type of learner (e.g., Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008; Spack, 1997; Talmy, 2008). For this reason, I now prefer to use the category English as an Additional Language (EAL), a term which acknowledges students' multilingualism and their additional languages as assets rather than deficiencies.

Spack (1997) argues that labels rhetorically construct English language learners' identities, serving as a kind of "shared shorthand by which [educators] talk about learners" (p. 765). This logic tends to reflect broader social discourses and the sociopolitical contexts related to language education (e.g., Lee, 2008) and can have tangible consequences for students. Left uncontested, categories and stereotypes become naturalized over time and accepted without question in English language teaching and research (Spack, 1997). Second, categories often conceal deep-seated discriminatory

practices rooted in "wider social/political/cultural processes of power" (Jones, 1991, p. 149; cf. Lee, 2008). I believe educators have a duty to challenge categories and stereotypes that diminish the inherent dignity of students as people created in God's image.

In addition to the gaps and interstices I saw in English language teaching related to Young's logic of identity, I connected with Young's (1990) distributive paradigm, a model which aims to distribute social justice vis-à-vis the allocation of material goods and jobs, but, in Young's estimation, does little to confront "institutionalized domination and oppression" (p. 15). In my own contexts as an English language educator, I have seen the workings of the distributive paradigm in the institutional tendency to remedy "the ESL problem" by creating additional courses, resources, teaching positions, and even new terms/labels for students to manage the "messiness" of multilingualism (Heller, 2007).

Most significantly, in my course readings, I was introduced to the notion of representation (Hall, 1997; Harklau, 2000; Mohanty, 2003), which helped me to further understand how and why labels are used to represent "cultural others." In applied linguistics research, Harklau (2000) refers to labels as "representations"—"temporary artifacts"—the result of "constant attempts to hold a heterogeneous and ever evolving social world still long enough to make sense of it" (p. 37). This notion of categories as "temporary artifacts" helped me to understand the power of representation to fix and privilege certain meanings over others. Despite the power of representation, I learned that current trends in applied linguistics conceive of identity as a fluid concept and that multilingual students' identities can never be finally fixed, but are dynamic, constantly changing over time and space (Norton, 2013). As Rosaldo (1993) cleverly puts it, the identities of multilingual students are "always in motion, not frozen for inspection" (p. 217). Further, arguing that representational practices have limited power, Hall (1997) notes that "meaning floats" (p. 325) and "*can never be finally fixed* …ultimately, meaning begins to slip and slide; it begins to drift, or be wrenched, or inflected into new directions" (p. 340). Yet despite this fluidness that both Rosaldo (1993) and Hall (1997) refer to, I was surprised to learn that in the applied linguistics literature, firm, fixed categories are widespread.

I realized that fixed categories are, in large part, based on modernist assumptions of languages as autonomous cognitive systems tied to particular places rather than on poststructuralist notions, which highlight the fluid and unstable relationship between language and identity. For example, in a discourse methods course I took with Dr. Steven Talmy at the University of British Columbia, I received a list of quotations that Dr. Talmy had assembled from the applied linguistics literature (mostly in U.S. College and Composition contexts) that described a group of immigrant students as Generation 1.5.[2] Reading much like an account of some sort of poetic, yet tragic protagonist, this list of quotations made Generation 1.5 an *object* of study. Most of these descriptions constructed the identities of these immigrant students in what can be read as "an *unfinished product of discourse"* (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 30)—remedial, deficient, academically unprepared for university studies, and centrally, caught in the middle between languages, cultures, and literacies. Sarah Benesch (2009), a vocal critic of the 1.5 category, maintains that rather than representing poststructuralist notions of language and identity, "the 1.5 metaphor creates a mismatch" … mapping a modernist understanding of language onto the contemporary global diaspora" (p. 70). Dr. Talmy's course inspired me to discover what I would later focus on in my own research.

As previously mentioned, the practice of naming and labelling is problematic in English language teaching and research. This is because many students for whom English is an Additional Language (EAL) do not to fit traditional categorizations of students, categories that are often represented as binaries: "native" and "non-native" speaker," domestic and international, immigrant and Canadian. As these binaries become reproduced and institutionalized in and through curricula and teaching beliefs and practices, they become the social (academic) order around which educators tend to direct their practice (Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997). At CPU, the category EAL identifies

---

[2] Talmy (2008, 2009, 2010) studied "old-timer ESL" or Generation 1.5 students in a public school setting in Hawai'i. He assembled this list of quotations and made it available to his students, including me.

students who learned a first language other than English as children and still use regularly, and/or who speak a language other than English most often with their friends (CPU, Undergraduate Student Survey). As a person who shifts between two very different linguistic and cultural spaces in my own life, the category "Generation 1.5" interested me and soon became the focus of my early research (Mossman, 2012, 2013).

Overall, my exposure to the logic of identity, the distributive paradigm (Young, 1999), representation (Hall, 1996; 1997; Harklau, 2000), and Generation 1.5 (Harklau et. al 1999; Harklau, 2000; Marshall, 2010; Talmy, 2001; 2005; 2009; 2010) influenced me as an emerging scholar to pursue research on Generation 1.5 students at CPU. In the following sections, I expand on the research category Generation 1.5, explain my reasons for using it, and give a rationale for focusing on this student demographic.

1.4. Generation 1.5

In this thesis, I refer to participants as Generation 1.5. While I realize that my decision to use this category may run the risk of essentializing participants' identities, I nevertheless purposely oversimplify a complex identity category to call attention to this diverse group of domestic EAL students. To borrow a term from postcolonial studies, I engage in "strategic essentialism" (Spivak, 1995) to highlight the 1.5 experience and contribute to a discussion among researchers and educators about the complex identities of Generation 1.5 students. Thus, my use of the category is situated and strategic (Bucholtz & Hall, 2003). As Stille (2015) argues:

> Suggesting that […] identities are socially constructed rather than fixed or inherent seems like a step forward, but poststructuralist notions of subjectivity are problematic in the risks they involve for nondominant or marginalized communities; particularly the risk of erasing shared dimensions of experience. (p. 493)

By using the category Generation 1.5 to refer to the participants, I wish to highlight their "shared dimensions of experience" (Stille, 2015, p. 493). In terms of why I am

studying Generation 1.5 students, my interest stems partly from my own sense of liminality and positioning in social life. I am also passionate about serving students and am committed to change and transformational practices. Because of these experiences, I feel I am well positioned to undertake this study.

1.5. Research Objectives

This study aims to contribute to a growing area of research in applied linguistics on Generation 1.5, language, and identity by exploring the processes of identity construction. The study addresses a research gap with regards to our understandings of how Generation 1.5 university students negotiate their identities within a Canadian university context. I explore what meanings Generation 1.5 students attribute to their lives; I seek to hear their stories, understand their perspectives, and interpret their experiences as multilingual, transnational immigrant youth in Canada through their local and situated sense-making practices. To this end, I ask the following research questions:

1.5.1.   Research Questions

1. What types of identities and representations of self and other are made relevant in the processes of being and becoming Generation 1.5?
2. What meanings do Generation 1.5 university students attribute to their identities?
3. What motivates university students to construct their identities as Generation 1.5?

1.5.2.   Methodology of the study

To carry out this investigation, I adopted a qualitative, interpretative approach underpinned by principles of ethnomethodological research. I seek to examine what aspects of Generation 1.5 students' identities are constructed in discourse. I use Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) to analyze

identity construction in talk-in-interaction[3], texts, and visual images, which I treat as culture-in-action (Hester & Eglin, 1997).

1.6. Data Generation and Collection

To generate data, I interviewed students at CPU in English who had completed some years of formal schooling in their countries of birth prior to immigrating to Canada, applying principles of conversation analysis (CA) and membership categorization analysis (MCA) to the data. By using these two ethnomethodologically informed principles that developed from Sacks' (1992) work on conversation, I examine the mutually informing relationship between the sequential organization of talk and the local production of identity in categories (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006). I also collected data from participants' formal and informal written texts and one visual image to gain insight into the processes of their identity construction. To analyze the data, I adopt a constructionist view and use CA and MCA to examine what identity categories participants invoke or make relevant. I examine how they use membership categories as culturally available resources to describe, identify, or make reference to other people and themselves (Antaki, 1998).

1.6.1. Overview of Chapters

The thesis consists of nine chapters. Chapter 1 provides the background to the study and the research rationale that led me to this research topic, and it describes how I reflexively position myself and am positioned by the research context. In it, I have outlined the three major research questions, research objectives, and methodology.

---

[3] The term "talk-in-interaction" is commonly used by researchers who use CA to emphasize the scope of the phenomenon they study, that is, both verbal and non-verbal in aspects of everyday life of (e.g. Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Psathas, 1995; Schegloff, 1988).

Chapter 2 describes the context of the study, including immigration trends in Canada, British Columbia, and Metro Vancouver. I first provide statistics on immigration trends and on the variety of languages spoken in Canada, British Columbia, and in Metro Vancouver. I then describe the EAL student demographic at CPU, highlighting trends in the growth in the number of international and domestic EAL students. Next, I focus on Generation 1.5 students, the focus group of this study, and describe the ways they have been represented in institutional reports at CPU and the possible implications of these representations. Following this, I describe the Writing Centre at CPU, which is frequented most often by EAL students, and highlight its co-curricular writing, learning, and EAL supports and services. I then describe the filters in place at CPU to screen incoming students for proficiency in written academic English and focus on the Academic Writing course (AW 101). I conclude this chapter by synthesizing the key background contextual issues in terms of my research questions and the challenges they pose.

Chapter 3 provides the theoretical frames of reference that guided my investigation. I present a review of the literature in applied linguistics on conceptualizations of identity followed by a brief overview of the key principles from conversation analysis (CA) and membership categorization analysis (MCA). Following this, I provide a brief historical overview of the category Generation 1.5 in applied linguistic literature. I include the category's (supposed) origins, entry into College Writing programs and ESL contexts, its popularization in the Korean-American media/community, its various scholarly interpretations, and the discourse of in-between-ness associated with the category. In the fifth and final section, I synthesize the theoretical frames of reference I have discussed above and review the empirical research on Generation 1.5 students, beginning first in the context of K-12 and immigrant ESL students in College writing programs in the United States (I include one study from Australia [Miller, 2000]) followed by Canadian K-12 and post-secondary contexts. By highlighting the lack of studies involving Generation 1.5 students in Canadian post-secondary contexts that utilize a CA/MCA analytic framework to study identity (there are none to my knowledge), this thesis attempts to address this research gap and contribute to original research.

Chapter Four address the research design I used in this study. I first provide information about recruitment and the participants and explain the qualitative, ethnomethodological, and interpretative approaches I adopted. It also addresses some common critiques of qualitative research and ethical issues I faced in this study.

Chapter 5 addresses the analytic framework I used in this study. It details the procedures I undertook for generating/collecting data, data theorization, and transcription conventions. It also addresses some of the methodological challenges and ethical issues I faced in this study.

In Chapters 6-8, I present my analysis of the data organized thematically according to three major themes: Identities from There, Here (Chapter 6), Identities in the Middle (Chapter 7), and Old Me, New Me Identities (Chapter 8). I choose these categorizations to illustrate the diversity of identities and representations of self and other the participants make relevant in the data. I structure my sub-headings around the participants' names to highlight their reported experiences. After presenting the data, at the conclusion of each of these sections, I relate the findings to the ideas and theories discussed in the literature review (Chapter 3), my research questions, and the theme of each data chapter.

In Chapter 9, I include a summary of my approach, rationale, and methods as well as a synthesis of the major findings. I also summarize the answers to each of my research questions, acknowledge the limitations of the study, and suggest implications for teaching and learning and possible directions for future research.

Chapter 2.   Research Background

This chapter describes the context of the study, including immigration trends in Canada, British Columbia, and Metro Vancouver. Highlighting the multilingual context of the study, I begin by providing statistics on immigration trends and on the variety of languages spoken in Canada, British Columbia, and in the Metro Vancouver region. I then describe the EAL student demographic at CPU, underscoring the trend in the growth in the number of international and domestic EAL students. I then focus on Generation 1.5 students and describe the ways they have been represented in institutional reports at CPU and the potential implications of these representations. Following this, I describe the Writing Centre and highlight its co-curricular writing, learning, and EAL supports and services. Next, I briefly describe the filters in place at CPU to screen incoming students for proficiency in written academic English and focus on the Academic Writing course (AW 101), which many Generation 1.5 students are directed to take before being eligible to register directly in writing in the disciplines courses. I conclude by synthesizing the key background contextual issues in terms of my research questions and the challenges they pose.

2.1. Canadian Immigration Trends

The linguistic and cultural landscape of Canada is richly diverse. According to Statistics Canada (2011), more than 200 languages are spoken in Canada as a home language or mother tongue, including the official languages, English and French. Nearly 7 million Canadians (21.0%) speak French most often at home and 6.8 million people (20.6%) speak a mother tongue other than English or French. Immigration Canada refers to languages other than English, French, or an Aboriginal language as "immigrant languages" (i.e., whose presence in Canada is originally due to immigration). In 2011, 80% of the Canadian metropolitan population reported speaking one or more immigrant languages most often at home. The 2011 census classified immigrant languages into 23 major language families per major region of origin: Romance (Spanish, Italian, and

Portuguese; 17.5%); Indo-Iranian (Punjabi, Urdu, Persian, Gujarati, and Hindi; 17.3%); Chinese (Cantonese, Mandarin, and an unspecified number of Chinese n.o.s.; 16.3%); Slavic (Polish, Russian, Ukrainian; 10.6%), and Germanic (German, Dutch, Yiddish; 8.9%) (Statistics Canada, 2011). In British Columbia (BC), the number of speakers of immigrant languages is growing exponentially. In 2001, for example, the top immigrant language spoken in BC was Panjabu (Punjabi) at 193,985 speakers, followed by speakers of Cantonese (138, 845) (16%), Chinese, n.o.s. (124, 580) (12%), Mandarin (96,420), (12%), German (77, 745), Tagalog (77, 100), Korean (50, 600), Spanish (43,965), Persian (37, 470), and Hindi (28, 135) (Statistics Canada, 2012; Visual Census, 2011 Census). One of the most diverse regions in British Columbia is Metro Vancouver, with large numbers of immigrants from predominately non-European countries taking up permanent residency every year.

2.2. Metro Vancouver

Following immigration trends in Canada and BC, the Metro Vancouver region is linguistically and culturally diverse with a nearly 40% foreign-born population (Statistics Canada, 2011, Census of Population). In terms of linguistic diversity, statistics from the 2011 Canada Census report that 32% (723,950 out of 2,292,115 respondents) of area residents speak a language other than English. This diversity is also reflected in the finding that 44% of residents have a mother tongue other than English (Statistics Canada, 2011, Census of Population). Statistics Canada (2011) has identified the size and percentage of the top 12 immigrant languages spoken most often at home in the Metro Vancouver as Punjabi (126,100; 17.7%), followed by Cantonese (113, 610; 16%), unspecified Chinese (86,580;12.2%), Mandarin (83, 825; 11.8%), Tagalog (47,640; 6.7%), Korean (38, 870; 5.5%), Persian (28, 970; 4.1%), Spanish 22, 505; 3.3%), Hindi (18, 355; 2.6%), Vietnamese (18, 225; 2.6%), Russian (11, 765; 1.7%), Japanese (9, 920; 1.4%) and Other (105, 140; 14.8%). The combined number of people who identified as speaking either Cantonese, Mandarin, or an unspecified Chinese language (Chinese n.o.s) accounted for 40 per cent of the population who spoke an immigrant language as their main language at home. Approximately 20% of the population reported being of

Chinese ethnicity while 31% reported speaking a language other than English or French most often at home. A comparison of the 2006 and 2011 mother tongue census data reveal a steady increase in the number of Chinese speakers in Metro Vancouver. While the number of Cantonese speakers rose modestly by 5.7%, from 28,545 in 2006 to 30,170 in 2011, and Chinese (n.o.s.) speakers increased by 6. 2% in 2006 from 23,230 to 24,670, the number of Mandarin speakers during the same period increased from 13,400 to 20,680, an increase of 54.3% (Statistics Canada, 2006 and 2011 Census).

The Metro Vancouver region is also home to increasing numbers of immigrant children. The number of children who speak a non-official language has remained relatively steady since 2006. In 2006, census data reported that 41,440 (32.3%) of children in Metro Vancouver ages 10-14 spoke a non-official language (Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population). In 2011, Canada Census data reported a slight decline, with 38,840 (31.1%) of immigrant children ages 10-14 speaking mother tongue other than English in Metro Vancouver. This growth in the number of immigrant children has had a concomitant impact on K-12 classrooms in Metro Vancouver. According to the British Columbia Teacher's Federation 2012 Report on Education, the number of English Language Learners (ELLs) receiving supplementary English language instruction increased from 59,343 in 2001–2002 to 62,080 students in 2011–2012 (an increase of 2,737 students) (British Columbia Teacher's Federation, 2012 BC Education Facts). These figures illustrate that one in four (23.8%) students enrolled in K-12 classrooms in 2012 had English as a second or an additional language. Equally significant, the report found that "[A]lmost double the number of ELL students (135,651) live in families where the primary language spoken at home is other than English, an increase of 16,874 students since 2001–02 and 8,676 students since 2007–08" (British Columbia Teacher's Federation, 2012 BC Education Facts, p. 11).

2.3. Canadian Pacific University (CPU)

2.3.1.   English as an Additional Language (EAL)

Impacted by the shifting demographics of Metro Vancouver, CPU is experiencing significant growth in the number of international and domestic EAL students. According to a recent undergraduate survey, 88% of respondents reported speaking English at home, 59% reported speaking a non-English language at home, 41% reported using a language other than English at home and/or speaking a language other than English most often with their friends, and 27% indicated speaking no English at home (citation deliberately excluded for reasons of confidentiality). In terms of linguistic diversity, speakers of Chinese (Cantonese and Mandarin) account for 17% of the EAL demographic, followed by Punjabi (8%), French (5%), Hindi-Urdu (2.5%), Korean (1.8%), Tagalog (1.6%), Persian (1.5), and Spanish (1.5%) (citation deliberately excluded for reasons of confidentiality).

CPU regularly tracks the growth in its international student population. CPU's annual undergraduate student report, for example, reveals that the number of international students has risen steadily over the past six years—from 3,578 in Fall, 2010 (14.4% of the total undergraduate student population) to 4,688 in Fall, 2016 (18.5% of the total undergraduate student population). In Fall 2010, CPU saw a sharp increase in the number of international students from China, up 37.4% over the previous year. Currently, Chinese students are the largest group of international students on campus; approximately 60% have registered each Fall between 2010 and 2016 (citation deliberately excluded for reasons of confidentiality). A growing number of exchange students also make up a small subset of CPU's international student population, with most arriving from France, England, Australia, Hong Kong, and the Netherlands (citation deliberately excluded for reasons of confidentiality).

2.3.2.   Representations of Generation 1.5

In addition to its growing international student demographic, CPU also has a significant number of "domestic EAL" (i.e., Canadian-born and raised, Generation 1.5, and immigrant). I conducted a scan of official CPU publications on EAL students and examined websites describing English language supports and services for EAL students. Only one official document briefly acknowledged the presence of "Generation 1.5" students, describing them as coming to CPU "with two to five years at a BC secondary school" (citation deliberately excluded for reasons of confidentiality). This definition suggests that Generation 1.5 students at CPU are positioned somewhere in-between Canadian-born EAL students (who complete all or most of formal schooling in K-12 Canadian schools) and international EAL students (who generally arrive directly from their countries of birth as first-year students or transfer from other post-secondary institutions). Further, the document reported that "80%" of AW 101 required students (a foundational literacy course for students who do not meet CPU's literacy admission requirements; see below) are Generation 1.5. Further, the presence of Generation 1.5 students in this course was reported to "create nuanced pedagogical issues and challenges" (citation deliberately excluded for reasons of confidentiality).

This Generation 1.5 institutional definition suggests that Generation 1.5 students are unprepared for the rigors of university studies, in need of literacy support, and are a homogeneous group with a fractured type of education. Equally significant is what was not included in this report. There is no mention of their various languages, literacies, and social practices that enrich and legitimize their identities as multilingual individuals or how they contribute to enriching the diversity of the CPU community. This finding suggests that Generation 1.5 at CPU are underrepresented, misrepresented, and misunderstood. This study attempts to address this potential ambiguity by highlighting what it means to become, be, and belong as a Generation 1.5 student at CPU.

2.3.3.   Multilingual Landscape

The multicultural landscape has important implications for the university. EAL students at CPU are socially, linguistically, and socio-economically diverse, but there is also great diversity in students' English language proficiency. While CPU has increasingly embraced diversity, seeing internationalization as a reality and even a necessity, it has also created a dilemma, namely, how to adapt to a growing multilingual, multi-ethnic student body whose presence in (mostly) monolingual mainstream classrooms is challenging institutional policies and classroom practices. To illustrate, student comments on a recent undergraduate survey expressed dislike at being "forced to work with Chinese international students who cannot speak English" and "who never do any work" and contempt for professors and TA's who speak English with "heavy accents." Another respondent offered: "It's my own problem and society's problem. English speakers do not like speaking with bad English speaker like me" (citation deliberately excluded for reasons of confidentiality). This comment suggests that this student feels excluded because his/her classmates do not consider him/her a legitimate speaker of English (Bourdieu, 1991). These examples illustrate how wider social discourses in society related to power, privilege, (il)legitimacy, the rise of standard English and multilingualism (Heller, 2007) are routinely performed at CPU. In the next section, I describe some of the ways these discourses are (re)produced, legitimized, and resisted at CPU.

2.4. The Writing Centre: CPU's Writing, Learning and EAL Support Centre

Centrally located on campus, the Writing Centre offers a wide range of co-curricular self-access (i.e., independent learning) supports and services. With the rapid increase in the EAL student demographic, in Fall 2010 the Centre expanded its mandate to include EAL services. Today, the Writing Centre is the central direct service provider at CPU for Writing, Learning, and EAL support. These services include consultations, workshops, and a variety of online resources. Writing consultations are in high demand (approximately 95% of consultations are for help with writing); these sessions are

delivered by trained undergraduate student tutors, graduate students, and staff. The Writing Centre regularly keeps statistics on the number of consultations each month as well as the number of students who attend workshops, and this information is annually shared with the CPU community. For example, from 2012-2016, the Writing Centre offered a total of 11,635 consultations and 364 open workshops (2,449 attendees) (citation deliberately excluded for reasons of confidentiality).

2.4.1. EAL Specific Supports and Services

The Writing Centre at the university where I collected my data is often frequented by EAL students (approximately 40% of all Writing Centre visits). When students make online appointments, or drop in for a consultation, they are asked to identify the courses they are taking, provide a brief description of the kind of help they are seeking, and are given the choice of self-identifying as having English as an additional language. I conducted a random one week scan of the consultations, and out of the 50 consultation requests that week, 40 of these came from self-identified EAL students. Although the reasons for their visits often overlapped, such as seeking help with grammar or wanting help with the structure or flow of an essay, 24 of the 40 self-identified EAL students indicated that the reason for their visit was specifically to get help with grammar and/or sentence structure.

The many requests for help with grammar suggest that EAL students at CPU strategically use the booking system and their follow-up consultations with the undergraduate student tutors as an "off-stage arena" (Canagarajah, 2004, p. 121) to get help with grammar despite the Centre's policy of not editing student work and/or making lower-order type of concerns such as grammar the focus of the consultation. These examples suggest a disparity between EAL students' (unacknowledged) multilingual repertoires and how students are expected to communicate (in Standard English) in formal academic settings (Marshall, Hasashi & Yeung, 2012).

Expectations on how to communicate in formal academic settings are reinforced via the EAL supports and services offered by the Writing Centre. These services include

consultations, workshops, English conversation groups, and print and online resources. The support offered is generic (e.g., not discipline-specific) and has a learning-to-write focus. Notably, the English conversation program is very popular, offering EAL students semester-long partnerships with student volunteers who help them improve their English fluency. These English conversation volunteers are a diverse group in terms of their linguistic, cultural, and discipline-specific educational backgrounds. Some of the volunteers are domestic EAL students, including Generation 1.5.

2.5. The Academic Writing 101 Course

At CPU, expectations on how to write and read in formal academic settings are also reinforced through the first-year course, Academic Writing 101 (AW 101). AW 101 is one of several filters in place to screen applicants for proficiency in English. For high school graduates, CPU relies on scores in the English 12 course for direct admission and placement into writing-in-the-disciplines courses or into the Academic Writing 101 course (AW 101). High school graduates who score between 60% and 74% in English 12 are admitted, but must register directly into AW 101, or write a written language proficiency exam. Students who elect to enroll in AW 101 must successfully complete the course with a grade of C of better within three enrolled terms before being eligible to register in writing in the disciplines courses. Students who transfer to CPU from other post-secondary institutions must demonstrate proficiency in English by taking a CPU approved English writing course. International students can meet CPU's literacy requirement by writing the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) exam and scoring a minimum overall band score of 7.0, with no part less than 6.5. Applicants who score a minimum of 6.5, with no part less than 6.0, may be admitted but must register in AW 101. Students who fail to obtain a grade of C or better in AW 101 after a maximum of two attempts are "hard blocked" from further course registration course. For this reason, the stakes are high, especially for the many EAL students who are directed to AW 101. The institution of these filters suggests that the shifting demographics of Metro Vancouver are contributing to a widening gap between students' English proficiency and university standards and expectations, and in response, CPU has instituted several supports and

services. As mentioned above, a significant number of AW 101-required students are Generation 1.5 students.

2.6. Summary

The key background contextual issues discussed in this chapter illuminate the dynamic linguistic and multilingual landscape of Canada, BC, Metro Vancouver, and CPU, and what I understand to be a tension between broader social discourses and sociopolitical contexts related to literacy practices, immigration, privilege, internationalization, and multilingualism. In terms of my research questions and the challenges they pose, this chapter has highlighted the persuasiveness of categorical practices in institutional and social life. Since categories display common-sense cultural knowledge (Hester & Eglin, 1997), CPU is rich ground for investigating the processes of identity construction of Generation 1.5 students. In the next section, I review the theoretical frameworks that guide this study.

Chapter 3.   Theoretical Framework

This chapter reviews the theoretical frameworks that guide this investigation into the processes of identity construction for Generation 1.5 university students at CPU. It is divided into four sections. In section one, I review theoretical trends that conceptualize identity as: a social process, a root or core, a process of (un/re) fastening, a discursive feature of interaction, a relational and socio-cultural phenomenon, an analysts' resource, and a member's resource. I review the analytic frameworks which guide my interpretation of the data, namely Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA). In the second section, I provide a brief, yet detailed overview of the Generation 1.5 category's (supposed) origins, entry, and circulation in mainstream ESL contexts, its popularization in the Korean-American media/community, its various scholarly interpretations, and the discourse of in-between-ness associated with this population of students. In section three, I review empirical research on Generation 1.5 students. Since much of the early research on Generation 1.5 has focused on university students who had graduated from US high schools in the United States, I begin by focusing on studies from these contexts, but include one study from Australia (Miller, 2000) for its relevance to this study. In the fourth and final section, I review recent literature on Generation 1.5 students in Canadian K-12 and post-secondary contexts and give a rationale for how this study addresses a research gap with regards to how Generation 1.5 students negotiate their identities in a Canadian post-secondary context.

3.1.   Conceptualizations of Identity

Changing time-space relations in contemporary society have contributed to increasing multi-disciplinary research on identity. In applied linguistics, researchers have theorized identity in a variety of ways, with most seeing a close link between language, culture, and identity (e.g., Gumperz, 1982; Hall, 1996, 1997; Joseph, 2004; May, 2000; Norton-Pierce, 1995; Norton, 2000, 2013, 2016; Phan, 2008). In addition, the interplay between culture and identity is well established in the literature. Bucholtz and Hall (2004),

for example, maintain that culture is a central resource for the production of identity. They argue that identity is not simply "the source of culture but the outcome of culture" (p. 382). Similarity, Kramsch (1993) highlights the close connection between language and culture, maintaining that in the case of immigrants learning a language, they simultaneously realize the presence of an underlying culture which is new and different. To interpret the processes of identity construction for Generation 1.5 university students, I find the link between language, culture, and identity a useful conceptual basis for examining the processes of identity construction for Generation 1.5 students.

Identity as a social process

Current trends conceptualize identity as a social process that is fragmented, dynamic, fluid, changing, and subject to construction, negotiation, and hybridization (e.g., Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1996; Norton, 2000) while the essentialist belief that identities are intrinsically "rooted" to one's ethnic identity is often rejected (Duff, 2012; Hall, 1996; May, 2011; Pennycook, 2004). Norton's (1995, 1997, 2000, 2013) research into the complex relationship between language learning and the social world is important to note here. Writing under the name Norton-Peirce, her 1995 study of the language learning process of five immigrant women in the 1990s in Canada is significant because it addressed a research gap concerning the relationship between identity and second language acquisition. By drawing on Weedon's (1987) notion of subjectivity, Norton-Peirce (1995) has been able to show that "language is the place where actual and possible forms of social organization...are defined and contested, yet it is also the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is constructed" (p. 21). Norton-Peirce (1995) drew our attention to how social conditions and unequal relations of power impact a language learner's ability to access opportunities to speak English. Her research challenged "educational agents to reflect on the material conditions that allow learning to take place, and how learners, inscribed by race, ethnicity, gender, social class, and sexual orientation are accorded or refused the right to speak" (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 37).

In addition to theorizing language as "constitutive of and constituted by a language learner's social identity" (Norton-Peirce 1995, p. 13), Norton-Peirce also distinguished

24

between motivation and investment in language learning in its relationship to identity. Motivation, she argued, is psychological, individual, unitary, and coherent, whereas investment is sociological and closely tied to identity, which changes across time and space and is reproduced in and through social interaction. Norton maintained that social and historical forces construct the learner's relationship with the target language: an investment in the target language "is also an investment in a learner's own social identity" (p. 411). Extending the discussion of Norton's formative work, Norton and Toohey (2002) argued that any theory of second language acquisition that fails to integrate the language learner and the language learning context is inadequate since language is a social phenomenon played out in social contexts in which participants are subject of and to different discourses that often involve unequal relations of power which have the potential to severely limit opportunities to practice English outside of the classroom:

> Language learning engages the identities of learners because language itself is not only a linguistic system of signs and symbols; it is also a complex social practice in which the value and meaning ascribed to an utterance are determined in part by the value and meaning ascribed to the person who speaks. (p. 115)

Norton (2013) uses the term identity to reference "how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is structured across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future" (p. 45). This definition fits well with my research aims to explore the processes of identity construction for Generation 1.5 students since all participants experienced moving between different cultural contexts. I also find Norton's call to look beyond language as a linguistic system and critically consider the social nature of language learning relevant to this study, as many of the participants reported negotiating their "identities and desires ….in the context of complex and often unequal social relationships" (Norton, 2016, p. 476). Considering new issues related to structure and agency brought about by global changes and technological advances, the notions of identity and investment were reconceptualised two decades after Norton's (1995) formative study by Darvin and Norton (2015), who examined motivation and investment in language learning through the lens of a dynamic "world order characterized by mobility, fluidity, and diversity" (p. 51). In response to this dynamic world order with its

new forms of social interaction, Darvin and Norton's (2016) reformulation positions "investment at the intersection of identity, capital, and ideology…to examine how specific communicative events are indexical of the macrostructures of power" (p. 24).

Norton's (2013) notion of identity as "structured across time and space, and how a person understands possibilities for the future" (p. 45) closely resonates with Hall (1991) who maintains that "identities are never completed, never finished; that they are always as subjectivity itself is, in process" (p. 47). Of particular relevance to this study is Hall's (1996) conceptualization of identities as "not about the so-called return to roots but a coming-to-terms-with-our routes" (p. 4). Identity, as Hall (1996) argues, is both a matter of *becoming* (our "routes") and *being* (our "roots"), and suggests that

> …identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being: not 'who we are' or 'where we came from', so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves. Identities are therefore constituted within, not outside representation. (p. 4)

While this processual view of identity may offer important insights with regards to how Generation 1.5 students' languages, cultures, histories, experiences, place of birth, formal schooling, social practices, and immigration impact their identities, the emphasis social constructionist theories give to identity may obscure some important contributions psychological and essentialist perspectives offer. Block (2013), for example, questions the predominately social view of identity in applied linguistics grounded in the poststructuralist tradition, suggesting that there is room, and perhaps "potential benefits" (p. 14) to theorizing identity from a psychological perspective. Highlighting the relationship between individual agency and social structures, he suggests that identity politics associated with poststructuralist approaches side step the important ways socioeconomic and social class impact identity.

Identity as a core or a root

       In terms of how cultural affiliation may impact identity, Phan's (2008) study is important to note here for it offered new perspectives on identity and language education and significantly, challenged dominant Western views of identity as exclusively fragmented, dynamic, fluid, and changing. Writing in the context of Vietnamese students in a TESOL teacher training course in Australia, Phan argued that her participants' sense of self was linked to their membership in, and their sense of belonging to, a national cultural identity, which unites members of society. She maintains that there is room to conceptualize identity as "a 'core', a 'root', on which new values are constructed" (Phan, 2008, pp. 12-13). Phan's work provides me with important understandings into the processes of identity construction for Generation 1.5 students. For many immigrants, a psychological connection to a national identity, home culture, and language plays an essential role in their identity formation (Joseph, 2004). As May (2000) notes, language is "a contingent marker of ethnic identity", and in some cases, "a key signifier of allegiance to their home nation" (p. 373). Relatedly, Djité (2006) makes an important distinction between "group identity [which] correlates with shared ethnic, religious and/or linguistic features, [and] individual identity [which] gives us a uniqueness of 'self' which consists of the various identities we share in" (p. 6). Since many immigrants, as Kumaravadivelu (2008) maintains, assimilate selectively and tend to maintain close ethnic affiliations over time, maintaining a sense of belonging to one's home nation, language, and culture may hold some psychological benefits.

Identity as a process of fastening, unfastening, and refastening

       In addition to conceptualizing identity as constructed across time and space (Norton, 2013) and as "a 'core', a 'root' on which new values are constructed" (Phan, 2008, pp. 12-13), Reed's (2001) notion of identity fastening and unfastening is a useful metaphor for understanding identity construction as people move between different cultural contexts. Reed (2001) defines identity fastening as "the work that individuals do to claim insider status for themselves and for others" (p. 329). Meanwhile, "identity unfastening often happens when individuals move from one cultural context into another where the norms

27

and rules for membership are different" (p. 329). In the context of this study, identity unfastening may be understood as a process that may impact Generation 1.5 students as they negotiate new and different cultural spaces and expectations in which "categories are not normalized" (p. 327). Reed argues that "identities are fastened by the categories that we have available and by the ways that we submit to those categories and subject others to them" (p. 329) (See also review of Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, below). She also maintains that "identity fastening, unfastening and refastening are continually done to us and by us" (p. 337). The notion of identity fastening, unfastening, and refastening resonates with Hall's (1990) discussion of cultural identity in the context of the colonial experience of African diaspora. Hall notes that cultural identity may be thought of in a least two ways: "one, shared cultural, a sort of collective 'one true self'" (p. 233) that provides individuals with a sense of stability and meaning, and a transformational process: "a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being' (p. 225), the latter often associated with 'ruptures and discontinuities'" (p. 225). Reed (2001) maintains that when immigrant students adopt a new national identity, "the process of fastening and unfastening identity may sometimes be voluntary, sometimes involuntary, but almost always disorientating" (p. 329). Further, Block (2002) explains this process as the frame of time when immigrants/learners question their beliefs, culture, and individual identity. He presents the theory of "critical experiences" (p. 3) to define how identities become disturbed and unclear because of the change in environment, making it difficult for newcomers to stabilize their identities. This instability suggests that as Generation 1.5 students move from their home cultural context to a Canadian cultural context they may experience discontinuities between their cultures, languages, and social practices (Kim & Duff, 2012).

Identity as constituted in discourse

Another way of conceptualizing identity is as constituted in discourse. Instead of asking what identities people have, a discursive approach focuses on "*whether, when*, and *how* identities are used" (Widdicombe, 1998, p. 195). It is primarily concerned with "the occasioned relevance of identities here and now, and how they are consequential for this particular interaction and the local projects of [the participants]" (Widdicombe, 1998,

p. 195). Cameron's (2001) definition of discourse as "'language in use': language used to do something and mean something, language produced and interpreted in a real-world context" (p. 13) aligns well with my research aims. Theorizing discourse as language-in-use allows me to explore how the participants "do" and recognize (and resist) descriptions of self and other in and through talk, texts, and social interaction.

A straightforward definition of identity as a discursive feature of interaction is offered by Benwell and Stokoe (2006): identity is "*who people are to each other*, and how different identities are produced in spoken interaction and written texts" (p. 6). Situating their work in "a 'discursive' and 'postmodern' turn across the social sciences and humanities" (p. 4), Benwell and Stokoe conceptualize "identities-as-construction" (p. 49). Identity, they argue, is "actively, ongoing, dynamically *constituted* in discourse" (p. 4). They identify two ways in which identity can be achieved: "as a discursive performance or construction of identity in interaction, or as a historical set of structures with regulatory power upon identity" (p. 29). The authors illustrate how such identity work is done/performed in a variety of discursive environments (everyday conversations, institutional talk, narratives, magazine advertisements, spatial locations, and online interaction).

Similarly, Bucholtz and Hall (2009) argue for the analytic value of theorizing identity as "a relational and socio-cultural phenomenon that emerges and circulates in local discourse contexts of interaction rather than as a stable structure located primarily in the individual psyche or in fixed social categories" (p. 18). Within these local contexts of interaction, they draw our attention to how identity is discursively produced and involves *"the social positioning of self and other"* (p. 18). In this thesis, I look beyond the referential meaning of language and embrace the view that language is social practice and a form of action (Austin, 1962; Levinson, 1983). I view language not only as socially shaped, but also as socially shaping, or constitutive: "that is, it creates what it refers to" (Taylor, 2001, p. 86).

Viewing language as social practice and a form of action (Austin, 1962) demonstrates that language has force—it not only describes things, but does and

achieves things. Talk *is* action. Accordingly, language carries a locutionary force (what an utterance is about, its content or referential meaning), an illocutionary force (what the speaker does with an utterance) and a perlocutionary force (the effect on the hearer's feelings, attitudes, and subsequent behaviour). To illustrate with data from this study, the utterance, "Abbey, you're such a fobby girl!" not only describes Abbey as a certain kind of person, which may or may not be true, but has multiple illocutionary force functions: in the situated indexical context of this study, the utterance could function to *accuse* Abbey of speaking/behaving/dressing like a newly arrived Asian immigrant (i.e., who is "Fresh Off the Boat"), *admonish* her for not behaving/dressing/speaking like "one of us" (e.g., a local Anglophone Canadian) and *tease* her for the way she speaks, acts, and looks. These illocutionary forces could hurt Abbey's feelings and perhaps cause her to change the way she speaks, acts, and looks (perlocutionary force).

Identity as a relational and socio-cultural phenomenon

The interplay between culture, power, and agency from the perspective of linguistic anthropology provides rich insights into the construction of identity through linguistic and other semiotic processes. In particular, Bucholtz and Hall's (2004) discussion of the semiotic processes of practice, indexicality, ideology, and performance and how these processes are accomplished through a framework they term *tactics of intersubjectivity* (p. 370) is important to note here. Bucholtz and Hall (2004) use the term *tactics* to account for "the local, situated, and often improvised quality of everyday practices through which individuals, though restricted in their freedom to act by externally imposed constraints, accomplish their social goals" (p. 382), and *intersubjectivity* to emphasize "the place of agency and interactional negotiation in the formation of identity" (p. 382). This theoretical model proposes three different pairs of tactics: "*adequation and distinction, authentication and denaturalization, and authorization and illegitimation*" (p. 383).

The first pair of tactics, adequation and distinction, refer to processes of similarity and difference. While adequation "involves the pursuit of socially recognized sameness" (p. 383), distinction "is the mechanism by which salient difference is produced" (p. 384). The first of this pair, adequation, occurs when individuals from the same culture or

linguistic community set apart potential differences between them in favour of characteristics they perceive as sharing with others, which are considered to be more situationally relevant. In this case, the basis of identity is found in perceived similarities with others, a relationship that "is not an objective or permanent state but a motivated social achievement that may have temporary of long term effects" (p. 383). Bucholtz and Hall (2004) suggest that adequation may be a way for individuals to preserve their community identity "in the face of dramatic cultural change" (p. 383). The second tactic, distinction, is the converse of adequation, and in the local context of its deployment refers to "the mechanism whereby salient difference is produced" (p. 384). Thus, in this relationship, differences between groups are accentuated. According to Bucholtz and Hall (2004), distinction "has a tendency to reduce complex social variability to a single dimension: us versus them" (p. 384). The second pair of tactics, authentication and denaturalization, refer to "the construction of a credible or a genuine identity and the production of an identity that is literally incredible or non-genuine"(p. 385). While authentication "highlights the agentive process whereby claims to realness are asserted" (p. 385) denaturalization "is the process whereby identities come to be severed from or separated from claims to 'realness'" (p. 386). The final pair of tactics, authorization and illegitimation, relate to how individuals attempt "to legitimate an identity through an institutional or other authority, or conversely the effort to withhold or withdraw such structural power" (p. 386). For example, authorization can be carried out through the standardization of a single state language in an attempt to impose a national identity on a group of people, whereas the process of illegitimation refers to attempts to remove or deny power, either to support or undermine the status quo. It is important to note that although Bucholtz and Hall (2004) write in the context of linguistic anthropology and focus the linguistic production of identity, they note that these processes "are not restricted to language and may even be carried out through other semiotic means as well" (p. 388). Thus, in my analysis of discourse data this thesis, I draw on aspects of this framework using membership categorization.

Identity as an analyst's resource

In contrast to the current trend in applied linguistics of conceptualizing identity as a social process, traditional cognitive approaches within the social sciences tend to treat identity as "pre-discursive, unified and essential" (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 25). These approaches rely on social structures, descriptive labels, and classification systems as analysts' resources to account for social phenomenon. As such, they tend to "remain couched as the theoretical level rather than examine how people actually make sense of their own social categories" (Fitzgerald & Housley, 2015, p. 2). The census statistics described in the previous chapter of this thesis, for example, illustrate how identity is treated as a quantifiable property or "demographic facts about people that have predictable consequences (Widdicombe, 1998, p. 194). Thus, collective identity and individual identity can be understood as "occupy[ing] the same [conceptual] space" (Jenkins, 1996, p. 26). As Widdicombe (1998) notes, beyond a concern with demographic facts identity can also

> refer to the content or the defining criteria of the category, such as common experiences or fate, common origin, or common culture, which distinguish it from other categories. Identity is thus a useful tool for dividing up the social world and for saying something about those divisions. (p. 192)

Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorization theory (Turner, et al. 1987) are two theoretically driven approaches that categorize people into groups in an attempt to predict behaviour. Social identity theory (SIT) posits that individuals have an intrinsic and relatively stable identity based on their relationship to other social groups (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). From this perspective, identities are constituted through social-cognitive process of membership: "individuals are born into and are ascribed particular social categories, but over time they develop an awareness of their membership, a preference for 'my group' over 'outgroups', and an emotional attachment to it" (Widdicombe, 1998, p. 193). In other words, "the ingroup is the one to which an individual 'belongs' and the 'outgroup' is seen as 'outside' and different from this group" (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 25). According to this view, the inevitable "us" and "them" dichotomy that arises from the mental comparisons people make between

themselves and others unsurprisingly leads to stereotyping and discrimination. Further, as Benwell and Stokoe (2006) note, in SIT, "outgroups are more easily and reductively characterized than ingroups, such that ingroup identification often leads to stronger stereotyping and prejudice towards outgroups" (p. 25). When applied to educational contexts, these theories may construct immigrant/EAL students as foreigners or outsiders and contribute to stereotyping, stigmatization, and prejudice (Harklau, 2000; Lee, 2008; Miller, 2000; Mossman, 2012; Talmy, 2005)

Identity as a member's resource

Conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis conceptualize identity as a member's resource, and examine how people do, manage, achieve, and negotiate identity-based knowledge in situ (Fitzgerald & Housley, 2015). In this study, conceptualizing identity as a members' resource is central to addressing what meanings Generation 1.5 university students attribute to their identities. However, framing my study around an analyst's category (Generation 1.5) while applying CA/MCA concepts to study identity as a member's resource was a methodological challenge I faced. To guard against the circularity of my argument, I strive to use the category Generation 1.5 in ways that take into account the complex identities of the participants.

Conversation Analysis (CA)

Conversation Analysis (CA) studies the production and sequential organization of talk in interaction. The foundation for CA was laid by Harvey Sacks (1992) and his colleagues Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson in the 1960s and 1970s. Sack's main concern was with how members of society accomplished social life in and through the turn-by-turn sequential aspects of conversation. Today, at least two types are practised: 1) "pure" or "basic" CA (Heritage, 2005) and 2) applied/institutional CA (ten Have, 2007). Pure or basic CA involves the collection and transcription of naturally-occurring, audio and/or video recordings of ordinary talk-in-interaction. CA examines the institution of talk-in-interaction, that is, how participants understand each other in interaction and the methods they use to do so in situ, such as taking turns, adjacency pairs (pairs of turns

found together regularly such as question/answer), preference design (structural bias toward alignment such as affiliation, solidarity), and repair strategies for dealing with interactional trouble.

In contrast, institutional CA or applied CA examines the production and management of social institutions in talk-in-interaction. Each kind of institutional talk is seen as constituting a "unique fingerprint" (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991, p. 95) of interaction involving "specific tasks, identities, constraints on conduct, and relevant procedures that the participants deploy and are orientated to their interactions with one another" (Heritage, 2004, p. 225). Although called conversation analysis, data in both types are not restricted to conversations, but encompass a wide range of interactions such as interviews, speeches, and/or classroom talk. However, it is normally in institutional CA where identity, power, and social issues emerge because these interactions are often characterized by asymmetries of participation, knowhow, and knowledge (Heritage, 2004).

Like basic CA, applied CA is "equally committed to a 'bottom-up' approach to the data rather than avoiding assumptions that institutionality is a prior constraint that determines what can and cannot be said" (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 99). In this thesis, I adopted an applied CA approach because it is practical and outcome-orientated. *Using* CA in this way as opposed to *doing* CA in the Schegloffian tradition (2007) allowed me the theoretical room to adopt a "'critical' stance towards current arrangements in society [such as] power, oppression, inequality, and ideology" (ten Have, 2007, p. 58). Further, ten Have (2007) suggests that applied CA can "support efforts to make social life 'better' in some way, and provide data-based analytical suggestions for, or critiques of, the ways in which social life can be organized" (p. 174). The conversation analytic attitude is that identity is "performed, constructed, enacted or produced, moment-to-moment, in everyday conversations…" (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 49). Antaki and Widdicombe (1998, p. 3) provide a broad overview of how identity is publicly constructed in talk-in-interaction in the following five general principles:

1. for a person to 'have an identity'—whether he or she is the person speaking, being spoken to, or being spoken about—is to be cast into a *category with associated characteristics and features*;
2. such casting is indexical and occasioned;
3. it *makes relevant* the identity to the interactional business going on;
4. the force of 'having an identity' is in its *consequentiality* in the interaction; and
5. all this is visible in people's exploitation of the *structures of conversation*.

In this study, I applied the principles outlined by Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) to my analysis of my interview and focus group data to help me answer my research questions. These principles provided me with the tools to examine what identities participants oriented to through their personal descriptions of themselves and other people and the inferential resources they associated with these descriptions.

Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA)

Alongside his work on CA, Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) was conceived of by Sacks in the 1960s to study the common-sense practical reasoning or "culture in action" (Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 14) that members of society routinely use, and crucially, take for granted to accomplish social life (Licoppe, 2015). By "culture-in-action," I refer to the notion that from an MCA perspective "[C]ulture does not exist independently of its production" (Hester & Francis, 1997, p. 167). That is, MCA takes the position that people produce culture as they do social life, and their orientation to doing it in particular ways shows a normative dimension to what is allowable and expectable in a given interaction. Thus, culture, from an MCA perspective, comes from our situated social actions—from us *doing* things.

Although sharing ethnomethodology's concern with members' practical sociological reasoning, MCA is a distinct empirical method which focuses on the local production of identity. MCA derives from Sacks' analyses of data from calls to a suicide prevention hotline (Sacks, 1972a) and stories told by children (Sacks, 1972b). Sacks developed a conceptual framework consisting of three major indexical (situated and

contextually embedded) expressions and their rules of application: 1) membership categories, 2) membership categorization devices (MCDs), and 3) category-bound predicates. Sacks conceptualized membership categories as the culturally available resources—classifications or social types—which allow people to describe, identify or make reference to themselves and other people in talk and text. Since Sacks, other scholars have proposed that "collectivites" and non-personal objects (Eglin & Hester, 1992; Hester, 1992; Jayyusi, 1984; McHoul & Watson, 1984) can also be conceived of in ways similar to personal categories. As summarized by Hester and Eglin (1997, p. 3):

> Collectivites or 'collectivity [membership] categorizations' (Coulter 1982; 37; Jayyusi 1984: 47-56; Sharrock 1974) range from 'concretely located,' named institutions usually linked to architectural structures (X bank), through more abstract designations such as 'the legal system,' 'state bureaucracy,' 'the health-care system,' etc. to holistic constructs such as 'the middle class,' 'feudal society,' and 'free enterprise system'.

For purposes of analysis, membership categories are not conceived *a priori*, but as a matter for empirical investigation. The central focus is to elucidate how the participants in an interaction describe and categorize each other, directly or indirectly, as certain sorts of members of society. Identity is not conceived as something "people passively or latently have…. which then causes feelings and actions" (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 2), or as reports by people of "who" they are. Rather, identity is conceptualized as indexical, occasioned, and procedurally consequential (Hester & Eglin, 1997). From an MCA perspective, procedural consequentiality refers to how identities have consequences for social interaction (and how social interaction has consequences for identities). To illustrate with an example from this study, the e-mail Cecile composes for Samantha (Excerpt 6.3) can be read as creating the context for Cecile's and Samantha's identities as cousins (Cecile as "older-cousin" and Samantha as "younger cousin"), which has consequences on the unfolding interaction. That is, it makes relevant an "older-cousin-younger-cousin" type of relationship with a locus of different rights, obligations, and responsibilities—what Sacks (1972b) described as a standardized relational pair (a type of MCD; see below). Further, Cecile composing the message in a

hybrid form of Créole and Samantha reading it can be viewed as associating the activity/predicate of speaking Creole to the identity category of Mauritian national.

MCA's attention to the identity categories that participants in an interaction/text invoke and/or make relevant and the understandings they display about those identity categories provides analytic value in terms of exploring the process of identity construction among my research participants. In terms of why Sack's treatment of categories is significant and how it differs from traditional social science approaches, Kasper (2009) remarks:

> The predominant view is that category membership is transparent and has no need of focused examination in its own right. In applied linguistics, for instance, paired categories such as native-nonnative speaker, L1 speaker-L2 speaker, student-teacher, women-men, child-adult are routinely used as analysts' resources, without attention to whether and how such categories (as descriptions and performed incumbencies) are treated in the 'data' by the persons so categorized. Sacks insists that membership categories be taken as a research *topic.* (p. 6)

Sacks' (1992) central framework was the Membership Categorization Device (MCD), which he defined as a collection of "categories-that-go-together" (p. 238) plus rules for applying them:

> Any collection of membership categories, containing at least a category, that may be applied to some population containing at least a Member, so as to provide, by use of some rules of application, for the pairing of at least a population Member and a categorization device member. A device is then a collection plus rules of application. (Sacks, 1992, p. 246)

According to Sacks, membership categorization devices are inference rich; they shape how interlocutors make sense of themselves and each other (and vice versa) and participate in an interaction. That is, categories within a collection "carr[y] different sets of category-bound activities, predicates, or rights or obligations that are expectable for an incumbent of that category to perform or possess" (Stokoe & Attenborough, 2015, p. 54). Hester and Eglin (1997) note that "[T]he idea that membership categories form collections

refers to the fact that, in the locally occasioned settings of their occurrence, some membership categories can be used and heard commonsensically as 'going together', whilst others cannot be used and heard" (p. 4).

Category-boundedness is another central aspect of Sacks conceptual framework. Sacks (1972b) argued that membership categories are "bound" (attached, tied) to category activities. That is, category-boundedness relates to the way in which members treat features as naturally related to a category in a taken for granted way. Since Sacks, the notion of category-bound activity has been expanded to include category *predicates* (Hester & Eglin, 1997; Jayyusi, 1984; Sharrock, 1974; Stokoe, 2012; Watson, 1978), which include not only activities, but also the rights, entitlements, obligations, knowledge, attributes, and competencies associated with or inferred by the categories. Not only do predicates imply categories, but categories imply predicates. For example, lecturing is a predicate that implies the category professor while the category professor implies the predicate of "assigning readings" (among other predicates). Categories and their associated activities and predicates do not, however, "go together" in a decontextualized way. Rather, "their orderliness, their 'going together' is achieved and is to be found in the local specifics of categorization as an activity" (Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 46). In other words, such 'going together' must be warranted in the data and "cannot simply be asserted on the analyst's authority" (Schegloff, 1992, p. xlii). More recently, Reynolds and Fitzgerald (2015) in the context of studying public arguments, have illustrated how differentiating between tied (Sacks, 1995), bound (Sacks, 1972b), and predicated relationships (Eglin & Hester, 1992) between member categories and features can lead to greater levels of analytical sophistication in MCA. Reynolds and Fitzgerald (2015) draw our attention to how these three relationships provide "greater scalar descriptive adequacy in representing the different 'strengths' of relationships between categories and their features" (p. 105). While a *category-tied* relationship allows the analysts to see how members in an interaction treat a feature as "not taken for granted and needing to be made explicit" (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015, p. 99) a *category-bound* relationship illustrates how members treat features as "naturally related to a category in a taken for granted way, but nevertheless explicit way" (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015, p. 99). When members treat

38

features and norms as directly implied by a category and not needing to be made explicit, they describe this relationship as *category-predicated* (Hester & Eglin, 1992). In this study, I used applied conversation analysis and MCA to analyze turn-generated identities-for-interaction in interviews and texts (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006).

In addition to identity, the category Generation 1.5 is a central construct in this study. For this reason, in the next section, I provide a brief historical overview of the category Generation 1.5 in applied linguistic literature. I include the category's (supposed) origins, entry into College Writing programs and ESL contexts, its popularization in the Korean-American media/community, its various scholarly interpretations, and the discourse of in-between-ness associated with the category.

3.2. Generation 1.5: A Brief Historical Overview

Ruben G. Rumbaut (1976) coined the term "one-and-a-half generation" to describe "children of Cuban exiles who were born in Cuba but have come of age in the United States" (p. 8). Rumbaut and Ima (1988) would later use the term "1.5 Generation" to refer to a population of Southeast Asian refugee youth completing their education in the U.S. high schools. In this study, completed as part of a report for the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement, they described this population of students as stuck in-between two societies, two languages, two cultures, and two generations:

> …they are many ways marginal to both new and old worlds, for while they straddle both worlds they are in some profound sense fully part of neither of them. Though they differ greatly from each other in cultural and social class origins…they occupy…the interstices, as it were, of two societies and cultures, between the first and second generation, between being 'refugees' and being 'ethnics' (or hyphenated Americans). (p. 2)

Rumbaut and Ima (1988) discursively constructed this group as what can be read as stuck in-between cultural worlds, which suggests a one-sided, deterministic "forever foreigners" (Lo & Reyes, 2004; Talmy, 2004) identity, "in which the subject is treated as a

mere effect of discourse and ideology rather than an initiator of action" (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 31).

Turning to Generation 1.5's popularization in the Korean-American media/community, in the context of the Korean-American communities of New York and Los Angeles during the 1970s, 일점오세 (il cheom ose, literally "1.5 Generation") was constructed as a way to distinguish the children of first-generation Korean immigrant parents from those of the 1st and 2nd generation. Korean American scholar Kyeyoung Park (1999), for example, makes the point that "although biologically the notion of a '1.5' generation is absurd, the sociocultural characteristics and psychological experiences of the pre-adult immigrants are distinct from either first or second-generation Americans" (p. 140). Park suggests that the term 1.5 Generation was "popularized by community leaders such as Professor Eui-young Yu and Bong Hwan Kim, former director of Korean Youth and Community centre" (p. 140), and contends that the first written record of its use occurred in the early 1980s and is attributed to K. Lee, editor of the *Korea Times English Edition*, who suggested "an analogy of 'twilight' in locating the 1.5 generation in the context of Korean American history" (p. 140). Because of their linguistic and cultural hybridity, the 1.5 Generation were assigned the important task of becoming "cultural brokers" (Park, 1999, p. 140):

> …KA [Korean American] community expects some 1.5ers to be bridge builders with the rest of American society in political and other arenas, a task which cannot be done satisfactorily by the current immigrants due to their linguistic, cultural, and other barriers. (Park, 1999, p. 141)

Park argues that the 1.5 generation are "neither Korean, American, nor Korean American," while they are, at the same time, all three. The simultaneity of their being 'neither/nor' and 'both/all' distinguishes the 1.5 generation from both immigrant Korean and American-born Koreans" (p. 12).

In applied linguistics research, much of the early knowledge-base about Generation 1.5 students can be traced to US Writing and ESL contexts in higher education

(Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999; Harklau, 1999, 2000; Roberge, 2002; Roberge, Siegal, & Harklau, 2009) and to some extent in US K-12 contexts (Talmy, 2004)). Linda Harklau (1999, 2000, 2009) pioneered much of the early research on Generation 1.5 in US Composition Studies contexts. In fact, Harklau et al. (1999) was the first major publication to introduce the term Generation 1.5 to the applied linguistics community. Harklau et al. (1999) defined Generation 1.5 as "bilingual U.S. resident students who enter U.S. colleges and universities by way of K-12 schools" (Harklau, et al. 1999, p. 1). The authors did not challenge the notion of in-between-ness introduced by Rumbaut and Ima (1988) but (re)presented students as being a considerable challenge to post-secondary institutions because they did not "fit…into current ways of categorizing college writers—ESL, developmental, regular" (p. 4). What is significant about this publication is the different ways Harklau et al. described this population of students: "bilingual students" (p. 1); "nonnative language writers" (p. 1); "linguistically diverse students" (p. 1); "bilingual U.S. resident students" (p. 1); "bilingual English learners" (pp. 2, 4); "language minority students" (p. 2); "U.S.-educated; U.S.-resident learners of English" (p. 3); "linguistically diverse college writers" (p. 4); "multilingual students" (p. 4); "non-English language background high school graduates" (p. 11); "bilingual college writers" (p. 11); "non-native English speaking students" (p. 18); "functional bilinguals" (p. 61); "immigrant student writers" (p. 143); and "second language writers" (p. 191). The reasons Harklau et al. give for including such a diverse array of descriptors in this collection is that such students "may be too diverse, too particularistic in their backgrounds, needs, and characteristics to hold under any single label or rubric" (Harklau, et al., 1999, p. 12). However, to my mind, these definitions, especially the decision to include students born in the US and raised in bi/multilingual enclaves under the 1.5 category, tend to create confusion amongst researchers and educators over who or what can/should be considered Generation 1.5 (e.g., see Marshall & Lee, 2017). In the context of US College and Composition, Matsuda and Matsuda (2009) draw our attention to the fact that the label Generation 1.5 played a "major role in creating a critical mass discursively by embracing various categories of students who had traditionally been represented by different terms, such as bilingual minority, immigrant ESL, resident ESL, or just plain ESL—or a subset of that population" (p. 59).

A discourse of liminality associated with Generation 1.5 students is well-established in the literature. Roberge (2002) suggests that the category Generation 1.5 was taken up by researchers to denote these immigrant students' in-between status:

> Because these students' experiences, characteristics, and educational needs may lie somewhere between those of recently arrived *first-generation* adult immigrants and the U.S.-born *second-generation* children of immigrants, scholars have begun to refer to these students as *generation 1.5 immigrants,…* . (p. 107-108)

Several researchers have constructed Generation 1.5 students as caught, stuck, or lost in the middle somewhere between languages, literacies, and cultures. I offer a few examples here, most in the context of first-year US College writing courses. Hinkle (2006) described Generation 1.5 as identifying "neither fully with the culture of their native countries nor with the US…" (p. 40). Oudenhoven (2006) positioned Generation 1.5 as "students who are *truly* caught in the middle—between languages, cultures, and classrooms" (p. 243, emphasis added). Trapped "among different worlds" is how Johns (1999) described Generation 1.5, adding that they "require pedagogies that will assist them in sorting out their languages as cultures…" (p. 159). Similarly, Crosby described Generation 1.5 as "caught between languages and literacies" (Crosby, 2007, p. 2) while Murie and Fitzpatrick (2009) positioned Generation 1.5 students as "by definition, […] 'between cultures'" (p. 164). As Blackledge cautions, when discourses are (re)produced in this way, "a more authoritative voice, and in a more legitimate context, gain[s] power and status" (Blackledge, 2005, p. 13). Over time, these discourses can influence the ways educators come to understand Generation 1.5 students. However, these discourses do not mean that Generation 1.5 are stuck in-between by default, or that they cannot (re)negotiate their identities within different social contexts.

Not surprisingly, the discourse of in-between-ness associated with Generation 1.5 students has drawn criticism. For example, Benesch (2008), a vocal critic of the 1.5 label, argues that Generation 1.5 discursively constructs students as demographically, linguistically, and academically partial. Like Benesch, Talmy (2001) strongly opposes the term, maintaining that the Generation 1.5 is "an ill-defined identity category which, despite

its imprecision, increasingly attributes cognitive, linguistic, and behavioral characteristics to the people it signifies" (p. 3) and "ensnare[s] [students] by a decimal point [1.5] signaling interstitial incompleteness" (p. 8).   Roberge (2002) also cautions educators that Generation 1.5 "may be problematic, for it implies that immigrant students are somewhere "between" first and second generation immigrants when, in fact, they may have experiences, characteristics, and educational needs which differ markedly from both of these groups" (p. 108). Similarly, Marshall and Lee (2017) maintain that the Generation 1.5 label "involves viewing social, cultural, and linguistic difference through a homogenous lens that can reduce educators' understandings of multilingual students to essentialist reifications" (p. 27). Despite being largely responsible for introducing the term Generation 1.5 to the applied linguistics community, Harklau, in a subsequent study (2000), offers a caveat: "[…] we live in a society that tends to equate "American" with "whiteness," where the term Generation 1.5 may inadvertently contribute to a representation of students as perpetual foreigners no matter how long they have resided in the U.S. (Harklau, as quoted in Matsuda et al., 2003, p. 155-156).

3.3. Generation 1.5 in Non-Canadian K-12 and Postsecondary Contexts

In this fifth and final section, I synthesize the theoretical frames of reference I have discussed above and review the empirical research on Generation 1.5 students. Since much of the research on Generation 1.5 has focused on K-12 students and on immigrant ESL students in College writing programs in the United States, I focus mainly on studies from these contexts, except for one study from Australia (Miller, 2000).

Generation 1.5 students may find themselves part of the "them" group in contexts in which knowledge of the dominant (Western) language and culture is made a prerequisite for school success. Miller's (2000) study of Generation 1.5 Chinese students learning English in an Australian high school, for example, highlights the link between language, identity, and the social order of schooling. Theoretically, Miller draws on Gee's (1996) notion of "enacting identity,' which highlights the central role of discourses in a

three-way interactional framework in which language use, social membership, and contexts interact concurrently. Miller presents three mini-case studies of Chinese speaking students: one grade 8 student (Tina from Taiwan), and two grade 9 students (Nora from Shanghai and John from Hong Kong). These students were tracked from an intensive ESL reception program (2-6 months) to high school ESL classes (several months) and to mainstream classes. A significant finding was that as these Chinese-students transitioned from "reception ESL" to "regular" ESL classes at the high school and on to mainstream classes, their opportunities to use English reportedly decreased; all reported feeling marginalized and discriminated against to varying degrees from their Anglo-Australian peers, many of whom simply refused to talk to them. Miller maintains that this behaviour "was one way they [the Anglo-Australian students] represented the social order of the school" (p. 97). Miller demonstrated how these Chinese students' unsuccessful attempts at social and academic integration were tied to institutional practices. Miller argues that since the other White immigrant students at the same school reportedly did not have as much trouble fitting in, wider racist ideologies in Australian society may have been at work within the school. The participants (including other Chinese students at the school) appeared to have been marginalized based not only on their limited English ability, but more so on their marked physical appearance (a condition which Abbey [p. 166 this study] alluded to at her high school in Metro Vancouver):

> This article would have been very different if I had chosen to write about the Bosnian students. After the initial stages, they did not encounter these problems in interaction and communication, leaving room for the possibility that part of the experiences of the Chinese students relates in fact to their visible difference. (Miller, 2000, p. 97)

Miller's study is highly relevant to this study as it provides important insights into how language, visual appearance, identity, ethnicity, and comfort zones impact immigrant students, and most importantly for the purposes of this study, how identity construction is tied to social practice and interaction. Schools can assist language minority students "construct new socially situated identities," Miller concludes, by grasping "the specific connections between institutional and social practices, social identities, and language resources" (p. 99).

Talmy (2004, 2005) provides in-depth analysis of the construction and negotiation of social identity of Generation 1.5 high school students in Hawaiʻi, showing its relevance to the literature in the applied linguistics. Based on 2.5-year critical ethnographic study of "old-timer ESL" or Generation 1.5 students at a high school in Hawaiʻi, Talmy (2005) studied how and why the stigma of ESL occurs, how ESL is constructed and resisted in schooling, and the social practices Generation 1.5 students engaged in to produce identities as "non-ESL" students. Drawing on community of practice (CoP) (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), language socialization (Ochs, 1990), interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz 1982), membership categorization analysis (Sacks, 1992), and applied conversation analysis (ten Have, 2001), Talmy focused on how competing "cultural productions of the ESL student" (p. 621)—a school sanctioned version and an opposing Local ESL student version—manifested in and through classroom practices. However, unlike the students in Miller's study, the school sanctioned version of ESL, which positioned students in disadvantageous ways, was subverted and actively resisted by the "old-timer ESL" or Generation 1.5 students in the ESL classroom. In particular, Talmy's 2015 study, which investigated the construction and negotiation of social identity through the theoretical and analytic lens of language socialization, is particularly relevant to note here. A significant finding consistent with the data presented in Chapter 8 of this thesis was that a central way the Generation 1.5 students in his study distinguished themselves from lower English proficient students and their newcomer classmates was through the construction of, in their terminology, "FOB" (Fresh off the Boat), an identity category that they achieved interactionally through their use of "Mock ESL": "oral disfluency, marked syntax, styled phonology, and lexical borrowings, which work together to index a racialized outgroup or 'foreign' persona" (Talmy, 2015, p. 356). In an earlier article, Talmy (2004) described FOB as "a noxious label signifying a recently-arrived, monumentally uncool, non-English-speaking rube of mythical, and for some, hilarious proportions" (p. 150). Utilizing Ochs' (1990) notion of "direct and indirect indexical relations" (p. 294), Talmy draws our attention to how Mock ESL was used by the Generation 1.5 students to performatively display their distinction from FOB by constructing identities which aligned with "Local' or 'mainstream,' social types" (p. 358). In this way, Talmy demonstrates how

they were able to construct "credible or genuine" social identities through an intersubjective tactic described by Bucholtz and Hall (2004) as "*authentication*" (p. 385).

Talmy's research is especially significant because it illustrates how an MCA/applied conversation approach to the empirical study of interactional classroom data can underscore some of the ways Generation 1.5 students differ from international/newcomer ESL students: "…advanced L2 interactional competence, their generally negative representations about ESL and their evident affiliations with mainstream … communities beyond ESL" (Talmy 2009, p. 205). For these reasons, Talmy's research directly informs the current investigation into the processes of identity construction for Canadian Generation 1.5 university students.

The construction of the archetypal learner (reported in Talmy's research above as "FOB") was also the focus of Harklau's study in 2000. As the first systematic study of institutional representations of Generation 1.5 students transitioning from high school ESL to a community college ESL program, the study made a significant contribution to the applied linguistics literature on Generation 1.5 and identity in the context of schooling across two educational settings in the US. Like Talmy (2009, 2010), who called for additional empirical research involving high school ESL populations, Harklau (2000) also identifies an important gap in the educational literature: studies that focus on Generation 1.5 students' transition from high school into college, which she maintains is "virtually nonexistent" (p. 36). Based on year-long ethnographic case studies, Harklau's study is significant for contributing the notion of *identity in movement* (Harklau, 2000, p. 41) to research on Generation 1.5 in the applied linguistics literature. Drawing on the notion of representation, Harklau compared ESL student identity in two educational settings: high school and college. The most striking result to emerge from the data was that, through class curricula and spoken and written interactions in high school, Generation 1.5 students appropriated and recreated institutional representations as hardworking, earning them the title, "good kids," but in the college context, these same students resisted prevailing institutional representations of ESL students as newcomers and cultural novices, resulting in their representation as "bad kids." For example, Harklau reported that in high school,

teachers assigned "inspirational" personal narratives, which she argued, perpetuated images of the determined, hardworking, immigrant who had overcome adversity, a representation Harklau maintains relates to "broader U.S. societal "Ellis Island" images of immigrants leaving their homes, enduring financial and emotional hardships, and through sheer perseverance succeeding in building a better life for themselves in America" (p. 46). Interestingly, Harklau observed that although students enjoyed writing such stories, they in effect "essentialized themselves as a cultural *Other* to "secure teachers' ongoing sympathy and support" (p. 48). In addition to collaborating with their teachers' construction of them as diligent, hardworking immigrants, students' classroom behaviour (e.g., attending class regularly, displays of appreciation and affection for their teachers, and staying on task) became an intrinsic part of their representation as "good kids"—well-behaved, hard-working, and persevering, which was "shaped by and served to reinforce broader societal notions about the immigrant experience" (p. 51). In contrast to the "good kids" representations in high school, these same students were reportedly institutionally constructed in their community college classrooms as newcomers and cultural novices despite the fact they had been U.S. residents for several years. The main reason for this representation was that most students in the College ESL program were in fact newly arrived and internationally educated. What it meant to be an "ESL college student" then, took on a very different meaning for these local ESL students. Harklau explains:

> The socioeconomic and educational background of the representation of
> these internationally educated students had become normative in the
> representation of ESOL students within the institution, much as it has in
> U.S. college-level TESOL research and pedagogy. (p. 59)

An equally surprising finding was that the prominence of this international student archetype "tended to position students as outsiders though discourses presuming a mutually exclusive "United States" and "your country." By asking students to write frequently about topics such as "my hometown," "homeless people in your country," "a holiday in your country," "my country-a great place to visit," for example, teachers created a binary of Self and Other which positioned students as perpetual foreigners and devalued their cultural hybridity, multilingualism, and previous rich experiences with English.

47

Another example that highlighted this binary and reinforced their status as novice English learners came from a teacher's comment on an assignment: "How much time do you speak English compared to your language?" Thus, these students were, in effect, caught between dual representations of culture prevalent in their classrooms—"implicitly assumed cultural exemplars of other countries and languages" (Harklau, 2000, p. 56) at one extreme and white American culture at the other. These findings relate to what has been suggested by Hall (1997): people who are significantly different from the majority often fall victim to binary representations and "are often required to be *both things at the same time!"* (Hall, 1997, p. 326; cf. Park, 1999 above). This binary-type of representation seemed to apply to the students in Harklau's study, who found themselves "neither or both depending on time and context" (p. 56). For example, students began to shift their use of pronouns in their compositions to account for both identities as the following sample of one of the case study student's writing illustrates: "In *my* culture *we* go to the market to buy food every morning. Not like *here*, *we* shop once a week" (p. 56). That students came to resent and resist these images was evident in Harklau's observations of students' boredom in class and uncooperative behaviour, earning them the label "the worst" students.

The studies reviewed here illustrate how the category Generation 1.5/immigrant ESL can be understood as rooted in the notion of *collective identities* (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 24), a notion that unites individuals by "common experiences or fate, common origin, or common culture" (Widdicombe, 1998, p. 192). Benwell and Stokoe (2006) note that "a commitment to… 'labels' is invariably the most common response to the question, 'Who am I?'" (p. 25). This conceptualization assumes that identities correspond "to an independently existing social structure (Widdicombe, 1998, p. 192), which gives rise to the notion that identity, as a fixed set of properties, belongs to individuals or society (essential) and corresponds to some aspect of social reality (realist). Benwell and Stokoe (2006) maintain that such conceptions of identity typically ask "'what' identities people possess…how they may be distinguished from each other…, and how they correlate with a variety of social science measures […]. (p. 3). I now turn to studies on Generation 1.5 in Canadian K-12 and postsecondary contexts.

3.4. Generation 1.5 in Canadian K-12 and Post-Secondary Contexts

In addition to the foundational research in US Writing and ESL contexts in higher education and in K-12, several Canadian applied linguists are contributing to the knowledge base of Generation 1.5 in K-12 and postsecondary classrooms (e.g., see Roessingh & Douglas, 2012, for a special themed issue on Generation 1.5 in Canada). Marshall and Lee (2017) highlight a broadening trend in terms of how the category Generation 1.5 is defined and understood in the Canadian context, citing several examples from Canada. For example, Garnett's (2012) critical review of 17 studies over 25 years broadened the scope of Generation 1.5 to include "immigrants, children of immigrants, ESL students, and non-native English and French speakers" (2012, p. 15). Leo (2012) studied discourse markers in academic writing and defined both Canadian-born Chinese students and more recently arrived Chinese students in Canada as Generation 1.5. Crossman and Pinchbeck (2012), studying transitional English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programing for post-secondary bound Generation 1.5 high school students, include children born of Canadian immigrants in their definition of Generation 1.5: "it is clear that for a growing number of Generation 1.5s, the Canadian-born children of immigrants who have spent their entire K-12 years in local schools, early identification, ongoing and shifting support, and transitional programming at key points are necessary for their educational success (p. 231, as cited in Marshall & Lee, 2017). Schechter's (2012) qualitative study investigated the literacy development of 24 junior-middle school students of immigrant parents from South Asia studying at a school in the Greater Toronto area. Describing these Canadian-born students, who were raised in families where Punjabi, Hindi, Guajarati, Tamil, and Urdu were predominately spoken, as "Generation 1.5 English Language Learners" and "G.15 linguistic minority students," Schechter follows the broadening trend in applied linguistics research of including students born in Canada under the 1.5 rubric, a move which I believe contributes to the confusion around the term. In her study of the linguistic identity and race of Generation 1.5 teacher candidates in Canada, Faez (2012) also includes Canadian-born immigrants in her definition of Generation 1.5: "Generation 1.5 is a label used for persons who are born outside Canada and the United States or those who are born to immigrant parents in

these countries and have received most of their secondary and/or elementary education there" (p. 242, as cited in Marshall & Lee, 2017). She does, nonetheless, recognize that those born to immigrant families in Canada have different life experiences from immigrants from other countries, a position that is congruent with the definition of Generation 1.5 I employ in this study. The variety of ways Generation 1.5 is understood and defined in these studies is viewed by Marshall and Lee (2017) as potentially "further reinforce[ing] essentialization of identity and negation of difference" (p. 26).

In this chapter, I reviewed the theoretical frames of reference that guide my investigation into the processes of identity construction for Canadian Generation 1.5 university students. I reviewed relevant educational research related to conceptualizations of identity in the postmodern tradition as well as traditional social science approaches. I then reviewed the analytical frameworks that I employ to interpret my data—conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis and explained how they connect to my study. Following this, I provided a brief historical overview of the Generation 1.5 category. In the final section, I reviewed research studies on Generation 1.5 in non-Canadian contexts, focusing mostly on US writing and ESL contexts. Finally, I reviewed the most recent literature on Generation 1.5 students in Canadian K-12 and post-secondary contexts. I reviewed literature in the Canadian context and highlighted a broadening trend in terms of how the category Generation 1.5 is defined and understood. I gave a rationale for how this study addresses a research gap with regards to our understandings of how Generation 1.5 students negotiate their identities in a Canadian post-secondary context. I now turn to a discussion of the methodology I adopted in this study.

Chapter 4.   Methodology

4.1. Qualitative, Ethnomethodological, and Interpretive Research

In this study, I chose a qualitative approach since it is "interpretive and creative while allowing the researcher to construct interpretations" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, pp. 25–26). This approach helped me to understand how the participants "make sense of their experiences and also how researchers in turn make sense of (interpret) data obtained from interviews, observations, narratives, and other sources" (Duff, 2012, p. 419). My aim in this chapter is to first explain the qualitative, ethnomethodological, and interpretative approaches I adopted.   I will then provide information about recruitment and the participants.

4.2. Methodological Approach

4.2.1.   Qualitative Study

In this thesis, I adopt a qualitative methodological approach to understand the factors that impact the identity construction of Generation 1.5 students and how these factors are mobilized and co-produced in talk, text, and social interaction in a Canadian university context. I locate this study in a historical moment defined by Denzin and Lincoln (2005) as the eighth movement, which "asks that the social sciences and the humanities become sites for critical conversations about democracy, race, gender, class, nation-states, globalization, freedom and community" (p. 3). This thesis contributes to critical conversations about identity, culture, and categorization practices and explores the factors that shape the processes of identity construction of Generation 1.5 students. To guide me in finding answers to my research questions, I use qualitative inquiry. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005):

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. [The researchers] turn the world into a series of representations, including fieldnotes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. It means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (p. 3)

Concerning where this study fits within the first part of this definition of qualitative research by Denzin and Lincoln (2005) above, I attempt to make the world of the participants visible in their situated context. As a researcher at CPU, I engage in research in the same spaces as the participants; we are members of academic communities and share, to some degree, a sense of belonging. Sharing this space with the participants helped me better understand them and make their world visible. I attempted to be "acutely tuned-in to the experiences and meaning systems of [the participants]—to indwell—and at the same time to be aware of how one's own biases and preconceptions may be influencing what one is trying to understand" (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994, p. 123). A key part of this process was understanding my active role as researcher in representing the world of the participants.

4.2.2.   Interpretative Framework

In this study, I adopt an interpretative approach (Mason, 2002) and rely on the subjective experiences of the participants as my primary data, generated/collected through semi-structured interviews, formal and informal texts, and one visual image. Mason (2003) notes that an interpretivist approach does not necessarily require the researcher to immerse him/herself in the field, but can "happily support a study which uses interview methods…where the main aim is to explore people's individual and collective understandings, reasoning processes, social norms, and so on" (p. 56). By adopting an interview-as-social practice (Talmy, 2011) orientation in my interviews, I attempted to bridge "the so called macro-micro divide" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2005, p. 483) and seek to understand how (macro) social and cultural norms (meaning) are co-produced, jointly

managed in the (micro) details of talk-in-interaction (form). In this study, I use the term "talk-in-interaction" "to denote language *in use* by two or more people *interacting* with each other" (Toerien, 2014, p. 327). The emphasis I place on interpreting social reality through the local and situated sense-making practices of individuals is useful in helping me answer my research questions.

4.2.3.   Recruitment

I applied for and received Ethics approval to conduct this study (See Appendix A for the Informed Consent Form). In keeping with the researcher's understanding of Generation 1.5, only students who identified themselves as having completed some years of formative schooling in their countries of birth (and/or in other countries) prior to immigrating to Canada were recruited. I recruited a total of thirty participants from four researcher-generated categories, but limit my analysis of data to contributions of eleven participants.

1. Writing Centre Students (6);
2. Writing Centre Volunteers (12);
3. Academic Writing Course Students (8)
4. Other (4)

In the first category, I recruited six undergraduate students who had made writing consultations in the Writing Centre at CPU. Through our ensuing discussions, students told me English was not their first language and/or that they came to Canada a number of years ago. This self-disclosure provided an opportunity for me to tell them that I was conducting interviews for my Ph.D. dissertation about identity and multilingual immigrant students. All six students agreed to an interview; two of these six students, Ida and Mi-Jung, also participated in a follow-up focus group.

I also recruited twelve undergraduate students who had volunteered as English language mentors (category 2) at the Writing Centre. I explained my research to each

participant and my particular interest in individuals who had completed some years of formative schooling in their other countries prior to immigrating to Canada.

I also recruited eight students who had taken CPU's Academic Writing 101 course. (Category 3). I gave a brief presentation on my research in several different sections of the course and invited those who identified as having completed some years of formative schooling in their other countries prior to immigrating to Canada to participate. By recruiting students from the AW 101 course, I was able to get to know some new participants in a teaching context outside of the Writing Centre.

In the fourth category, Other, I recruited four undergraduate students who were introduced to me by other students. I contacted them by e-mail and invited them to participate in an interview. In total, I interviewed twenty-eight of thirty participants. The two participants I did not interview, however, choose to participate in one focus group discussion. A total of fourteen students out of the thirty participated in a focus group.

4.2.4. Study Participants

Focus student

*Participated in Focus Group

Writing Centre Students (6)

Name (Sex)	Country of Origin	Age on Arrival	Languages	Faculty	Year at CPU
Eva (F)	Hong Kong, SAR	15	Cantonese, Mandarin, English	Business	2
Hee-Young (F)	Republic of Korea	14	Korea, English	Business	3
*Ida (F)	Hong Kong, SAR	14	Cantonese, Japanese, English	International Studies	1
Lisa (F)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	13	Taiwanese, Mandarin, English	Psychology	4
*Tiffany (F)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	13	Taiwanese, Mandarin, English	Business	4
*Mi-Jung (F)	Republic of Korea	12	Korean, English	Criminology	2

Writing Centre Volunteers (12)

Name (Sex)	Country of Origin	Age on Arrival	Languages	Faculty	Year at CPU
*Abbey (F)	People's Republic of China	11	Mandarin, English	Psychology	3
Ashley (F)	Republic of Korea	7	Korean, English	Business	4
Baljit (F)	Federal Republic of Germany	16	German, Hindi, English	Biomedical Kinesiology	3
Chloe (F)	Hong Kong, SAR	12	Cantonese, English	International Studies	3
*Denise (F)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	12	Mandarin, Taiwanese, English	Linguistics	3
Ellen (F)	Dubai	12	Khudmonni, Farsi, Urdu, English	Sociology	3
*Kerstin (F)	Republic of Korea	9	Korean, English	International Studies	4
*Mandy	People's Republic of China	5	Mandarin Cantonese, English	Educational Psychology	3
Milena (F)	Republic of Uzbekistan	12	Russian, English	Criminology	2
Samantha	Republic of Mauritius	12	Créole, French, English	Economics	2
*Shahdi	Islamic republic of Iran	11	Persian, English	Chemistry	3
*Stefanie	Federal Republic of Germany	17	German, English	English	3

Academic Writing 101 Students (8)

Name (Sex)	Country of Origin	Age on Arrival	Languages	Faculty	Year at CPU
*Cathy (F)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	13	Taiwanese, Mandarin, English	Business	1
*Genevie (F)	Republic of Korea	14	Korean, English, Japanese	Criminology	1
Jenny (F)	People's Republic of China	12	Cantonese, Mandarin, English	Health Sciences	3
Jun (M)	Republic of Korea	12	Korean, English	Psychology	2
*Min-Kyung (F)	Republic of Korea	13	Korean, English	International Studies	1
*Taylor (F)	People's Republic of China	15	Mandarin, English	Business	1
*Wayne (M)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	14	Taiwanese, Mandarin, English	Economics	2
Stelian (Steve)	Romania	14	Romanian, English	Applied Sciences	1

Other Students (4)

Name (Sex)	Country of Origin	Age on Arrival	Languages	Faculty	Year at CPU
Diego (M)	El Salvador	14	Spanish, English	Health Sciences	4
Daisuke (M)	Japan	15	Japanese, English	Economics	2
David (M)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	15	Taiwanese, Mandarin, English	Computer Science	2
Wakana (F)	Japan	10	Japanese, English	Health Sciences	4

In order to provide a "thick description" (Geertz 1973) of each participant, in the following sections, I describe where the eleven focus participants were born, the number years of formative education they received prior to coming to Canada, age upon arrival in Canada, the languages they described speaking, and their year and field of study at CPU

at the time of their participation in the study. Although not a focus student, Stefanie has a minor but important role in the focus group in Chapter 8, and for this reason, I include this description of her to help my readers understand her background.

4.2.5. Writing Centre Students

Eva

After completing six years of compulsory primary education and one year of secondary education in Chinese in the Hong Kong school system, Eva and her family emigrated from Hong Kong to Canada when she was 15 years of age. Her family settled in a neighborhood with many Chinese immigrants (and other Asian ethnicities) from Hong Kong. She completed grades 10-12 at a public school in Canada before coming to CPU. At the time of the interview, she was in her second-year of a degree in Business.

Hee-Young

Hee-Young immigrated with her family to Vancouver from South Korea when she was 12 years old. She completed grades K-5 in a Korean public school and grades 7-12 (the school administration placed her in grade 7, so she skipped grade 6) at public schools in the Metro Vancouver area before coming directly to CPU from high school. During the interview she told me that she was "Canadian from Korea" and spoke only Korean at home. At the time of the interview, she was in her fourth year of a degree in Economics.

Lisa and Tiffany

Tiffany and Lisa were 24-year-old twins from Taiwan. They completed grades K-7 at a public school in Taiwan and at the age of 13, immigrated to Canada with their family and completed grades 7-12 at a public school in the Metro Vancouver area. I interviewed them together. At the time of their participation in the study, they were pursuing undergraduate degrees in Psychology and Business. They described speaking Taiwanese, Mandarin, and English.

4.2.6.   Writing Centre Volunteers

Abbey

Abbey came to Canada from Beijing, China, when she was 11 years old (Grade 6), after completing six years of formal schooling in Mandarin in China. She completed her Grade 6-12 education in the public-school system in Metro Vancouver. For the first year of school, Abbey described being routinely called FOB by her classmates, something she readily accepted: "I was a fob. I dressed differently, I spoke differently and then how I acted was different." Sacks (1992) argued that categories are inference rich, which means, that the category FOB infers, for example, attributes such as being poor at English, not fitting in, having an "accent," having long, dyed hair (for males), wearing clothes "from Asia," and living in non-English speaking enclaves. She described speaking Mandarin with her parents and mostly English with her friends at school. At the time of her participation, she was a fourth-year student pursing a degree in International Studies.

Chloe

Chloe was 12 years of age when she immigrated to Canada from Hong Kong with her family. She completed six years of primary education in the Hong Kong public school system and Grades 6-12 in the public-school system in Canada before coming to CPU directly from high school. She described being fluent in Cantonese and English and visiting relatives in Hong Kong at least once a year. At the time of her participation, she was in her third year of a degree in International Studies.

Kerstin

Kerstin was 9 years of age when she and her family immigrated to Canada from Seoul. She completed five years of primary education in Korea and the remainder of her compulsory elementary and high school education in English in the public-school system. She described a time during elementary school when her parents locked up all her Korean books for three years in an attempt to force her to learn English. At the time of the study,

she had lived in Canada for 14 years, and was in her fourth year of a major in Communications. She described being fluent in Korean and English and making regular visits to South Korea to visit her parents, who had moved back to South Korea.

Samantha

Samantha was born in Mauritius and described growing up in Port Louis speaking Mauritian Créole at home and French and English at school up until grade 6. Her family immigrated to Canada when she was 12 years old (Grade 7) and she completed her education in the public-school system in Metro Vancouver. She described regularly attending local Mauritian cultural events with her family and friends from Mauritius. At the time of her participation in the interview, she was in her second year of a degree in Economics.

Stefanie

Stefanie, an international student from Germany, arrived in Canada when she was 18 years of age and completed two years of high school a high school in the Metro Vancouver area. She described being proficient in German and English and being "more than ready" for university, coming from one of the top schools in Germany. Rather than starting in Grade 12, her new school placed her in Grade 11 due to a "problem" with courses transferring. At the time of the interview, Stephanie was in her third year of an undergraduate degree in English.

4.2.7.   Academic Writing 101 Students

Genevie

Genevie was born in South Korea and completed six years or primary school and one year of secondary school in the Korean public-school system prior to immigrating with her family to Canada at 14 years of age. Her teenage years in Canada were reportedly a tumultuous time in her life, as she resisted her parent's decision to send her to a parochial

school, and as result, she ended up attending two different public high schools in the Metro Vancouver region before coming to CPU to study Psychology. She described speaking Korean and English. At the time of her participation, Genevie was in her first year at CPU majoring in Psychology.

Jun

Jun, his younger brother, and his parents immigrated to Canada in September 2005, when Jun was 12 years of age. He completed six years of compulsory primary education in Korea prior to coming to Canada. In high school, he described having a lot of difficultly with English and "fitting in." He described being the target of racism during Grades 10-12, mostly by other students he referenced as "Persian." Because of his difficulties with English and the ongoing racially-motivated bullying, he began to skip class and his grades dropped. Because of this, he was labeled a "trouble maker" by school staff. He ended up quitting high school and later completed his Grade 12 education online. He described speaking Korean, English, and some Chinese. At the time of his participation in this study, he was in his first year of a degree in Criminology.

Wayne

Born and raised in Taiwan, Wayne and his family immigrated to the Vancouver area when he was in Grade 8 (13 years old). An avid gamer, Wayne described learning much of his spoken English in Canada from playing *Counter Strike*, an first player shooter video game in which players assume roles of members of combating teams and can speak to each other through headsets. Wayne spent a few years working after completing high school before coming to CPU. He described speaking Taiwanese, Mandarin, and English. At the time of his participation (in an interview and focus group), he was in his first year of a degree in Business.

Chapter 5. Method

5.1. Data Collection

In this chapter, I describe the data collection, procedure, methodological challenges, and ethical issues. Lastly, I will describe my analytic framework. I describe the procedures I undertook for generating/collecting this data, how I theorized the interviews and focus groups and why, and the transcription conventions I used and why.

5.1.1. Semi-Structured Interviews

I conducted a total of twenty-eight, face-to-face, in-person, semi-structured interviews (Creswell, 2009; Mason, 2002) at the CPU campus with students who have experienced immigrating to Canada. Each interview lasted between 40 minutes to one hour. I interviewed each participant once in English—my first language, but the second or third language of the participants. In total, I generated 17.86 hours of interview data. This number of participants falls within the range of 5-25 that Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) suggest is adequate for qualitative research, as "[beyond a certain point, adding more respondents will yield less and less knowledge" (p. 113). I did not analyze all of the interview data, but was selective, choosing data that I thought was most interesting and helpful at answering my research questions. I chose semi-structured interviews to examine how the participants "project their own ways of defining the world. [This approach] permits flexibility rather than fixity of sequence of discussions, allowing participants to raise and pursue issues and matters that might not have been included in a pre-devised schedule" (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 182).

5.1.2. Interview Theory

I theorized my interviews (and focus groups) from a constructionist perspective (Roulston, 2010), which can be traced, at least in part, to Alfred Schütz's (1953) principle

of the primacy of ordinary lay members' common sense cultural knowledge and reasoning in interpreting the world. Schütz (1953) argued that individuals interpret the world "based on a stock of previous experiences of it, our own or those handed down to us by parents or teachers, which experiences in the form of "knowledge at hand" function as a scheme of reference" (p. 4). Rather than reports, I treated the data as accounts, which involve participants "in the generation of versions of social reality" and the "local production […] of versions of a moral order" (Baker, 2004, p. 163). I took the position that my interview data do not simply reflect participants' mental states, but perform social actions. By focusing on both the what's and the how's of the interview, I attempt to "show how interview responses are produced in the interaction between interviewer and respondent, without losing sight of the meanings produced or the circumstances that condition the meaning-making process" (Holstein & Gubrium, 1997, p. 127).

Theorizing my interviews in this way required that I adopt an ontological (what is) and epistemological (what can be known) shift away from using the interview unproblematically as a neutral tool to discover "truths" towards treating the interview as social practice (Talmy, 2010a; 2011). I strived to be reflexive regarding my role "in occasioning interview answers, on the subject 'behind' the interviewee, on the status ascribed to [my] interview data, and how those data are analyzed and represented" (Talmy, 2010a, p. 143). I treated what the participants told me as versions produced and designed for a particular interactional moment. I embraced this variability, rather than seeing it as a nuisance as in other forms of social scientific research that are predicated on objectivity, transferability, and universality and aim to suppress variability (Wood & Kroger, 2000). In other words, the "answers that are produced in the interaction are not simply 'there,' waiting to be elicited; they may never have been produced beyond that moment" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 72). Analyzing the data as discourse, I used the tools of (applied) Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) to examine turn-generated identities for interaction and to weave a more implicitly critical view of the participants' social and academic worlds into my analysis.

Procedure

I adopted Creswell's (2009) steps for interviewing and conducting focus groups. First, I decided my research questions and prepared a list of open-ended questions to ask the participants (See Appendix A: Sample Student Interview Questions). These questions were designed to map onto my research questions by highlighting themes associated with immigration, language, identity, culture, and Generation 1.5. Next, since the "intellectual puzzle" (Mason, 2002) of this qualitative study is to understand the process of identity construction of Generation 1.5 students, I recruited interviewees who identified as having completed some years of formal education in their home countries before immigrating Canada, and who I felt could best answer these questions. I then determined that face-to-face interviews and focus groups would generate the most useful information to answer my questions. The interviews and focus groups were audio-recorded and conducted in English, the researcher's first language, and the second or third language of the participants. One of the focus groups also video recorded. I designed an interview protocol (See Appendix D), which included the participants' names, date of interview, location and time of the interview, a brief description of the project, and a list of questions. Early on in my study, I conducted some of my interviews in a temporary office on the CPU campus. I soon realized that this location may not be suitable because it had the potential to create "an unequal power dynamic between the interviewer and interviewee" (Creswell, 2009, p. 173). As Herzog (2012) notes, the location of the interview must be considered carefully since it:

> plays a role in constructing reality, serving simultaneously as both cultural product and producer. Thus, the choice of interview location (who choses and what place is chosen) is not just a technical matter of convenience and comfort. It should be examined within the social context of the study being conducted and analyzed as an integral part of the interpretation of the findings. (p. 207)

As a result, I took measures to ensure a more equitable interview situation by moving the location of the interviews to study rooms in the library, which were more neutral, quiet, private, and free from distractions. I undertook a pilot study as a course project for

a required qualitative research methods course at SFU. The pilot helped me "to refine and develop [my research] instruments, assess the degree of user bias, [re]frame questions, collect background information, and adapt research procedures" (Creswell, 2009, p. 165). At the interview site, I allowed the interviewees to read over the informed consent form and obtained their consent to participate in the study. I then clarified the *task understanding* (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 290). I explained that the study was about understanding the life experiences of multilingual university students and that the interview would last about 45 minutes. I also told them that the interview would be audio-recorded, transcribed for analysis by me alone, and that excerpts would be included in my dissertation and possibly later in academic publications.

I offered to make my dissertation available to participants to read once completed. During the interviews, my strategy was to begin with my prepared questions, stay within the 45-minute time frame, and listen carefully. I did not go through the entire list of questions one by one, assuming I could gain access to a single, "true" answer. Rather, I embraced variability "as a major feature of discourse…and employed [it] as an analytical tool" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 72). I did this by encouraging the interviewee to answer the questions as completely and fully as possible, and treated what they told me as one possible version. Rather than remaining neutral and uninvolved during the interviews, I adopted an interventionist approach (Potter & Wetherell, 1987): I was "neither neutral nor indifferently supportive" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, pp. 72), but strived to "make the interview challenging by providing opportunities for participant[s] to produce the fullest account[s]" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 73). I did this by in several ways: I listened carefully; I probed and paused; I asked follow-up questions; I asked participants to elaborate. In the section below, I expand on the roles of the interviewer and interviewee, and describe and provide a rationale for the theoretical stance I utilized for my interviews.

5.1.3. Transcription

An integral part of my data analysis are my transcriptions of the recorded interview and focus group talk. Ochs (2014) notes that "*transcription is a selective process reflecting*

theoretical goals and definitions" (p. 167). I transcribed the interview and focus group data using transcription conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (Wooffitt, 2001) (see page xv, for a list of transcription symbols used in this study) as these have become the standard in many discourse analytic studies. The Jeffersonian system of transcription differs fundamentally from other kinds of transcription: in addition to *what* is said, it is equally concerned with *how* something is said (Hepburn & Bolden, 2014). In short, it captures data as *performative* (Ochs, 2014). Prior to analysis, I transcribed all interview and focus group data myself, which "forced [me] to attend to details of the interaction that would escape the ordinary listener" (ten Have, 2007, p. 95). After transcribing the data, I re-read the transcripts repeatedly and compared them to the recordings for accuracy. I looked for category/identity work, sequential organization, and my role in the co-construction of knowledge.

For ease of readability, I used three vertical columns with numbered lines. In the first column, I began a new line for each speaker. In the second column, I used my name, Tim, to explicitly represent my contributions in the interview, thereby highlighting the interactive nature of the interview (Hepburn & Potter, 2005), and I used the names (pseudonyms) of the interviewees to reference their utterances. I entered the transcribed data in the third column. When it was not clear who to attribute a pause to, I placed it on a separate line. For focus group data with multiple participants, I followed the same format. Below, I provide two contrasting excerpt transcriptions. The data excerpt is from an interview with Hee Young (Excerpt 6.3). The first is representative of transcribed interview data in qualitative research without a discourse focus. The second, the one I use throughout this thesis to analyze my data, is transcribed with the Jefferson system. I provide this illustration to show how a Jefferson transcription system can result in analyses that can be more compelling to argue for the strength of my research methodology in relation to my research questions and focus on identity construction.

Non-Discourse Analysis Transcription

Tim   How do you feel when you when you read that?

Hee   That's exactly what I feel actually, hehehe.

Tim   You feel that way?

Hee   Ya, exactly how I'm feeling, um ya, that's how I felt cuz I don't have a lot of

English speaking friends, 98% of my friends are Korean.

Discourse Analysis Transcription

```
01   Tim  How do you feel when you (.) [when you read that?

02   Hee                               [°That's exactly what I feel

03        actually° hehehe.

04   Tim  You feel that way?

05   Hee  Ya, exactly how I'm feeling=um (0.2) ya, that's how I felt

06        cuz I don't have (.) a lot of (.) English speaking friends

07        (.) like (0.3).hh hhh (0.2) ((sighs)) 98% of my friends are

08        (.).hh Kor↓ean.
```

Unlike the non-discourse analysis transcription, the Jefferson system captures the sound of the talk as it was originally spoken, drawing attention to timing, sequence, emphasis, pauses, and non-speech sounds (e.g., pauses, gaps in tenths of a second, silence, sighs, laughter, in breaths, outbreaths). This allowed me to remain "loyal to the source of the interviewee's oral statements" (Kvale, 1997, p. 24) while "making the transcription accessible to readers unfamiliar with systems further removed from standard orthography" (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984, p. 12). Significantly, this method also ensured that my transcription was transparent to "allow readers to make a full evaluation rather than one that may already embed [my] own theoretical assumptions within it" (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 289). In line 01, the tiny 'gap' (.) between "you" and "when" in my opening question (.) creates the context for Hee Young to start a turn. That is, this gap signals a possible relevant place for her to take a turn. The single left bracket ([ ) shows

that my question and her answer overlap. Also evident in line 02 is a noticeable decrease in Hee Young's volume. These details are important to my analysis since "no order of detail in interaction can be dismissed *a priori* as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant" (Heritage, 1984, p. 241). Finally, unlike transcript A, the line numbers in B help analysts and readers identify target lines. As representations of the interviews and focus group events, the audio recordings and transcripts "are always partial, selective, motivated, methodologically driven, and an integral part of [my] analytical process" (Prior, 2016, p. 22).

5.1.4.   Methodological Challenges

Data Instrument

I varied the approach I took with each participant in terms of prompts and data instruments. In addition to the list of questions I had prepared (see Appendices C & F), for some of the interviews and focus groups, I showed the participants a list of quotations that described Generation 1.5 students, most of which were collected by Dr. Steven Talmy from the applied linguistics literature for a course on discourse analysis he was teaching (See Appendix B) at the University of British Columbia. As a student in his class, I received this list of descriptions. When I introduced a category, such as Generation 1.5, I did so with the specific purpose to understand how participants worked with this research category. Rather than taking the meaning of Generation 1.5 for granted, I made the category open for discussion. While I understand the inherent dangers to doing identity research that relates to the fine line of problematizing identity discourses while possibly simultaneously reproducing them, I attempted to elicit information that would cast light upon how participants understood the possible implications of these discourses as they manifest in their lives.

Conversation Analysis and Research Interviews

I recognize that my decision to generate data via interviews may be seen by some social science researchers, especially conversation analysts and discursive psychologists,

as contrived, and therefore, unsuitable. This is because conversation analysts prefer to work with "tapes and transcripts of naturally occurring interactions" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 291). Researcher-generated methods such as interview and focus groups are generally deemed to "suppress fundamental features of the natural interactional phenomena" (Speer, 2008, p. 7). One of the potential problems I encountered in applying CA/MCA to interview talk is that Sacks viewed interviews as not mundane:

> The trouble with [anthropologists'] work is that they're using informants; that is, they're asking questions of their subjects. That means that they're studying the categories that Members use, to be sure, except at this point they are not investigating their categories by attempting to find them in the activities in which they're employed. And that, of course, is what I'm attempting to do. (Sacks, 1992, Vol. 1, p. 27)

It is important to note that in the above quote, Sacks was writing at time when a great deal of anthropological research used interviews as participant observations rather than recordings of interaction, and looking at interview data as discourse data was seldom done. Sacks maintained that studying a topic should involve studying the categories used in naturally occurring instances, and I join a long line of work following Sacks' ideas. I took the position that interviews are "in-their-own-right-analyzable instances of talk-in-interaction" (Baker, 2000, p. 778). Recognizing the debate between "naturalistic" and "contrived" data in social science research, a dispute that "trades adversarial images of notions of 'natural' versus 'unnatural' data" (Nikander, 2012, p. 398) (e.g., Potter, 1997; 2002; Potter & Hepburn, 2005; 2007; Silverman, 1998; 2006; Griffin, 2007; Henwood, 2007; Holstein & Gubrium, 1997), in this thesis, I align myself with work done by feminist researchers such as Speer (2008) and Kitzinger (2000), who regularly generate data with surveys, interviews and focus groups to topicalize gender—a phenomenon Speer (2008) maintains is "for most 'ordinary' members […] background to interaction" (p. 2)—in order to render it visible and "studiable" (Speer, 2008, p. 3). Thus, in order to adequately answer my research questions, I took the position that naturalistic data may have limited the "observability, access to, and frequency" (Speer, 2008, p. 3) of identity as a topic of investigation. Another reason I found interviews and focus groups suitable to study identity was because they provided "an economic and efficient means of eliciting 'talk on

topic,' and open-ended interviews can topicalize past, current, and future perspectives on virtually any issue" (Nikander, 2012, p. 400). Thus, interviews and focus groups helped me answer my research questions since they allowed me to study how the participants "describe events experienced and witnessed, account for their personal actions and opinions, express past and current feelings, and do so within a limited time-space (Nikander, 2012, p. 400).

In fact, interviews that use a CA/MCA analytic framework have been successfully used to study youth subculture. In their extensive study of youth on the streets of London whose appearance suggested that they identified with the subcultures punk, hippy, or gothic, Widdicombe and Wooffitt (1995) explored the ways in which these youths accomplished membership or non-membership in the categories punk and gothic through informal interviews. Treating their interviews as informal conversations to examine participants' interpretative reasoning practices, they assert that

> the relevance of talk as 'interview talk' (or any other kind of categorisation of the interaction) should be manifest in data. A further point is that it seems highly unlikely that people have a special set of communicative competencies which are exclusive to interviews. Therefore, it seems most fruitful to treat interviews as a method of eliciting rather than constraining speakers' accounting practices. (pp. 73-74)

Baker (2002) asserts that interviews should not be treated as separate from social interaction: "Interviews are seen as a particular subset of interactional settings and as events that members make happen thoroughly inside and part of the social worlds being talked about, rather than as 'outside' or 'time out' from those social worlds" (p. 778). To analyze my data, I drew on the following procedures outlined and demonstrated by Baker (2002, p. 778):

1. studying the interview as conversation interaction
2. treating the interview materials as accounts rather than reports
3. looking for membership categorization work within the interaction and within accounts

4. finding the production of identities, and relatedly,

5. finding versions of worlds talked about in the interaction, in the accounts, and in the membership categorisation work.

Baker states that these five "keys" are connected, "such that turning any one of them to open an analysis gives access to the next key, and the next" (Baker, 2002, p. 778). Rather than organizing my analysis to focus on each of these "keys" separately, I reflected on all five in my analysis.

To summarize this section and relate it to my research questions, I align myself with the view that interviews are not "time out" from ordinary interaction (Baker, 2002), but are a type of social practice in which interviewer and interviewee draw on their "stock of [folk] knowledge" (Schütz, 1953, p. 4) to orient to research topics and make sense of one another's utterances and actions in the interactional context of the interview. I adopt the position that the knowledge my interviewees and I mutually construct in the interview is not simply a representation of the world "out there" but is "part of the world [we] describe" (Hammersely & Atkinson, 1998, p. 107). From this perspective, I conceptualize my interviews as socially situated speech events (Mishler, 1986; Talmy, 2011), topics in their own right, rather than a neutral technology to examine some other sociological phenomenon (Sharrock, 2011). Building upon other studies within CA/MCA that have successfully used interviews to examine identity in talk and interaction (e.g., Baker, 2000; Paoletti, 1998; Widdicombe, 1998), I applied CA/MCA to my interview data to understand what factors impact the identities of the participants and how these factors are mobilized and co-produced in the real-time, sequential, interactional context of the interview.

5.1.5.   Focus Groups

Creswell (2009) notes that focus groups can be beneficial "when the interaction among interviewees will likely yield the best information, when interviewees are similar and cooperative with each other, when time to collect information is limited, and when individuals interviewed one-to-one may be hesitant to provide information" (p. 164). Some

of the students in the three focus groups I conducted knew each other and all were co-operative. As multilingual students who identified themselves as having completed some years of formal education in their home countries before immigrating Canada, they had much in common. I also felt that the more reserved students I interviewed one-to-one might be more willing to share ideas in a group setting. I conducted three separate focus groups with the 15 students described in the tables below.

I situated the focus group data theoretically within a tradition of social science research that "treats opinions and attitudes rhetorically, as utterances produced in specific situations, rather than as attributes of subjects" (Myers & Macnaghten, 1999, p. 185). I was particularly interested in understanding what factors impact the construction of their identities and whether the group had a coherent sense of Generation 1.5 and what that meant. I began each of the three sessions by going over the procedures for conducting a focus group, clarifying my role as moderator, and encouraging the participants to interact with each other. I began by asking each of the participants to introduce themselves and then explained the purpose of my study. I conducted three focus groups involving 15 participants. In total, I recorded approximately five hours of focus group data. I provided some light snacks and drinks for the participants. These focus groups provided me with the "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) characteristic of interpretive ethnographic inquiry. I designed a focus group protocol (See Appendix E), which included the participants' names, date, location and time of the focus group, a brief description of the project, and two prompts (see Appendix F). I provided a space between the questions to record responses to participants' comments.

Session One

Name (Sex)	Country of Origin	Age on Arrival	Languages	Faculty	Year at CPU
Abbey (F)	People's Republic of China	11	Mandarin, English	Psychology	3
*Stefanie	Federal Republic of Germany	17	German, English	English	3
*Tiffany (F)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	13	Taiwanese, Mandarin, English	Business	4
*Wayne (M)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	14	Taiwanese, Mandarin, English	Economics	2

Session Two

Name (Sex)	Country of Origin	Age on Arrival	Languages	Faculty	Year at CPU
Denise (F)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	12	Mandarin, Taiwanese, English	Linguistics	3
Ida (F)	Hong Kong, SAR	14	Cantonese, Japanese, English	International Studies	1
Genevie (F)	Republic of Korea	14	Korean, English, Japanese	Criminology	1
Shahdi	Islamic Republic of Iran	11	Persian, English	Chemistry	3
Taylor (F)	People's Republic of China	15	Mandarin, English	Business	1

Session Three

Name (Sex)	Country of Origin	Age on Arrival	Languages	Faculty	Year at CPU
Cathy (F)	Republic of China (Taiwan)	13	Taiwanese, Mandarin, English	Business	1
Daisuke	Japan	15	Japanese, English	Economics	2
Kerstin (F)	Republic of Korea	9	Korean, English	Communications	4
Mandy	People's Republic of China	5	Mandarin Cantonese, English	Educational Psychology	3
Mi-Jung (F)	Republic of Korea	12	Korean, English	Criminology	2
Min-Kyung (F)	Republic of Korea	13	Korean, English	International Studies	1

Procedure

As with the procedure with the interviews, at the focus group site (a large group study room in the library), I allowed time for those interviewees who I had not previously interviewed to read over the informed consent form and I obtained their consent to participate in the study. I then clarified the *task understanding* (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 290). I explained that the study was about understanding the life experiences of multilingual university students and that the discussion would last about 60 minutes. I also told them that our discussion would be audio-recorded (I also video-recorded the third and final focus group), transcribed and analyzed later by me alone, and that their contributions would be included in my dissertation and possibly later on in academic publications. For the first two focus groups, I prepared two prompts (See Appendix F). First, I presented each participant with three descriptions of Generation 1.5 students from the applied linguistics literature. In order to understand if these were the commonsense everyday discourses of Generation 1.5 that served as the implicit backdrops to participants' identity negotiations, I attempted to made the implicit explicit in the process of problematizing discourses of in-between-ness. After allowing time for them to read them, I posed the following questions:

What might these quotes mean to you in terms of ideas of self? What do you think about each definition? Do you agree, disagree, or partially agree/disagree and why? What does and does not resonate with you and why?

For my next prompt, with the aim of understanding notions of self-ascription, I reversed the tables and asked the participants to think about how they would describe themselves to others based on their own lived experiences:

Imagine you are a researcher writing a book on Generation 1.5. How would you describe and/or introduce this population to your readers so they might better understand this population, and their lived experiences?

For my third focus group, I decided to start with a different prompt. I introduced a study I found online called "Race project: Between Two Worlds: America's Generation 1.5," a collaboration between the Pacific Science Centre, the University of Washington Department of Communication, and the City of Seattle Race and Justice Initiative. The project was designed "to capture[s] a few stories from America's Generation 1.5, in their own words. An overview of the study along with photos and audio recordings of five "Generation 1.5" young people sharing their stories appeared in Race Blog section of the *Seattle Times* online newspaper on November 18, 2013. These five participants were described as "a generation of children who exist between two nations, cultures, and identities—from all over the world." I felt that the participants in my study might be able to relate to these stories and that this could lead to some interesting discussion.

Before the focus group, I carefully vetted the sound recordings and chose two that I felt the participants could relate to and that indexed the fluid, dynamic, and transnational make-up of the participants in the room. I began with Amana's story, who described being born in Texas, moving to Indonesia with her parents at four months of age, and moving back to the United States at the age of 14. After we listened, I paused the recording and asked them if anything resonated with them and why. Following about 15 minutes of discussion, I then introduced Joon Yi, who was born in South Korea and spoke of the tension she felt between her Korean and America identities. Since Koreans represent one

of the largest immigrant groups in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2008) and two of the students participating in this focus group were immigrants from South Korea, I felt that the context of her story may strike a chord with the participants and help me understand the factors that impact the processes of identity construction of the participants.

For my second prompt, I asked the participants to think about how they would describe themselves to others based on their own lived experiences. I told them to discuss these questions:

> Imagine you are a researcher writing a book on Generation 1.5. How would you describe and/or introduce this population to your readers so they might better understand this population, and their lived experiences?

I told them I would leave the room for 15 minutes and asked them to discuss these questions. I did this to allow the participants to talk freely among themselves.

In my thesis, I present an analysis of only one focus group (session one). This is because I found repetition across the focus groups, so continuing or expanding on them was not done. I decided to focus on the group that was most representative of the focus groups as a whole to illustrate these findings, and that was most useful in finding answers to my research questions.

5.1.6.   Texts and Visual Images

To analyze participants' texts and visual images, I used MCA to analyze how participants did things with identities as social categories in texts (e-mail, online chat, and formal writing) and visual imagery (a drawing) to account for, explain, justify, and make sense of their lives as Generation 1.5 students. Lepper (2000) notes that textual data are a "rich source of naturally occurring data, through which the processes of culture can be systematically studied and formulated" (p. 77). Baker (2000) has demonstrated the analytical power of MCA to understand how culture is internal to action, operating inside social practices, rather than outside and external to action. While the study of visual

images as cultural products is well established in visual cultural studies (e.g., Hall, 1997), within CA/MCA it is relatively unexplored (Lepper, 2000). Thus, by using MCA to analyze my data in texts and images, I attempt to make an important contribution to MCA research on texts and visual images.

5.2. Ethical Issues

In conducting this study, at each stage of my research I carefully followed the guidelines set forth by Simon Fraser University's (SFU) Office of Research Ethics concerning research involving human subjects. In this section, I will address key ethical issues I encountered to undertake this study, adapting the "Ethical issues at Seven Stages of Research" by Kvale (1997, p. 24) to my own data generation. According to Kvale (1997, p. 24), "beyond the scientific value of the knowledge sought," the research study should also seek to improve the situation of its participants. I had to manage ethical issues related to research design, which involved "obtaining the participants' informed consent to participate in the study, securing confidentiality, and considering the possible consequences of the study for the subjects" (Kvale, 1997, p. 24). I gained the informed consent of all 30 participants. In my informed consent (see Appendix A), I made it clear what the study was about, what it was for, and what their tasks as interviewees and focus group participants would be. I also gave the subjects the right to withdraw at any time. I interviewed the AW 101 students after they had completed the AW 101 course.

In terms of my positionality, I am employed full-time in an established role as coordinator of EAL at the university where I work. As a result, I am fully aware that the participants may have constructed me as a person of institutional authority within academia, not necessarily at CPU. When I collected my data at CPU, my positionality carried through with my interactions with the participants. It is likely they identified me as having power, or being similar to people who had power over them. As a result, in such contexts, the likelihood that they would say things to please me or that they might reproduce ideas through my textual prompts and in our co-constructed conversations in

interviews may be higher. This is despite the fact that my position of power would have no direct impact on their success as students at CPU.

5.2.1. Potential Benefits to Participants

The study provided participants with an opportunity to reflect on their experiences and social practices and clarify their views through interaction with other participants in focus groups. For a few others, the potential benefits/consequences seemed more tangible. Chloe, for example, described benefiting by making a personal connection to the category Generation 1.5, which resulted in her writing a term paper on Generation 1.5 in one of her classes at CPU. Additionally, two participants, Tiffany and Lisa, took up my invitation to co-present with me at an International Applied Linguistics Conference in Taipei, Taiwan, in 2012. Following Ethics guidelines, prior to the conference, with my senior supervisor's approval, I applied for and received an amendment from SFU's Office of Research Ethics to include on optional section on participation in conferences and publications in my Informed Consent. I made it clear to Tiffany and Lisa that by co-presenting with me they would lose their anonymity. Both Tiffany and Lisa signed this amended Informed Consent form.

5.2.2. Minimizing Risk

Another issue I had to consider was whether any negative consequences or harm could affect the participating subjects. The risks to participants were minimal, but a potential issue I had to manage was how to avoid harming a participant via their identification with, for example, their country of birth, area of study, or personal opinions, or by someone being able to deduce their identity through association with the actual university or via other particulars, such as their volunteer opportunities and/or services they participated in. To minimize any negative consequences, I anonymized the participants and study details: pseudonyms were used for participants' actual names; the location of the study was identified as Canadian Pacific University (CPU), "a university in Metro Vancouver;" different titles for courses and participants' majors were used and

names for places on campus unique to the actual site of the study were changed.[4] I ensured the participants' privacy and confidentiality at all stages of research—collection, coding, analyzing, and reporting of data. I kept all interview and focus group securely stored in my office on campus, which was locked whenever vacated. I also kept participants' interview and focus group transcripts and samples of writing securely locked in a filing cabinet in my office. Only I had access to this information, and it was not shared with anyone else.

5.2.3. Insider-Outsider Status

A further challenge relates to my omnipresence as insider and outsider and how my (simultaneous) membership in these categories impacted the study. As I entered the field, the boundary between being an external researcher (outsider) and being a student (insider) often blurred. A clear benefit of my insider role status as student was acceptance:

> One's membership automatically provides a level of trust and openness in your participants that would likely not have been present otherwise. One has a starting point (the commonality) that affords access into groups that might otherwise be closed to "outsiders." Participants might be more willing to share their experiences because there is an assumption of understanding and an assumption of shared distinctiveness; it is as if they feel, "You are one of us and it is us versus them (those on the outside who don't understand). (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009, p. 58)

However, despite my insider student status, during the interviews I often felt like an outsider. There clearly was a "play of power" (Scheurich, 1995, p. 246) related to our different socially and historically situated subjectivities. Despite these issues, I aimed for a research relationship with each participant characterized by trust and integrity. Regarding confidentiality for focus group participants, I made it clear to the participants

---

[4] As of October 2017, all the participants included in Chapters 6-8 had successfully convocated and are no longer students at CPU.

that their contributions would be shared with the others in the group and encouraged them to keep confidential what they heard during these discussions. In cases where I interviewed participants before their participation in the focus group, I did not disclose anything they told me in the interview during the focus group.

5.2.4.   Reporting of Findings

One final ethical issue I had to deal with was how the reporting/dissemination of the results of the study (e.g., at conferences and/or in publications), which might affect the participants. Following CA's requirement to "ground analytic claims in the participants' visible realities" (Kasper & Wagner, 2014, p. 190) and address potential issues of misrepresentation (Murphy & Dingwall, 2007), I strived to privilege the participants' perspectives by adopting an emic (insider) perspective. That is, this emic perspective attempted to address issues of potential misrepresentation by highlighting the categories that the participants invoked and/or make relevant and their understandings about those identity categories as opposed to my understandings as researcher. However, admittedly, my wanting to privilege the participants' perspectives in my interviews was not entirely possible. As the researcher, I initiated everything from my position of power and for my research aims (see discussion of insider-outsider status above).

In this chapter, I described the analytic framework I used and the procedures I undertook for generating/collecting data.   I explained my data theorization, and transcription conventions. I also addressed some of the methodological challenges and ethical issues I faced. I also included a statement of positionality, recognizing that participants may have constructed me as a person of institutional authority. I suggested that this could increase the likelihood of participants reproducing what I produce and co-construct in my interactions with them. In the next three chapters, I present my analysis of the data.

Chapter 6.   Identities from There, Here

In the next three chapters, I present my analysis of the data organized by three major themes: *Identities from There, Here* (Chapter 6*), Identities in the Middle* (Chapter 7), and *Old Me, New Me Identities* (Chapter 8). I choose these categorizations to reflect the diversity of representations of self and other the participants made relevant. I structure my sub-headings around the participants' names to highlight their reported experiences. After presenting the data, at the conclusion of each of these sections, I relate the findings to the ideas and theories discussed in the literature review, my research questions, and the theme of each data chapter. I limit my analysis of data to contributions with eleven focus students: Chloe, Samantha, Hee-Young, Kerstin, Eva, Tiffany, Lisa, Jun, Wayne, Abbey, and Genevie.

In Chapter 6, I illustrate how Chloe, Samantha, and Hee Young produced identities as social categories that exemplify what I understand as *Identities from There, Here* (Marshall, 2009). I recognize that there are pros and cons to categorizing the participants' identities in this chapter according to the dichotomous terms "there" and "here." Agnew (2005), for example, views the terms positively, suggesting that members of diasporic communities may experience a "dynamic tension every day between living "here" and remembering "there", between memories of places of origin and entanglements with places of residence and between the metaphorical and the physical home' (p. 4, as cited in Marshall, 2009, p. 93). In contrast, Kalra, Kaur, and Hutnyk (2005) maintain that the ascribed categorizations "here" and "there" may "congeal into hardened categories. The very idea of a 'host' and an 'arrivée' culture assumes a degree of non-hybridity which is difficult to sustain unless there is an insistence on an unbridgeable difference between the here and there (p. 88, as cited in Marshall, 2009, p. 93). As will be seen in the data, for these three students, maintaining a close connection to their home countries, language, and culture seemed to be important and significantly impacted how they represented themselves and others. For these reasons, the suitability of the terms "there and "here" derive from participant perspectives. In this chapter, I first analyze two paragraphs from an essay from Chloe, in which she discusses the social mechanism of resistance in

educational settings and applies it to her own contexts as a middle school student in Canada. Following this, I present my analysis of interview data with Samantha and an e-mail written in Mauritian Créole (English translation provided) sent to Samantha from her cousin, who has also moved away from Mauritius. I illustrate how written Mauritian Créole gets used as an important resource for Samantha and her cousin, helping them maintain a sense of community as Mauritians living away from "home." In my analysis of the interview data, I illustrate how Samantha made relevant what can be understood as an *aspired to* "credible or genuine" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) Mauritian identity. I conclude this chapter with my analysis of my interview with Hee Young, illustrating how the processes of Hee Young's identity construction relate to her sense of who she is becoming and how she relates to those around her.

6.1. Chloe

Chloe was 12 years of age when she immigrated to Canada from Hong Kong with her family. She completed six years of primary education in the Hong Kong public school system and Grades 6-12 in the public-school system in Canada before coming to CPU directly from high school. In this first section, I present my analysis of two paragraphs from a 15-page paper written by Chloe for one of courses at CPU. The writing task was for Chloe to reflect on her experiences in the formal education systems prior to coming to CPU and weave course readings related to four social mechanisms in educational settings into her essay: authority, reproduction, recognition, and resistance. She shared an original, unedited copy of her paper with me for my research (without any instructor's comments or grade) after she had successfully completed the course, and I received her permission to include it in this study. The analysis is of two paragraphs (436 words), in which she describes the social mechanism of "resistance" in the Canadian educational context. I focus on these paragraphs because they provide important insights into the processes of Chloe's identity construction. I illustrate how Chloe invokes and uses her routine commonsense knowledge to emphasize her identity as a Chinese student in Canada, invoking identities from there (Hong Kong) here (Canada), the theme of this chapter.

Excerpt 6.1. Fragment from Chloe's essay: "Our own country"

01   On the other hand, In Canada, one of the most noticeably resistance is the

02   resistance of getting along with classmates from other race. Given that Canada

03   is a multicultural society, schools are often occupied with many students

04   around the globe. Many of us have different rituals and habits. One of the

05   concerns for many immigrants is the fear of losing their identity and forced

06   to adapt a new status in a new country. Another word, many of us are resisting

07   losing our own culture and accepting new ones. This is similar to the situation

08   where grandfather Wilfredo was resisting on learning to speak English because

09   he was afraid he would forget about his own culture (Kohl, 1994). For that

10   reason, many of our parents would send us to Chinese school to continue

11   learning about our own country. Although many of us did not like the process of

12   studying and writing exams, many of us would still be excited to attend Chinese

13   school in Saturday morning. This is because Chinese school is the only place

14   where we felt it can provide us with the knowledge of our culture and meet other

15   people from the same culture too.

In paragraph one above, Chloe introduces her reader to a "cast of characters" (Baker, 2000, p. 104) in the social network of her new school environment and family life in Canada: "classmates from other race" (line 02), "students around the globe" (lines 03-04), "us" (04, 06, 11, 14), "immigrants" (line 05), "our parents" (line 10), "we" (line 14), "people from the same culture" (line 15). These categories provide important insights into the processes of her identity construction during Chloe's middle school days. In 01-02, she topicalizes the Canadian education context and highlights what for her is a significant difference from her experiences in the Hong Kong school system: the presence of students from "other race" (line 02). To Chloe, "getting along" with classmates who were "racially different" was reportedly a major source of "resistance" (line 02). In line two, she

establishes a category-bound relationship between Canadian society and the feature "multicultural" to justify the presence of "students around the globe" at her school (lines 03-04). By employing the deictics "us" (six times in lines 06, 10, 11, 12, 14) and "our" (four times in lines 07, 10, 11, 14), she asserts her membership and affiliation to the category "immigrant" (subsequently invoked in line 05) and excludes her membership in other groups in her new school environment. By repeatedly orientating to these terms, Chloe establishes a cohort of immigrant/Generation 1.5 students distinct from their local student counterparts (i.e., we practice "different rituals and habits," line 04), but bound by their shared cultural practices. Setting aside potentially salient features of her own identity in favour of similarities she reportedly shares with this group, Chloe asserts that they all share a sense of "fear" (line 05) about losing their traditional "identity" (lines 05) to assimilative forces, and are united in their resistance to the imposition of new cultural values and norms associated with living "in a new country" (line 06). Chloe includes the in-text citation about grandfather Wilfredo's resistance to speaking English for fear that "he would forget about his own culture" to explain why her parents sent "us" to Chinese school. By invoking the category "Chinese school," Chloe's identity as a speaker of Cantonese can be read as coming to the fore. Despite her reported dislike of the homework and tests, learning about Chinese language and culture and being able to socialize with other students "from the same culture" (line 15) are two resources recruited in the account Chloe provides about why she got excited about attending Chinese school on Saturday mornings. By describing Chinese school as "the only place" she could gain this cultural knowledge and socialize with other Chinese speakers, Chloe emphasizes the extremely (Pomerantz, 1986) important role attending Chinese school had on the maintenance of what can be understood as her "core" or "root" (Phan, 2008) Chinese identity. According to Pomerantz (1986), when people "report the frequency or prevalence of practices […] to propose and substantiate the rightness and wrongness of those practices," they often use extreme case formulations, such as "'all the time,' 'everybody,' 'no one' [to] propose behaviors [that] are acceptable and right or unacceptable and wrong" (p. 228). Here, Chloe uses the extreme case formulation "only," which can be read as proposing and substantiating that attending Chinese school was the right thing for her to do. Chloe's parents *sending* her (as opposed to asking her or suggesting that she attend)

to Chinese school on Saturday mornings suggests that the decision to enroll Chloe in Chinese school was first who *they were* (e.g., 1ˢᵗ generation immigrants from Hong Kong) and second, who they wanted their daughter *to become*: a Chinese-Canadian conversant in their mother tongue and familiar with the social practices of "back home." In this way, her parents can be understood as playing a key role in the preservation of Chloe's identity from Hong Kong, here in Canada. Excerpt 6.2 continues with Chloe where the previous excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 6.2.   Fragment from Chloe's essay: "We are aliening ourselves"

16	As a result, my friends and I would continue to make friends with people that
17	came from our own country and refuse to become close friends with people
18	from other races. Because of this resistance, I have lost a great amount of
19	knowledge. I was not able to learn the knowledge about people from neither
20	other counties nor the country of Canada in a detailed way. This also led us
21	become alienated from other students in school. Without many friends, I did
22	to not have a fun school life during middle school. Sometimes, I even
23	became a student with lacks of confidence because I did not know many
24	people in school and did not get along well with other students. When I got
25	to high school, I started to meet more students from all over the place. As a
26	result, I learned a lot knowledge about how to communicate with people and
27	to respect other's culture too. In this experience, I noticed that although as
28	immigrations, we always ask for equal rights and wanted others to respect
29	our cultures; on the other hand, we are aliening ourselves from being able
30	to get along with others and not accepting other's culture.

In paragraph two, Chloe positions the students at her middle school in a bifurcated categorization (us and them) constituted by differences in country of origin and race:

"people that came from our own country" (lines 16-17) and "people from other races" (line 17-18). Forging friendships only with classmates from her Chinese school and refusing to socialize with other non-Chinese students are two reasons Chloe provides to account for her lack of knowledge of other cultural groups of "the country of Canada" (line 20) and the resulting sense of alienation (line 21) she reportedly felt because of these actions. By imposing racially salient identity categories on the other students in her school and obscuring potential differences between her and her Chinese school friends, Chloe accentuates her own (and her group's) unique identity positioning, a move that can be understood as "not as an objective and permanent state but as a motivated social achievement" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 383). That is, highlighting the common bond she reportedly had with other Chinese classmates can be understood as a strategy Chloe used to secure her identity as a Chinese in the face of the unavoidable challenges associated with moving to Canada, one of which was being "forced to adapt to a new status in a new country," lines 05-06, Excerpt 6.1 above). In this way, unlike earlier generations of immigrants, she invokes a theme widely observed among today's Generation 1.5 youth: "acculturation without assimilation" (Roberge, 2009, p. 11). By shifting from a collective "us" identity position (line 20) to a first-person "I" identity position (line 22), it is possible to see a more personal side of Chloe's identity construction during her middle school days. In lines 21-23, she constructs herself as lonely ("I did not know many people), timid ("a student with lacks of confidence"), and socially awkward ("I did not get along well with other students"). In contrast, in line 24-27, she constructs herself as more sociable, communicative, and accepting of other cultures, highlighting the positive impact her high school years reportedly had on her identity formation. To conclude, Chloe summarizes her experiences in the formal education system in Canada by re-topicalizing what can be read as an ethically contingent, Chinese identity (May, 2000) ("as immigrantions, we", line 33). She accomplishes this collective sense of belonging by proposing that "equal rights" and "respect our cultures" are mutually shared and morally desired by all members of her group. By re-invoking the terms "we" (lines 33 & 35) and "our" (line 34), Chloe re-constructs her group identity as an immigrant Chinese student and displays an orientation to a shared ancestral identity. Not being able to "get along" with students outside her inner circle and "not accepting other's culture" are two reasons

Chloe offers to explain why "we are aliening ourselves" (lines 34). By concluding her paragraph in this way, Chloe seems to suggest that she has some regrets about her middle school years, which reportedly were an unhappy time in her life (lines 21-22), and offers up a caveat to other immigrant students: when you insist on equal rights and respect from other cultural groups without accepting their cultures or making an effort to get to know them, you risk alienating yourselves.

In terms of how the data address my research questions, relate to the theme of this chapter, and connect to the ideas and theories discussed in the literature review, Chloe's decision to organize herself into the collective group "us" and orient to an "us-them" binary was especially interesting. Positioning herself in opposition to students outside of what can be understood as her "inner circle" of Chinese-speaking friends, suggests that Chloe was not motivated by "some pre-existing and recognizable similarity but by agency and power" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 371) in the face of the threat of potentially losing her Chinese identity through the process of assimilation. Equally significant, Chloe's asserting her membership and affiliation to the category "us" suggests that her identity construction during her middle school days was strongly linked to her membership in, and sense of belonging to, what can be understood as a "root" or "core" cultural identity (Phan, 2008), an identity that was actively supported by (and perhaps even demanded by) her parents. This finding is consistent with Kumaravadivelu (2008), who maintains that difference is a key determiner of identity, and that "identity can be understood in a meaningful way only by understanding others and by recognizing and highlighting one's difference in relation to others" (Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 145). Much less expected was Chloe's construction of herself as a lonely and socially isolated middle school student. Her account underscores the difficulties immigrant youth may face when they move to a new country during their formative years, which for Chloe was likely a disorientating process (Reed, 2001). Faced with navigating unfamiliar racial, linguistic, and social spaces "where the norms and rules for membership are different" (Reed, 2001, p. 329), Chloe withdrew and resisted, seeking support and solace in the company of others whom she recognized as socially the same. This pursuit of comradery with other Chinese-speaking students at her school may be understood as *adequation,* the pursuit of "socially

87

recognized sameness" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 383). It may also be understood as Chloe's way of claiming insider status for herself in a new, unfamiliar cultural context (Reed, 2001, p. 329). Rather more significant, the data supported the commonly held view in the literature in applied linguistics of the close link between language and identity. For Chloe, Cantonese and Chinese school can be understood not merely as symbolic cultural identifiers, but "contingent marker[s] of [her] ethnic identity" (May, 2000, p. 373), playing a fundamental role in her identity construction (Joseph, 2004) as a member of the Hong Kong diaspora in Vancouver. Thus, Chloe's processes of identity construction can be understood as a relationship between language and culture, and thus meaning making (Hall, 1997).

6.2. Samantha

Samantha was born in Mauritius and described speaking Mauritian Créole at home and French and English at school. Her family immigrated to Canada when she was 12 years old (Grade 7) and she completed her education in the public-school system in Metro Vancouver. She described regularly attending local Mauritian cultural events with her family and friends from Mauritius. In this section, I present three excerpts from my interview with Samantha, a second-year student and volunteer in the Writing Centre at the time of the interview. These three excerpts are ordered chronologically from the start of the interview proper after she read over the project description and signed the consent form.

Excerpt 6.3. Samantha interview extract: Our mother tongue

```
01  Tim    Tell me about your (.) your=your background=where you were

02         born::(0.2) when you first arrived in Canada::, (0.2) how

03         old you were you at that ti::me,

04  Sam    pt um: so I was born in Maur↑itius (0.2)[a small island (.)

05  Tim                                             [Mauritius
```

```
06           close to South Af↑rica (0.5)[um], so (0.2) our first language

07   Tim                                [∘Right∘].

08   Sam     there (.) is English: but actually we mostly speak French (.)

09           and Créole⁵,

10   Tim     At home?=

11   Sam     =>Ya at home.< (0.2) so at school and at home (.) we mostly

12           speak Créo:le=cause that's our mother tongue, (.) .hh so

13           when I came here:: um: I was 12 years old, (.) um::: (0.5) so

14           I started elementary school (.) started grade seven (.)

15           a::nd everybody here would speak English really flue↑ntly

16           around ↑me,

17   Tim     Mmhm.

18   Sam     a::nd (.) I had problems mostly (0.4) um, I would say mostly

19           having a conversation (.) with (.) um friends here because

20           >they assume you don't know how to speak English so they

21           wouldn't really be friends with you↑< (.) right away.
```

By inquiring about Samantha's place of birth, arrival to Canada, and age on arrival, I invoke two themes associated with Generation 1.5 students: the relevance of non-Canadian birthplace and age on arrival in Canada as they pertain to Samantha. Assessing the common geographical knowledge shared by us, Samantha's answer suggests I am unfamiliar with Mauritius: its location is associated with a country that is perhaps better known (South Africa, as opposed to Madagascar or Mozambique, which are

⁵ According to the Central Statistical Office (2000), Créole is the first language of roughly 75% of the population of Mauritius.

geographically closer), and the languages spoken there are enumerated (English, French, Créole). Créole comes third, which seems downgraded. But in line 12, the "mother tongue" category comes to the fore, accentuating her linguistic identity, which suggests that she has three languages, cultures, and literacies, not one and a half. I treat the feature speaking a first language other than English as related to the category Generation 1.5 in a taken-for-granted way. But by mentioning English as her first language, Samantha problematizes the presuppositions that are implied in my question (i.e., that she likely began learning English before coming to Canada). My asking Samantha if she speaks Créole at home (e.g., who she speaks Créole with), makes her identity as a Mauritian national relevant, shaping the answer she gives. Despite Samantha reporting that English is her first language, her volunteering an account of her initial troubles conversing with classmates in English and making friends suggests that while Samantha could be understood as a native speaker of Mauritian English, her Mauritian accentuated form of English was not recognized by her classmates as legitimate. This demonstrates "how relations of power in the social world affect social interaction between second language learners and target language speakers" (Norton, 1995, p. 12).

Prior to data included in the next extract (6.4) below, I asked Samantha to tell me about her identity. She told me that she follows the Hindu religion. Not knowing very much about Mauritius or Mauritian culture, I asked her a few more questions to better understand her background. I asked her whether she still speaks Créole at home in Canada and she made it clear that maintaining her Créole was important to her and that speaking Créole at home helps her "remember where I'm from, my own culture." She then told me she often attends "get togethers" with "family friends who are also from Mauritius" as a way to "keep my Mauritian culture." She described feeling "like you're in Mauritius almost" at these events, as the music, food, and language reminded her of her "home." Excerpt 6.4 continues with Samantha where the previous excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 6.4. Samantha interview extract: I've never been back home yet

```
22 Tim   So it sounds like you still (.) reta:in a, a close connection
```

```
23          with[your Mauritanian (.)culture.

24  Sam     Ya, [for sure.

25  Tim         [It seems that's important to you.

26  Sam     It's important to me (.)cause um,(.2) I don't ever want to go

27          back to Mauritius and people having to perceive (.)or look

28          at me and think that ((quoting voice)) >Oh, she's all changed,

29          she's all Canadian, she speaks<(0.2) you know, Canadian=with

30          a Canadian accent=

31  Tim     =Has that ever happened to you when you've [gone back?

32  Sam                                              [Um:: I've

33          never (.)∘been back home yet∘.

34  Tim     You [haven't?

35  Sam         [Ya, hehe it's been 9 years, (0.2) it's a lo:ng trip and

36          you need time off for it, so that's(.)the kind of constraint

37          I have.
```

My turns in lines 22 and 25 are designed to position Samantha as closely connected to her Mauritian roots. In turn 24, Samantha emphatically confirms my positioning of her ("Ya, for sure"), and we jointly construct an identity from there, here. Not wanting "people" (who are not identified, but likely index or point to her friends and family back in Mauritius) to think she is has significantly changed (Pomerantz, 1986) (*all* changed," line 28; "*all* Canadian," line 29), and speaking with a "Canadian accent" are two resources recruited in the account Samantha provides about why she chooses to remain close to her Mauritian culture and language. The emphasis she gives to the words, "I don't ever (line 26) want to go back" index Samantha's assessment of the urgency of her circumstances. My question in turn 34 could be read as implying that visiting one's county of birth is an ordinary, and perhaps morally obligatory, activity. Samantha's softly spoken, mitigated overlapping turn in line 32 indexes her assessment of her circumstances as

failing to fulfill this obligation. Distance and time constraints are two resources Samantha recruits to account for not having "been back home yet" (line 33). By making these features relevant to her circumstances, Samantha is able to morally account for not visiting Mauritius and re-position herself in a more positive way to me. Excerpt 6.5 continues with Samantha where the previous excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 6.5.   Samantha interview extract: I haven't forgotten my identity

```
38  Tim   So is that something that you think might happen when you go

39        back (.) that people will think that way about you?

40  Sam   Y:[:a.

41  Tim     [I wonder why you [(.)why you feel that way.

42  Sam                       [for sure.

43  Sam   Reason being is (.) hh it's that perception like (.) you're

44        coming from (1.0) even if you're coming from England⁶ you

45        know, you're(.) you're all European (.)you're coming from

46        Canada=North America so [(.)for sure they're going to see

47        you as being different=because you're going to dress different

48        first of all,[(.)>you're going to speak (0.5)>you're not

49  Tim                [∘Mmhm∘.

50        going<=I'm not going to speak perfect Créole=even though I

51        tr:y (.)[because (0.2)>sometimes even with Créole when I

52                [∘Hmm∘.

53        speak with my brother I lo:se the words[(.)[some English kind
```

---

⁶ Likely indexes Cecile, one of Samantha's cousins living in England (see extract 6.6 below).

```
54                                                    [Hmm.

55       of comes in, [and it's:(.) not something that I want=like I

56                    [Hmm.

57       want to work hard to make sure that I .hh speak perfect

58       Créole >before I go back home<> be[cause I don't want them

59                                          [Ya.

60       thinking that I've changed< (0.2)like I'm still who I am

61       (.)years ago [but(0.5) >I don't want them to think that I've

62 Tim                [Ya.

63 Sam   forgot< that I'm Mauritian.

64 Tim   OK.

65 Sam   I haven't forgotten that I'm Mauritian[= I haven't forgotten

66 Tim                                          [Ya.

67 Sam   my identity.
```

My turn in lines 38-39 implies that Samantha will eventually return to visit Mauritius one day (not if but when). Samantha emphatically agrees ("Y:[:a.," line 40) that people will think she has changed despite her adamantly just telling me she wants to avoid such a scenario (lines 26-30). In line 41, I prompt Samantha to elaborate. Samantha's overlapping "for sure" (line 42) can be read as her readiness to offer an explanation. Samantha then begins an account ("Reason being is," line 43) and mentions "coming from" three times (emphatically in lines 44) and once more in line 45. In this way, she invokes (at least) three themes associated with Generation 1.5 students: the relevance of moving to immigrant-receiving countries (lines 44 and 46), transformation ("you're going to dress different," line 47); ("you're all European," line 45), and first-language attrition (>you're not going<=(lines 48 & 50), cut off, but which can be contextually understood as "speak your first language perfectly," a condition Samantha immediately orients to by adding, "I'm not going to speak perfect Créole" (line 50). By adding "even though I try" (lines 50-51),

Samantha orients to the pursuit of what can be understood as an *aspired to* "credible or genuine" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) Mauritian identity. By holding her brother somewhat accountable for the attrition of her Créole ("when I speak with my brother I lo:se the words," lines 51 & 53), she is able to sustain this credible version of herself by suggesting it is not entirely her fault. Rather than an asset, English is recruited as a problem ("some English kind of comes in, and it's: (.) not something that want," (line 53 & 55) in the account Samantha provides about her reported frustration with her less than perfect Créole. Nevertheless, Samantha suggests that if she just "work[s] hard," line 57), she will speak "perfect Créole" by the time she goes "back home" (line 58). By invoking the location category[7] "home," Samantha constructs what can be construed as a "root" or "core" Mauritian identity that is somehow immune to change: "I'm still who I am (.) years ago" (lines 60-61). The emphasis Samantha places on the word "years" can be read as indexing her firm assessment of the unchanging, durability of her Mauritius identity. By immediately adding "but" after a lengthy pause, Samantha orients once again to her annoyance of potentially being perceived by friends and family in Mauritius as having forgotten who she "really is" (lines 26-30) by talking faster and emphasizing the words "forgot" and "Mauritian": ">I don't want them to think that I've for<u>got</u>< that I'm Ma<u>uritia</u>n" (lines 61 & 63). By telling me twice that she hasn't forgotten that she is Mauritian (line 65) she asserts her claim to "realness" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) and constructs herself as a morally responsible Mauritian, that is to say, one who despite living away from "home" (line 33) for nine years without returning once for a visit, hasn't forgotten her "true" identity. By invoking the word "identity" she seems to recall my introducing this term earlier in the interview: "I haven't forgotten my identity" (lines 65 & 67).

The data illustrate the theme of this chapter, *Identities from There, Here*. Samantha and I co-construct meaning, my questions, prompts, and assumptions (line 34)

---

[7] A set of terms formulated by Schegloff (1972) that illustrate how interlocutors drawn on their common sense geography to refer to places, generate distinctions, and provide inferences.

influencing (in some cases significantly, e.g., lines 38 and 41) Samantha's versions of events. Relating the data to my research questions and the ideas and theories discussed in the literature review, Samantha's construction of a real or credible (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004) Mauritian identity seemed dependent on her speaking "perfect Créole" (lines 57 & 58) before returning to Mauritius. Thus, her wanting to be speak "perfect Créole" can be understood as "an investment in her own social identity" (Norton-Peirce 1995, p. 411). Samantha was resolute about speaking Créole perfectly to avoid "that perception" (line 43) of being seen as somehow "incredible or non-genuine" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385). This identity construction relates to a pair of intersubjective *tactics* Bucholtz and Hall (2004) refer to "*authentication* and *denaturalization*" (p. 385). Whereas authentication "highlights the agentive processes whereby claims to realness are asserted" (p. 387), denaturalization "is the process by which identities come to be severed or separated from claims to 'realness'" (p. 386). Fundamentally, Samantha's construction of a credible or authentic Mauritian identity can be understood as tied to her membership in "an imagined national unity" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) with Créole playing a fundamental role (May, 2000) in her identity construction (Joseph, 2004) as a Generation 1.5 student from Mauritius living in Canada. Like Chloe, whose investment in her social identity as a member of the "us" group was reproduced in and through social interaction in Cantonese with her parents and classmates at Chinese school, Samantha's speaking Créole with her parents and brother significantly influenced the processes of this credible identity construction. Although Samantha insisted that she had not changed ("I'm still who I am (.) years ago," lines 60-61) and reportedly still felt a close connection to her ethnic identity (Phan, 2008) ("I haven't forgotten that I'm Mauritian=I haven't forgotten my identity" (lines 65 & 67), immigrating to Canada and speaking English outside of her home environment (e.g., at school and with friends) seemed to have unsettled her sense of self, something that she readily stated: "you're going to dress different" (line 47); "I'm not going to speak perfect Créole=even though I try," lines 50-51); "I lo:se the words (.) some English kind of comes in" (lines 53 & 55). This finding also relates to my first research question, that is, what types of identities and representations of self and other that are made relevant in the processes of being and becoming Generation 1.5. While Samantha went out of her way

to represent herself to me as Mauritian through and through, she also recognized that she was "different" (line 47) and had changed.

Written Créole can be also understood as playing a key role in Samantha's investment in a social identity as a credible member of the Mauritian diaspora in Canada. In this section, I present my analysis of an e-mail sent to Samantha from Cecile, one of Samantha's cousins living in England. Despite the fact that that Mauritian Créole has not been officially standardized as a written language,[8] Cecile composes the email in a mixture of Mauritian Créole and French. This mixing of languages allows her "to tie the interactional moment to the context of the activity by drawing attention to who-we-are-and-what-we-are-doing (Rintel, 2015, p. 125). Of particular significance to my interest in studying identity as a members' resource, the e-mail context both enables and constrains the communication and the types of identities that are made relevant. As a type of asynchronous communication, the e-mail is short and direct and consists of several questions about Samantha's well-being, enabling Cecile to constitute herself as fulfilling

---

[8] According to Owodally (2011), three main reasons have stood in the way of standardizing Créole: "First, it is widely regarded as the "poor cousin of French." Second, it is feared that its use will be at the expense of French and English, thus isolating Mauritians in general and, more particularly, ghettoizing the lower classes. Third, it has at times been described, constructed, and perceived as an ethnic language, the language of the Créoles. (p.137)

the job of, or "doing being" what I understand as, an "ordinary" (Sacks, 1992)[9] big sister. Categories and their associated rights, responsibilities, and obligations related to the category "family" are numerous (cousin, extended family, mum and dad) while others are inferred (e.g., big sister, students, Generation 1.5). My focus here is to investigate how Samantha's cousin enacts identities associated with Mauritian identity through the "display of, or ascription to, membership of feature-rich categor[ies]" (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 2) and the implications of these categories and their associated category-bound predicates (Hester & Eglin, 1997) for Samantha' s identity construction.

Excerpt 6.6.   E-Mail from Samantha from her cousin, Cecile: We should go to Mauritius together[10]

01	**Allo Sam!**
02	Hi Sam!
03	Cva? longtemps **pa tane** toi.
04	How are you? It's been a long time since I heard from you.
05	Sinon, **tou korek**? **Bien manque toi**!
06	Anyway, is everything OK? We missed you!
07	Quand **to vine visite nou** la?
08	When are you coming to visit us here?

[9] Sacks (1992) describes doing "being ordinary" as follows: "Your business in life is to only see and report the usual aspects of any possibly usual scene. That is to say, what you look for is to see how any scene you're in can be made an ordinary scene, and that's what it is. Now plainly that could be a job; it could be work. The scene doesn't in the first instance simply present itself, define itself, as insufferably usual, nothing to be said about it; it's a matter of how you're going to attack it, what you are going to see in it that you can say about it. Plainly people are monitoring scenes for this storyable possibility" (p. 218).

[10] I wish to acknowledge and thank my supervisor, Dr. Steve Marshall, for providing the English translation. The features that stand out most as being Creole rather than standard French are highlighted in bold, but the text may be best understood as a hybrid form.

09	Ici, **pe** faire **impe** frais, mais bientot l'ete **pe vini** la.
10	Here it's a bit cold, but summer's coming soon.
11	La bas **tou korek**? **Travaille tou bien**?
12	Is everything OK over there? Is work OK?
13	Moi, **mo pou fini** l'ecole l'annee prochaine.
14	As for me, I will be finished school next year.
15	Nous **bizin alle** Maurice ensemble avec **tous cousins cousine**.
16	We should go to Mauritius together with all our cousins.
17	Quand to gagne le temps, **vine lor** Skype!
18	Whenever you have time let's connect on Skype!
19	Allez, **mo quitte toi** - a bientot!
20	OK, I've got to go - see you soon!
21	Faire **to mama ek papa compliment pou moi**!
22	Send regards to your mum and dad from me!
23	bisous xxxx.
24	kisses xxxx.

By addressing Samantha as Sam and inquiring about her well-being and other aspects of Samantha's life (e.g., work), Cecile performs being Samantha's older cousin, an identity that has consequences for how the interaction unfolds. The tone of the e-mail is intimate, yet suggests that Samantha has not regularly kept in touch with Cecile; and in this regard, line 04 can be read as doing important "big sister type" relational work. In this way, the relationship between Cecile and Samantha can be understood as forming a standard relational pair (cousin-cousin), a type of membership categorization device (MCD) (Sacks, 1995) with a locus of different rights and responsibilities. Cecile's use of "we" as in "we missed you" rather than "I" invokes what can be read as their joint membership in the MCD "extended family" and interactionally displays "who-we-are-and-what-we-are-doing" (Rintel, 2015, p. 125). Cecile's question in line 08 can be read as

making the feature "visiting/keeping in touch with extended family" morally obligatory. By making the location category (Schegloff, 1972) "here" relevant twice (lines 8 and 10) and referring to the climate and seasons, Cecile suggests that she is living as a member of the Mauritian diaspora somewhere other than Mauritius and Canada, a place reportedly "a bit cold" (line 10). Further, by stating that she will soon be graduating, Cecile casts herself into a category she shares with Samantha: student. Her suggestion that she, Samantha and all their cousins visit Mauritius makes their relationship as cousins relevant to the interactional business at hand (Antaki, 1998), and also infers certain rights, obligations, and activities associated with/expected of Mauritian diaspora family members, an important one of which is returning "home" to visit. In this way, Cecile can be understood to be indexing a collective "core" sense of nationhood, moral obligation, cohesion, and belonging. Just before closing, Cecile reminds Samantha to stay in touch in an indirect but persuasive way. Cecile's mention of Skype suggests that they have access to and have used, other forms of computer mediated communication to keep in touch. By invoking Samantha's parents as mama ek papa/mum and dad, Cecile makes her identity as Samantha's cousin from Mauritius relevant and the close relationship they enjoy as cousins can be read as surfacing again in Cecile's closing salutation (bisous xxxx/ kisses xxxx).

The analysis of this email links to my research questions in several important ways. First, Cecile composing the message in a hybrid form of Créole, and Samantha reading it (and presumably later replying in a similar hybrid form) can be viewed as associating the activity/predicate of speaking Creole to the category of Mauritian national. Through this hybrid form of communication, it is possible to see how language and culture constitute their identities as family members from Mauritius. As they engage in the practice of reading and writing in Creole, they can be seen as navigating through "an interstitial passage between fixed identifications that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 4). In this way, Créole can be understood as giving Cecile and Samantha a way to shore up a Mauritian identity as cousins living away from "home." This analysis suggests that rather than self-evident and unchanging, Cecile and Samantha's identifies as Generation 1.5 youth are "ever-evolving" (Harklau, 2000, p. 37),

made and remade each time they engage in the social practice of corresponding by e-mail. The data suggest that for Samantha and Cecile, this hybrid form of Créole is an essential feature of their identities as Mauritian nationals and an important resource for them to maintain a sense of community away from home, support first language acquisition, and construct a "fun" space to engage in pre-established, Mauritian interactional norms.

6.3. Hee-Young

Moving to a country with large numbers of immigrants from one's country of birth often results in comfortable and easy access to the languages, social practices, networks, and resources associated with "back home" (there). However, the abundance of these resources may also preclude access to other resources, such as English-speaking networks at school and in the wider community (here) (Kim & Duff, 2012). These factors may cause Generation 1.5 students to identify with members of their own cultural and linguistic communities, as was reported by Chloe and Samantha. This also seemed to be the case for Hee-Young, who, at the same age as Chloe and Samantha (age 12), emigrated from South Korea with her family to an area of Metro Vancouver with one of the highest numbers of Canadians of Korean origin born outside of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2001). The Korean community in this municipality is highly visible, with many shops, restaurants businesses catering to the Korean community. Korean speakers make up the highest percent of the non-official language mother-tongue demographic at 13.9 % (7,600), many of whom are young adults between the ages of 15-24 (Statistics Canada, 2001). These statistics provide an important context from which to interpret the interview data. I present with Hee-Young in the next section.

Hee Young completed grades K-5 in a Korean public school and grades 7-12 at public schools in the Metro Vancouver area before coming directly to CPU from high school. In this section, I present three excerpts of interview data with Hee-Young. I began the interview by asking her when she came to Canada and her experiences in ESL classes in Canada. At the five-minute mark, I began the interview by describing my study and

introducing the research category Generation 1.5. I asked Hee Young if she had heard of Generation 1.5 before; she told me she was very familiar with the term in Korean (*il cheom ose*) and that the notion of 1.5 is considered common knowledge in Korea and in the Korean Canadian community. When I asked her what the term meant to her, she replied, "Like children who came here after they were born in their own child country. So, not quite Canadian, not quite Korean, in the middle." I then asked Hee-Young whether she had ever experienced any tensions between Canadian and Korean cultural values. My turn in line 01 in Extract 6.7 below begins at 11:45 of the interview (total time 27: 32) immediately after Hee Young (shortened to "Hee" in the transcript) had told me about the strict curfew her parents made for her during high school, her parent's high academic expectations for her, which she felt was sometimes "too much," and her father's disapproval ("He doesn't really understand") of her having a boyfriend. Excerpt 6.7 begins about half way through the interview.

Excerpt 6.7.   Hee Young interview excerpt: All my life is in Korean

```
01 Tim   So, do you speak Korean at home?

02 Hee   Yes::

03 Tim   Always?

04 Hee   Yes::

05       (1.0)

06 Tim   And with your friends?

07       Yes::

08 Tim   Do you have many other Generation 1.5 (.) [friends?

09 Hee                                            [Yes.

10 Tim   Do you?=

11 Hee   =all of them are, hehehe.

12 Tim   Really?

13 Hee   Yes.
```

```
14 Tim   All of [them are?

15 Hee          [That's why (.) that's why I'm confus:::ed (.)[um:

16         whether I am a Canadian or a Korean (.) because (0.2) um::

17         I feel like I more fit into Canadian culture, but all my

18         friends are Korean, and all:: my:: life is in Korean=like

19         (.) I live in Korean society.

20 Tim   In Canada=

21 Hee   =In Canada (.) so: (.) I don't feel like I'm a Cana:dian

22         (.) but (.) I'm also not that Korean=if I go to=if I

23         actually go to Korea and look at myself, I'm different

24         from them.
```

By prefacing my turn with "So" (line 01), I "characterize the upcoming action as having been 'on [my] mind' or 'agenda' for some time" (Bolden, 2009, p. 976). (i.e., the question is one that I prepared, see Appendix C, question 11). My turns in lines 01, 03, and 06 make assumptions about Hee Young's identity as Generation 1.5 by implying that her speaking Korean at home and with her friends is an ordinary activity (Sacks, 1992). Hee Young approves of the identity I have proposed by emphatically agreeing (indicated by lengthening the "s" sound in "Yes::" in lines 02, 04, & 07). By inquiring about whether Hee Young has "many other" Generation 1.5 friends, I attempt to forge her identity as a socially active member of this group. The laughter following her turn in line 11 ("=all of them are, hehehe") indexes Hee Young's assessment of her circumstances as unfavorable. Hee Young immediately aligns with my assessment of her circumstances as problematic ("All of [them are?", line 14) by building an account in which she positions herself in a catch 22-situation (lines 15-19). Despite claiming that Canadian culture is a better "fit" for her (line 17), having no friends outside of her Korean Generation 1.5 cultural group (**all** my friends are Korean") and living "**all**" her "life in "Korean society" are two extreme (Pomerantz, 1986) resources recruited in the account Hee Young provides about why she is "confus:::ed" about whether she is "a Canadian or a Korean" (lines 15-16). I

complete Hee Young's turn for her by adding "In Canada" (line 20), which she immediately endorses. In this way, I construct her as a Korean Generation 1.5 in Canada. Extending her turn in line 21 and prefacing it with "so:" she indexes a causal connection between living "all::" (line 18) her life in Korean society and not feeling "like I'm a Ca<u>na:</u>dian (line 21). She temporarily abandons her account ("if I go to=) about why she is "also not that Korean" (line 22), parenthetically adding "actually" (Clift, 2001)—if I actually go to Korea and look at myself"—which I believe could be reinforcing the truth value of her subsequent claim—that she is different from "them" (Koreans in Korea, lines 23-24). In this way, she constructs a contrastive or oppositional identity by reducing the "complex social variability between herself and [Koreans in Korea] to a single dimension: "[me] versus them" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 384). Excerpt 6.8 continues with Hee Young where the previous excerpt leaves off. I show Hee Young the following quote:

> They are in many ways marginal to both the new and old worlds, for they straddle both but are in a profound sense fully part of neither. They occupy the interstices of two societies and cultures, between the first and second generation. (Rumbaut & Ima, 1988, p. 2)

Excerpt 6.8. Hee Young interview excerpt: 98% of my friends are Korean Generation 1.5

```
25  Tim   How do you feel when you (.) [when you read that?

26  Hee                               [∘That's exactly what I feel

27        actually∘ hehehe.

28  Tim   You feel that way?

29  Hee   Ya, exactly how I'm feeling=um (0.2) ya, that's how I

30        felt cuz I don't have (.) a lot of (.) English speaking

31        friends (.) like (0.3).hh hhh (0.2) ((sighs)) 98% of my

32        friends are (.).hh Kor↓ean.

33  Tim   Hmm.

34  Hee   Generation 1.5.
```

```
35          (1.5)

36   Hee    So that's why (.).h even though I'm living in (.) Canada

37          (1.0) I'm still (0.5) my life's still always in the

38          Korean society (.) except for school (0.2) or wor↓k.

39   Tim    Right.

40   Hee    And then.

41          (2.0)

42   Hee    Um: I don't know=if I meet other (.) cuz I've been here

43          since (.) like since grade 7=I've had a lot of (.).hh

44          >friends from different countries as we↑ll.<

45   Tim    °Right.°

46   Hee    but I don't feel like I fit into their (1.0) group (.)

47          °as well° (0.2) but I do fit in with this Korean people.

48   Hee    Korean friends=>because they're also <Generation 1.5<.
```

I attempt to shed light on the possible manifestations of discourses of in-between-ness in Hee Young's life by showing her Rumbaut and Ima's quote. After Hee Young had read the quote, I asked her how she felt about it. In lines 26-32, her overlapping turn, her noticeable decrease in volume (as indicated by the degree symbols ° °), her use of the descriptor "exactly" and laughter index her assessment of her circumstances as closely aligning with the quote. Hee Young responds to my inquiry in line 28 by repeating her claim ("Ya, exactly how I'm feeling,") and begins an account, recruiting her few English-speaking friends (lines 30-31) and "98%" Korean Generation 1.5 friends (line 31) as resources to justify why she feels "exactly" like the students described in Rumbaut and Ima's (1988) quote. The brief pause, the audible in breath, and brief pause preceding an audible out breathe (a heavy sigh) in line 31 can be read as indexing her situation as seemingly inescapable. With no uptake from me, Hee Young constructs an identity which, the data suggest, could be construed as *stuck* in Korean society—except for "school (0.2)

or wor ↓ k" (line 38). By beginning her account with "Even though I'm living in (.) Canada,"

Hee Young employs her common-sense understanding that access to the target language

community and its associated social goods is readily available to immigrants in Canada.

However, her tone of voice and demeanor, the emphasis, brief pause, and fall in pitch

("school (0. 2) or wor ↓ k") suggest that this may not be the case and that she is frustrated

by her circumstances. With no uptake from me, she extends her turn and begins another

account prefaced by "I don't know," creating a more credible rhetorical position by

displaying a lack of interest (Potter, 1996) in her claim that she is stuck in Korean society.

Length of stay ("since grade 7") and "a lot of friends from different countries" are two

reasons Hee Young provides about why she feels she is not completely excluded from

mainstream Canadian society. By invoking these (what for her can be understood as

important sources of social capital) (lines 42-44), she momentarily constructs a local,

cosmopolitan-type of identity, but in turn 46 she abandons this positioning, which I believe

could be downplaying her affiliation to "their group" (line 46) and underscoring her shared

membership in the Korean community: but I do fit in with "this Korean (.) people, Korean

friends" (lines 47-48). By making relevant what can be read as a half-hearted connection

to "their group" (indexed by the softly-spoken qualifier "°as well°" in line 47) and

accentuating (indexed by her emphasis on the word "do" ["but I do fit]") her sense of

belonging to the group Generation 1.5, Hee Young establishes a relationship between the

category Korean Generation 1.5 friends by treating the feature "fit in" as implied and not

needing to be made explicit (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015). Excerpt 6.9 continues with

Hee Young where the previous excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 6.9. Hee Young interview excerpt: We understand each other, right?

```
49   Tim    So why don't you, you say you don't feel you fit into the

50          other people (.) why is that, is that (0.2) because of (.)

51          what (.) language:: or [cul[tural?

52   Hee                          [Language:(0.2) I think (.) like

53          language is the main reason I think, because I don't really
```

```
54          understand the slangs they use, like you know how they

55          joke around and stuff (.) I'm=and I'm always(.)umm

56          I don't [understand.

57   Tim           [Oh::OK.

58   Hee    Ya=so I'm always (.) out of the (.) communication.

59   Tim    Ya: so, you must feel (.) kind of uncomfortable [(.)

60   Hee                                                    [Umhmm.

61   Tim    when that happens=

62   Hee    =ya so:(0.2) that's when I started to be: more like (.)

63          fitting into Korean society, [.hh but (.) the reason why

64   Tim                                 [Ya.

65   Hee    I can fit into Korean society is because (.) they are also

66          (0.2) Koreans (.) living in Canada=so they=we understand

67          each other, right?

68   Tim    Sure.
```

I respond to what I interpret as Hee-Young downplaying her sense of belonging to her international group of friends and her identifying with the 1.5 group by asking her to elaborate. By proposing the reasons "language::or [cul[tural?" my line 50-51 turn can be read as limiting "what will be "treated as [an] allowable contribution" (Heritage, 2004, p. 225), (potentially) altering how she interprets my question. Her overlapping turn in line 52 indexes her assessment of her circumstances as possibly related to language ("Language:(0.2) I think,"), which she then upgrades in the second half of her turn ("language is the main reason"). Hee Young accounts for her assessment of her circumstances by recruiting "the slangs they use" (line 54) and "how they joke around and stuff" (line 55) as resources to explain why she thinks she is "always (.) out of the (.) communication" (line 58). After ratifying my assessment of her circumstances twice (turns 60 & 62), she immediately justifies her social positioning by suggesting that "being out of

the communication" was the reason she started "fitting into Korean society" (line 63). Her claiming a shared sense of understanding ("we understand each other, right?" (lines 66-67) in a non-contestable way (indexed by her use of the tag "right?") can be read as justifying her social positioning as a member of the Korean 1.5 group. Like Chloe and Samantha, Hee Young's orientation towards membership in the category "Koreans (.) living in Canada" may be understood as motivated by the pursuit of "socially recognized sameness" (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004, p. 383). Her emphasis on belonging to this group may also be understood as Hee Young's way of claiming insider status for herself (Reed, 2001, p. 329) in a new, unfamiliar, cultural context, and as a way to display to me that she is different from "them" (lines 23- 24) (i.e., Koreans who live in Korea).

The data provide important insights into the processes of Hee Young's identity construction. Before I introduced Rumbaut and Ima's (1988) quote, Hee Young described herself in what can be understood as occupying a space between a Canadian and a Korean. This description was likely because she reportedly was familiar with the category 1.5 and understood it as implying "not quite Canadian, not quite Korean, in the middle." Despite claiming that she "more fit into Canadian culture" (line 17), I believe her telling me that "all" of her friends were Generation 1.5 Koreans and that she lived "all" her life in "Korean society in Canada" could be the reason for her reported isolation from "mainstream" Canadian society. However, her relationships with other Korean 1.5 friends also seemed to provide her with some psychological benefits: "we understand each other, right?" (lines 66-67). Her commitment to the group "Koreans living in Canada" ("I do fit in with this Korean (.) people, Korean friends=>because they're also <Generation 1.5" (lines 47-48) and her disaffiliative stance towards "Koreans living in Korea," whom she described as "them" was especially interesting. Despite constructing herself as no longer one of "them" (line 24), her language choices nevertheless seem to play "a fundamental role" (Joseph, 2004) in her identity construction as a Korean. Hee Young "always" speaking Korean at home and with her friends (lines 04 & 07) was as an important way she represented herself to me. The data suggest that the processes of Hee Young's identity construction relate to her sense of who she is becoming (and is no longer, i.e., one of "them"), how she relates to those around her and how she "understands possibilities for

the future" (Norton, 2013, p. 45). This finding supports Hall's (1996) conceptualization of identity as both a matter of *becoming* (our "routes") and *being* (our "roots"):

> …identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being: not 'who we are' or 'where we came from', so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves. Identities are therefore constituted within, not outside representation (p. 4)

Much less expected was Hee Young's account of not fitting into the group "friends from different countries" (line 44) and her reported lack of English competence: "(I'm always (.) out of the (.) communication," line 58. This finding suggests that Generation 1.5 students in Canada such as Hee Yong may "not have the luxury to interact with whom they choose, as their opportunities to practice English are generally limited and socially structured for them. Under these circumstances, many immigrants become marginalized, introverted, and sensitive to rejection" (Cervatiuc, 2009, p. 255). It seems plausible that Hee Young's active participation in the local Korean community significantly limits her social and linguistic capital by restricting her access to English-speaking networks "except for scho̲ol (0.2) or wo̲r ↓ k" (line 38). This finding suggests that Hee Young may feel marginalized, underscoring Norton's point that language learners negotiate their "identities and desires in the context of complex and often unequal social relationships" (Norton, 2016, p. 476) and that educators must look beyond language as a linguistic system and critically consider the social nature of language learning. Hee Young's questioning her beliefs, culture, and individual identity also resonate with Block's (2002) point about how immigrants' identities often become disturbed and unclear due to changes in environment, making it difficult for them to stabilize their identities in a new cultural context. Always feeling "out of the (.) communication," Hee Young withdrew ("so: (0.2) that's when I started to be: more like (.) fitting into Korean society," lines 62-63), seeking the company of other Korean Generation 1.5 whom she recognized as the same (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004): "we understand each other, right?" (lines 66-67). This identity construction may be understood as way for her to claim insider status for herself by forming her own group of "Koreans (.) living in Canada" (line 66) (Reed, 2001, p. 329).

In this chapter, I illustrated how Chloe, Samantha, and Hee Young did things with identities as social categories that exemplify what I understand as *Identities from There, Here*, the theme of this chapter. Both Chloe and Hee Young made relevant oppositional or contrastive identities, which can be understood as motivated by the intersubjective tactics of "authentication and distinction" as described by Bucholtz and Hall (2004). In Chloe's case, being unaccustomed to interacting with students who she perceived as different, she resisted, instead gravitating towards her Chinese speaking classmates with whom she could reportedly relate to more easily and forming a cohort bound by a common language and culture. Setting aside "potentially salient differences" with her Chinese friends in the pursuit of "socially recognized sameness" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 383), Chloe, supported by her parents, sought to preserve what she understood as a shared "core" Chinese national identity, which unites immigrants from her cultural group (Phan, 2008). Her actions relate to Reed's (2001) notion of "identity fastening": as Chloe moved from one familiar cultural context to an unfamiliar one, she fastened her identity to her "us" group. This process can be understood as a way for her to "claim insider status" (Reed, 2001, p. 329) for herself and for the others in her group. Chloe's "core" sense of self was reinforced by her participation in the "us" group at her Middle school and in particular by her parents, who sent her to Chinese school as a safeguard against forgetting her first language and culture. For Chloe, studying Cantonese at Chinese school on Saturday mornings was a central resource for the production of her identities from there, here in Canada (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004). Similarly, Samantha's identities from *there* can be understood as being made and remade *here* each time she corresponds with her cousin via e-mail. In this way, the data suggest that written Créole is as an important resource that helps Samantha develop a sense of community from *there*, *here* in Canada, by supporting her first language acquisition.

In addition to both Chloe and Hee Young making relevant identities of sameness and difference, the data also highlight the close link in applied linguistics research between language, culture, and identity. In Middle school, the "us-them" binary Chloe constructed can be understood as "more situationally relevant" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 383): identity not as a "permanent state but as a motivated social achievement" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004,

p. 383), helping her adjust in the interim to the disorientating process (Reed, 2001) of moving to Canada and adjusting to a new school system, a new language of instruction, classmates from other countries, and new and different social practices. Similarly, Hee Young was able understand her identity in a meaningful way by emphasizing how she was different from "them"—Koreans in Korea—a process which involved reducing the "complex social variability between herself and ["them"] to a single dimension: "[me] versus them" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 384) and similar to her Korean Generation 1.5 friends ("we understand each other, right?"). In a similar way, Chloe produced "salient difference" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 384), accentuating her identity as a member of the "us" group, who she saw as distinct from other racialized classmates. Related to Chloe's experiences, Hee Young associating exclusively with other Korean Generation 1.5 friends seems to underscore the difficulties immigrant youth may face when they move to a new country "where the norms and rules for membership are different" (Reed, 2001, p. 329). Thus, for both Chloe and Hee Young, difference seemed to play a key role in the processes of their identity construction (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). Unlike both Chloe and Hee Young, Samantha's construction of an aspired to "credible or genuine" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) Mauritian identity seemed to be tied to her (imagined) perception that she would appear "incredible or non-genuine" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) when she eventually returned to Mauritius. Despite Samantha's claim that she had not changed, her move to Canada and long absence from Mauritius reportedly had changed her: "you're going to be different" (line 47).

In this chapter, I illustrated how Chloe, Samantha, and Hee Young produced identities that exemplified what I understand as *Identities from There, Here* (Marshall, 2009). I included data from an essay from Chloe, an interview with Samantha, and an e-mail in Mauritian Créole. In the interview with Samantha I illustrated how she produced an *aspired to* "credible or genuine" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) Mauritian identity and how Mauritian Créole in an e-mail helped Samantha and her cousin maintain a sense of community as Mauritian nationals living away from "home." In analysis of my interview with Hee Young, I illustrated how Hee Young's identity construction related to her sense

of who she is becoming. In the next chapter, *Identities in the Middle*, I present data from interview excerpts with Kerstin, Eva, Tiffany and Lisa, and Jun, and analyze a text by Jun.

Chapter 7. Identities in the Middle

In this chapter, I present data from interview excerpts with Kerstin, Eva, Tiffany and Lisa, and Jun, and analyze a text (low stakes and not formally graded) composed by Jun while he was enrolled in a section of AW 101. I demonstrate how the participants did what I understand as cultural in-between-ness. I illustrate how Kerstin, Eva, Tiffany and Lisa made relevant identities that can be understood as closely tied to their perceptions of how they differed from the "mainstream" in terms of language, visual appearance, and ethnicity. Jun's narrative text highlighted several features associated with what I understand as being and becoming a Generation 1.5 student. In excerpts from the interview with Jun, I illustrate how his account of visiting Korea seemed to help him understand how different he had become from his family members in Korea, a change he attributes to the power of the environment to change people. After presenting the data, at the conclusion of each of these sections, I relate the findings to the ideas and theories discussed in the literature review (Chapter 3) and to my research questions.

I begin by presenting my analysis of five excerpts of my interview with Kerstin, a fourth-year student and volunteer in the Writing Centre at the time of the interview. These five excerpts are ordered chronologically from the start of the interview proper (beginning at 3:33, after she read over the project description and signed the consent form) and ending at 9:29 (approximately 9 minutes and 48 seconds of recorded data from a 60 minute interview). Although Kerstin carefully read over and signed the consent form, which included the Generation 1.5 category in the study title and description, the extent to which she was familiar with the category was uncertain, and neither Kerstin nor I used the category in the interview.

7.1. Kerstin

One of the youngest participants at age upon arrival in Canada, Kerstin was 9 years of age when she and her family immigrated to Canada from Seoul. She completed

five years of primary education in Korea and the remainder of her compulsory elementary and high school education in English in the Canadian public-school system. She described being fluent in Korean and English and making regular visits to South Korea to visit her parents, who had moved back to South Korea. Excerpt 7.1 begins immediately after she had read over and signed the informed consent form.

Excerpt 7.1. Kerstin interview extract: I was troubled

```
01  Tim      So last time we were talking about your presentation=you

02           were about to go and (.) give a presentation, right?

03  Kerstin  Yes, [I was.

04  Tim           [How did that go?

05  Kerstin  It went (0.5) ra↑ther well.

06  Tim      Ya?

07  Kerstin  Ya=

08  Tim      =What were you talking about again?

09  Kerstin  I was talking about:(1.0).hh um:(0.5) cultural identity.

10  Tim      Ri:[ght.

11  Kerstin     [cultural identity (0.5) while trying to put myse̲↑lf

12           in the context of it (.) bec[ause the reason I started

13  Tim                                  [Ya.

14  Kerstin  thinking about cultural identity, .hh was because I was

15           troubled by: what exactly is̲: cultural identity (.)

16           especially in the context of now̲ where there's a lot of

17           mass migration=right, like large movement f[rom=like

18  Tim                                                  [Yes.

19  Kerstin  transnational movement, so[.hh um:: as a::(0.5) I guess
```

```
20   Tim                                         [Right.

21   Kerstin  as a first generation immigrant,

22   Tim      Ya.

23   Kerstin  myself=

24   Tim      =<Is that how you see yourself>?

25            (1.0)

26   Kerstin  Um:

27   Tim      As a first [generation immigrant?

28   Kerstin             [I'm um,(0.5) I guess so because I, I  came

29            here with my parents (.)so: I'm thinking that it's first

30            generation↑=

31   Tim      =When you were si:x?↑=How old were you?=

32   Kerstin  =I was ni↓ne

33   Tim      OK.

34   Kerstin  nine=um::so in grade 4, and we: came here in 2000.

35   Tim      Ya.
```

About three months prior to the interview, Kerstin told me about a day-long, public workshop on exploring Canadian culture and identity that she was involved in as part of her studies at CPU. Although she invited me, I was unable to attend. By drawing attention to her presentation, my turn 01 and 03 questions can be read as my attempts to make Kerstin's identity as a student relevant to our talk and attempt to revive the theme of her presentation by selecting a description "that [I] know [Kerstin] knows" (Sacks, 1992, p. 148). The lack of any gap between Kerstin's turn in line 07 and my turn in line 08 indexes my assessment of my unsuccessful attempts to encourage Kerstin to topicalize Canadian cultural identity. Kerstin's turn in line 09 satisfies the expectations set by my question, which I ratify in turn 10, and she immediately begins to build an account framed around what for her seems to be unresolved questions related to her own cultural identity (line 12)

114

to justify her interest in the topic. Half way through turn 19, she hesitantly describes herself as a "first generation immigrant." In turns 25 and 27, I orient to Kerstin's establishing a direct link between first-generation immigrant and the related action "came here with my parents" (lines 28-29) as complicating the features I associate with the 1.5 category. My inquiry is met with a full second of silence, suggesting that Kerstin orients to my question as challenging the normativity of her social knowledge (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015). She justifies her first generational status by employing her common-sense cultural knowledge as a resource to connect the action "came here with my parents" to the category "first generation immigrant." But by inquiring about her age of arrival in Canada, I attempt to tie the category Generation 1.5 to the feature "immigrating with parents during adolescence."   Kerstin's answer ("nine=um::so in grade 4") reestablishes a theme associated with Generation 1.5 students: age upon arrival, as it relates to Kerstin. However, I do not offer my interpretation of Generation 1.5 and we both display different understandings of generational status. Excerpt 7.2 continues with Kerstin where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 7.2.   Kerstin interview extract: Messy

```
36   Kerstin  So: for me::(0.5) I (.) began to think about (0.5) what

37            (.) really (.)is cultural identit[y=well (0.2) first

38   Tim                                       [Right.

39   Kerstin  of all what really is culture (.) but then (.) for

40            me:: (1.0) I have trouble associating °completely°(.)

41            with eith↑er (0.2) cul↑ture=<let's say Korean culture

42            or Canadian culture.>

43   Tim      You have trouble identifying with (0.3) either one (.)

44            fully?

45   Kerstin  Ya: because (.) I do have (1.0) Canadian citizenship.

46   Tim      [Right.
```

```
47   Kerstin  [Um: I got that (.) um, kind of natur↑ally because my

48            mom applied for it and at the time I was little so they

49            kind just (0.2) °give it to you I guess° [if you're a

50   Tim                                              [Ya.

51   Kerstin  kid and [you apply.

52   Tim             [OK.

53   Tim      Oh, nice [hehheh.

54   Kerstin           [hehheh. I'm not sure=the whole process

55            is very messy and it's just very disorganized um, (.)

56            but (.) um, I do have Canadian citizenship (.) and at

57            that time Korea didn't (.) allow or dual citizensh↑ip,

58   Tim      Oh, OK.

59   Kerstin  They do n↓ow. So, (0.5) I had to give up my Korean

60            citizenship.

61   Tim      I see.
```

Half-way through her line 39 turn, Kerstin shifts from raising abstract questions about the meaning of cultural identity to talking more specifically about how it relates to her circumstances. In turn 43, I advance the hypothesis that she feels in-between Korean and Canadian culture for confirmation. The design of my question can be read as preferring a "yes" answer to confirm the hypothesis and co-construct Kerstin as partial to her Korean and Canadian worlds. The "messy" and "disorganized" (line 55) process of applying for Canadian citizenship, her status as a "kid" (a category ascribed less power and fewer rights, privileges, and competencies, line 51), constitutional laws disqualifying her from holding dual citizenship (line 57), and having to relinquish her Korea citizenship (lines 59-60) are four resources Kerstin provides about why she has trouble associating "°completely°" (line 40) with either Korean or Canadian culture. Excerpt 7.3 continues with Kerstin where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 7.3.   Kerstin interview extract: Stark contrast

```
62   Kerstin  Um, but, I do have this government document that says I

63            am a Canadian citizen,

64   Tim      Right.

65   Kerstin  .hh (.) but then, (.) I come here and (.) I have to

66            admit that (0.2)[Canada

67   Tim                     [when you come to Canada,

68   Kerstin  Ya, I have to admit that Vancouver is a very um, unique

69            in terms of its po↑pulation make up,

70   Tim      Ya.

71   Kerstin  .hh um: it's kind of in stark contrast to Korea because

72            Korea is a very, very ethnically homo[genous (.) country

73   Tim                                          [very homogenous.

74   Kerstin  .hh um so if you're in Korea you have (.) you have no

75            question of what Korean (0.2) [hh are, Korean identity

76   Tim                                   [Sure.

77   Kerstin  is >you know kind of t↑hing.<

78   Tim      Right.
```

Kerstin's orientation to categories of location (Schegloff, 1972) make implicit
"possible paths of shared understanding" (Lepper, 2000, p. 90) into the processes of her
identity construction.   Invoking the categories "here" (line 65), "Canada" (line 66),
"Vancouver" (line 68), and "Korea" (lines 71 & 72), Kerstin generates distinctions and
provides inferences about these two places. By contrasting what she understands as
Vancouver's culturally eith↑er (0.2) cul↑ture diverse demographic with her home country's
"ethnically homogenous" population (line 72), Kerstin highlights what for her is a significant
difference in how she understood her Korean identity before moving to Canada—

unquestionable (lines 74-75)—and how immigrating to Vancouver and becoming a Canadian citizen seemed to disrupt her sense of self: "I have trouble associating °completely° (.) with either (0.2) cul ↑ ture=<let's say Korean culture or Canadian culture.> (lines 40-42). Kerstin's account can be read as making relevant an identity situated in-between Korea and Canada. Excerpt 7.4 continues with Kerstin where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 7.4.   Kerstin interview extract: Funky

```
79   Kerstin   .hh but whereas her:e, (0.5) I never realized it be↑fore

80             until I got a little older that ((quoting voice)) Oh,

81             this place is a little funky, you know.

82   Tim       Funky. hehehe.

83   Kerstin   Hehehe. It's a little odd, I mean um (0.3) there is a=

84   Tim       =by funky, you mean good, good thing, or just (.) kind

85             of an odd thing or,

86   Kerstin   Um: it's a mix of things=

87   Tim       =Ya.

88   Kerstin   It's good in that there seems to be many cultures,

89   Tim       Ya.

90   Kerstin   There seems to be many cultures=there's often see people

91             from (.) all over the world.

92   Tim       Sure.

93   Kerstin   Um,

94   Tim       That's funky.
```

In turn 79, Kerstin indexes Vancouver as "here" and "this place," orientating to our shared knowledge of the local context. Her description of Vancouver ("this place") as

"funky" can be read as implying something unconventional or odd. Kerstin orients to my display of amusement in line 82 with affiliative laughter, but then immediately downgrades "funky" to "a little odd," which she begins to justify. I interrupt Kerstin by querying her description in turn 84, indexing my assessment of her description of Vancouver (where I was born and raised) as accountable. I seek clarification by asking Kerstin is she interprets funky as "good, good thing" or "an odd thing." In response, Kerstin upgrades funky to "a mix of things," which can be read as doing the interactional work of appeasing me, as indicated by my agreeing with her account in turns 87, 89, and 92 and my reintroducing "funky" (line 94) under the revised terms Kerstin provides: "many cultures," "people from all over the world" (lines 90-91). Excerpt 7.5 continues with Kerstin where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 7.5.   Kerstin interview extract: I don't fit

95	Kerstin	Ya, funky.(0.3) At the same tim:e,
96	Tim	Ya.
97	Kerstin	I am hesitant to call it really multicultural. Also,
98	Kerstin	there is the idea that despite its population make-up
99		Canada is largely a North America you know, Western
100		country, um: so then if I think about what a typical
101		Canadian looks like, which is very different for me
102		from what the typical Vancouverite (.)looks like=I
103		don't know, Canadian identity and Vancouverite identity
104		it's a very different thing for me, I'm not really sure
105		and why, .hh but if I think about what a typical
106		Canadian would look like, (.).hh
107	Tim	Ya.
108		(1.5)

```
109   Kerstin   That's not me. (.) I don't fit that.

110   Tim       Hmmm.

111   Kerstin   Um: so, if I'm here (0.2) a lot of people might even

112             think that I don't speak English (0.2).hh depend on

113             how I dress (.)um sometimes, but (0.2) I don't (.)fit

114             within that bracket of Canadian.
```

Kerstin indexes her assessment of our jointly arrived at understanding of "funky" in her turn in line 95, but withholds full endorsement. She accounts for taking up this cautious disposition by indirectly indexing ideologies ("there is an idea," line 98) associated with race and racialization in Canada. Canada's "population make-up," which in this situated context can be read as "White," the inference-rich membership categories "North American" and "Western," and the "typical" Canadian non-marked "look" (line 101) are four resources recruited in the account Kerstin provides about why she hesitates "to call it really multicultural" (line 97). Kerstin prefaces her claim that Canadian and Vancouverite identity is "a very different thing" with "I don't know" (lines 102-103), creating a more credible rhetorical position for herself by displaying distance or a lack of interest in critiquing Canada's official policy of multiculturalism (Potter, 1996) in the presence of a White, Anglophone, Canadian researcher. Following 1.5 seconds of silence, she invokes an identity atypical of (White) Canada: "That's not me, (.) I don't fit that" (line 109). Her ethnicity and visual appearance (dress, line 113) are two resources recruited in the account Kerstin provides about why she states she does not conform to "that bracket of Canadian" (line 114). Her drawing attention to her "look" (lines 106) and "dress" 113) can be understood as indexing a marked, newly arrived, non-Canadian identity associated with being ESL (line 112). The involuntary and symbolic loss of Kerstin's Korean "core" sense of self (Phan, 2008) coupled with her perception that membership in "that bracket of Canadian" (line 114) (an index for White, English-speaking Canada) as implausible seems to have had a disorientating impact on Kerstin's identity construction (Reed, 2001).

In terms of what the data suggest about the literature review theories and ideas, it is evident that Kerstin not only talks about cultural identity through her accounts, but is doing identity: doing an identity that I interpret as in-between Korean and Canadian. Although she reportedly gave up her Korean citizenship to gain Canadian citizenship, her accounts suggest she still feels out of place in Canada because of what she perceives to be her marked visual appearance and possible perception as an illegitimate speaker of English. Equally significant is in Korea and "here" in Canada, Kerstin's sense of self seems impacted by how she positions herself (as a visible majority in Korea, but as a visible minority in Canada) and is positioned by cultural discourses of normativity (in Korea) and otherness (here). Further, the data suggest that for Kerstin there are symbolic identity costs associated with moving to Canada, where social categories such as whiteness and standard English have "a special, default status that contrasts with the identities of other groups, which are usually highly recognizable" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2010, p. 372). As a child growing up in "ethnically homogenous" (line 72) Korea, Kerstin had "no question" (lines 74-75) of her cultural identity, but moving to ethnically "funky" Vancouver seemed to disrupt what for her was a stable, "stark" (line 71) Korean sense of self. The fact that she reportedly had to "give up" (line 59) her Korean national identity in exchange for Canadian citizenship before Korea changed the law allowing dual citizenship seems to have contributed to her sense of cultural dissonance (Kim & Duff, 2012). The data also suggest that Kerstin constantly negotiates who she is and who she is becoming (Hall, 1996) in Canada, where complex discourses of immigration, ethnicity, race, identity, language, nationhood, and difference intersect with the processes of her identity construction.

7.2. Eva

After completing six years of compulsory primary education and one year of secondary education in Chinese in the Hong Kong school system, Eva and her family emigrated from Hong Kong to Canada when she was 15 years of age. Her family settled in a neighborhood with many immigrants of Chinese and other Asian ethnicities.   In this section, I present my analysis of three excerpts from my interview with Eva. This was one

of my first attempts at interviewing and the interview was conducted as part of a mini-study in one of my courses at SFU in 2010. My aim in this mini study was to determine if representations of Generation 1.5 from the applied linguistics literature resonated with participants whose experiences broadly paralleled those scholars had defined as Generation 1.5. I assembled a series of definitions[11] as prompts, organized thematically around common themes associated with Generation 1.5 in the applied linguistics literature. While I realize that these prompts may have formed responses in Eva and led her to reproduce my agendas to some extent, by asking Eva to respond to big-d Discourses of identity categories under question, I attempted to elicit information that would cast light upon how she understood the possible implications of these discourses as they manifest in her life. Prior to the excerpts here, I asked Eva when she had come to Canada and she told me that she immigrated to Canada from Hong Kong with her family at age 15. I asked Eva what she thought Generation 1.5 meant (she reportedly had not heard of the term before). She replied: "Um::: HA::LF Chin::ese ha:lf Canadian culture? > I mean like< half my h:ome country half here, I guess. Eva orients to the following quotes in line 03 in Excerpt 7.6 below:

> They are in many ways marginal to both the new and old worlds, for they straddle both but are in a profound sense fully part of neither. They occupy the interstices of two societies and cultures, between the first and second generation. (Rumbaut & Ima, 1988, p. 2).

> These are students who are truly caught in the middle—between languages, cultures, and classrooms. (Oudenhoven, 2006, p. 243)

---

[11] These descriptions were originally complied by Dr. Steven Talmy for a classroom exercise.

Excerpt 7.6.   Eva interview extract: Kind of really

```
01   Tim    How do you feel when you read (.) these descriptions of

02          Generation 1.5 students?

03   Eva    Oh, (.) as I read one and f↓our (.) I think like four is

04          like (.) is like (.) so:: true.

05          (0.7)

06   Tim    Is that rig↑ht?=

07   Eva    =Ya, what I feel is true.

08          (1.0)

09   Eva    >because like<(.) it's:: (1.2) it's like(.)really

10          <dif::ferent.>

11          (1.0)

12   Eva    But in my situation (.) it's like kind of really in the

13           mid̲dle, in-between.
```

My opening turn calls attention to the prompts I assembled of representations of Generation 1.5 students. Eva's assessment of Oudenhoven's (2006) quote as "so:: true" (line 04) suggests that she may have had experiences that broadly parallel Generation 1.5 as defined by Oudenhoven. The silence in line 08 can be read as attributable to Eva as my tag question is both directed to her and makes her strong alignment with the quotes by Rumbaut and Ima (1988) and Oudenhoven (2006) accountable. Eva orients to the silence, and in her next turn and attempts to justify her opinion by making relevant an identity in the middle that is shaped by, and oriented to, the interactional context of talking about Oudenhoven's quote. Excerpt 7.7 continues with Eva where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 7.7.   Eva interview extract: Hard to move it

```
14  Tim  Do you think that's a (.) bad place to b↑e (0.3) or a good

15       place[to be?

16  Eva       [Well (.) >in my opinion< I didn't feel bad about this,

17       but (.) I just feel that (.) it's like (0.2) ya I'm in the

18       middle, how can I do:? >like because I<(.) it's hard for me

19       to mo:ve it to (.) change all the perspectives to

20       Canada,[but

21  Tim          [Um hmm.

22  Eva  I also like kind of (0.2) I should be moving on, right? so

23       in: my: perspective, >I didn't feel bad< about the such and

24       such.
```

By inquiring whether Eva feels being in the middle is bad or good, she seems to stoically justify her liminal positioning in social life as an unfortunate, yet inevitable outcome of relocating to Canada: "how can I do:? (line 18).   She builds a moral construction of herself as a "good immigrant" (Jayyusi, 1984) who is trying, but struggling to redefine herself as Canadian (lines 17-20). Eva ending her account with the tag "right?" (line 22), can be read as constructing me as a person of institutional authority within academia. As a result, it is likely the tag question is used here to please me and/or to reproduce ideas about immigration she has heard from others through these textual prompts. Eva ends her turn by downplaying the relevance of Rumbaut and Ima's (1988) and Oudenhoven's (2006) quotes as they relate to her: "I didn't feel bad< about the the such and such" (lines 23-24). Excerpt 7.8 continues with Eva where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 7.8.   Eva interview extract: My home country just, pull me back there

```
25  Tim   What do you mean I should be moving o↓n?

26  Eva   Like >because like< I already::: (.) in my old world like

27        because like I choosing to move to Canada (.) then I should

28        more participate in here and enjoy my life here, but ah::

29        in certain way that sometimes I didn't (0.2) feel that I

30        wa:nt to↑(.) >like just my (.)home country just, pull me

31        back there=(.)=like ((quoting voice)) <oh you are Chinese you

32        should be more Chinese>,> you know <in Chinese> and then like

33        because like<, most your friends is in Hong Kong::>and then<

34        most your friends in your home country> like they are doing

35        the same things >different from you, right?< but you also

36        have a bonding with them=communicate with them, so you can't

37        be like so::: outdated from (.) your home country.

38  Tim   Hmm.

39  Eva   >so like< (.) you like> so that's why I like sometimes I

40        also like mostly read the Chin::ese newspaper from my: (.)

41        home:country.

42  Tim   Umhm.

43  Eva   But (.) > on the other way < (.) like (.) people that here>

44        should think that like ((quoting voice)) <Oh you guys should

45        be moving on like you should be in Canada now:: you should

46        be:: like: (0.3) enjoy the environment here.

47        (1.0)

48  Eva   like this is what I think.
```

Throughout the excerpt, Eva refers to geographical locations that she organizes concentrically according to nearness ("here," four times in lines 28, 43, 46, and "Canada"

in line 27) and farness ("old word," line 26; "home country," four times in lines 30, 34, 37, 41; "back there" in line 31; and "Hong Kong" in line 33). These categories can be read as carrying inference rich implications which shed light on the processes of Eva's identity construction. In my turn 25 utterance, I ask Eva to elaborate. Assessing the common-sense geography shared by us, Eva builds a category-based account in which she invokes the location formulation "my old world," which can be understood as Hong Kong. Her telling me that she is "already" in her "old world" suggests that the Chinese norms, language, and culture associated with Hong Kong (her old world) continue to define her sense of self and impact how she positions herself and is positioned by those around her in Canada and in Hong Kong. Eva describes herself metaphorically as being pulled back "there" by her "home country." In line 31, Eva evokes an unnamed "figure" (Goffman, 1981) who she begins to animate. By openly challenging Eva to "be more Chinese" (line 32), the figure can be seen as acting as an "agent of normativity" (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015, p. 101), invoking norms to regulate, control, and sanction Eva's behavior: "be more Chinese" (line 32); "communicate with them" (line 36); "you can't "be like so:::outdated from (.) your home country," (line 36-37). This finding relates to Sacks' (1972) observation that "[v]iewers use norms to provide some sort of the orderliness, and proper orderliness, of the activities they observe" (p. 339). Her telling me that she sometimes "reads the newspaper in Chinese from my home country" can be read as her attempt to show herself to be a morally good (Jayyusi, 1984) Chinese immigrant from Hong Kong. In turn 43, Eva relays what another unnamed figure told her—described as "people that here" (which likely indexes local Canadians). The casting of Eva into the category "you guys" directly indexes Eva's identity as an immigrant youth/Generation 1.5. This move is accomplished by co-selecting the category "you guys" and the actions "moving on" and "enjoy the environment here," activities that the figure expects Eva and other members, as incumbents of this group, to perform "properly" (Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 5). Eva ending her account with "like this is what *I think*" (emphasis added) can be understood as her way to manage the dilemmas of presenting her opinions to me, a university researcher, confidently but without seeming to be overly assertive (Antaki, Billig, Edwards, & Potter, 2003).

The data presented here offer a way to understand what types of identities and representations of self and other are made relevant in the processes of Eva being and becoming Generation 1.5. Especially significant is how, in the interactional context of discussing Oudenhoven's (2006) quote, our talk produced accounts that highlighted the role of categorization practices at rendering visible "the relationship between morality, practical action and the social organization of [Eva's] everyday life" (Fitzgerald & Housley, 2015, p. 3). This relationship can be seen in how Eva represented her relationship with Hong Kong as an "old world" that still exerts tremendous power in her life, metaphorically pushing and pulling her back and forth between Canada and Hong Kong. Equally significant was Eva's animating an unnamed "figure" (Goffman, 1981) who challenged her "be more Chinese" (line 32). These findings highlight the dilemmas Eva faces as a Generation 1.5 youth in Canada: the tension between maintaining a connection to the "old world" or "moving on" as they relate to Eva. These dilemmas underscore the idea that identity is a site of struggle "constructed across time and space" (Norton, 2013, p. 45), subject to construction, negotiation, and hybridization. In terms of the role of language plays in the processes of Eva's identity construction, the Chinese language seems to be "a key signifier" (May, 2000, p. 373) of her social identity and allegiance to her "home county." This relates to Norton's (1995) ideas that "language is the place where actual and possible forms of social organization...are defined and contested, yet it is also the place where [her] sense of [herself], [her] subjectivity, is constructed" (Norton-Pierce, 1995, p. 21). While I recognize that my prompts inevitably affected how Eva responded, her accounts nevertheless suggest that discourses of in-between-ness may manifest in her life, as she "juggle[s] the simultaneous and sometimes contradictory demands and pressures of the multiple social worlds [she] inhabit[s], including family, community, workplace, and campus" (Murie & Fitzpatrick, 2009, p. 164).

7.3. Tiffany and Lisa

Tiffany and Lisa were 24-year-old twins from Taiwan. They completed grades K-7 at a public school in Taiwan and at the age of 13, immigrated to Canada with their family and completed grades 7-12 at a public school in the Metro Vancouver area. They

described speaking Taiwanese, Mandarin, and English. In this next section, I analyze two excerpts from my interview with Tiffany and Lisa, who I interviewed together. The first of these, Excerpt 7.3 below, occurs at 10:47 (total 107:15 in length) of the interview. I introduced the category Generation 1.5, but did not define it, nor did I share any descriptions of Generation from educational literature. Prior to the data presented here, Tiffany told me that she had read about the 1.5 category in a Sociology course she had taken at a community college but did not offer any interpretation. I include these excerpts here to highlight the types of identities and representations of self and other that they make relevant and that I jointly construct.

Excerpt 7.9.   Tiffany and Lisa interview extract: The stuck in-between

```
01  Tim      What does that mean (.) to you guys (0.2) Generation 1.5?
02           (0.5)
03  Tiffany  Like we're half:(0.2) Canadian, he[he half umm: Taiwanese.
04  Lisa                                       [hehehe (.)
05  Tiffany  I feel like=ya I feel (.) we don't belong(.)to [the norm
06  Lisa                                                    [to any
07           other group=
08  Tiffany  =ya we're neither nor, we're sort of like the (.) stuck
09           in-between.
10  Tim      You feel that way?
11  Lisa     Ya.
12  Tim      Like you're stuck in betw↓een
13  Tiffany  Y↑a because we (.) don't belong to the: (0.3)
14  Lisa     Mainstream=
15  Tiffany  =mainstream (.) like the all Canadian(.) society,
```

By inquiring about what Generation 1.5 might mean for them, Tiffany self-selects, making relevant what could be understood as a dual national identity:" half: (0.2) Canadian, he[he half umm: Taiwanese." Tiffany's answer simultaneously creates the context for their (reported) non-membership in "the norm" (line 05). Lisa's overlapping utterance, "to any other group," supports her sister's account and can be read as implying that they are

"outsiders." In turn 8, Tiffany repositions both herself and her sister in an in-between space as "neither nor" and "the stuck-in-between." Designed as yes-no questions, my turns 10 and 12 attempt to make "yes" the preferred answer. Both Lisa (turn 11) and Tiffany (turn 13) satisfy the expectations set by my question, describing themselves as not part of the "mainstream" (turn 14) and "like all Canadian society" (turn 15). In this relatively brief exchange, in the interactional context of talking about Generation 1.5, Tiffany, Lisa and I jointly produce categories that can be read as highlighting various shades of cultural in-between-ness.

1. half Canadian, half Taiwanese
2. non-normals (Goffman, 1963)
3. to any other group
4. neither nor
5. the stuck in between
6. non-mainstream
7. on the fringes of *all* Canadian society (emphasis added)

These categories and the features inferred by them make relevant a discursive theme associated with Generation 1.5 students in the educational literature: cultural in-between-ness (e.g., Crosby, 2008; Ferris, et al. 2004; Hinkle, 2006; Murie & Fitzpatrick, 2009; Oudenhoven, 2006; Rumbaut & Ima, 1988). Excerpt 7.10 continues with the twins where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 7.10. Tiffany and Lisa interview extract: Fobby people

```
16   Tiffany   but we don't belong to the (0.3) all Asian, you know=
17   Lisa      =like fobby (.) people, he[hheh.
18   Tiffany                              [hehheh.
19   Tim       The what?
20   Tiffany   FO[B.
21   Lisa        [fobby people, hehehe.
```

```
22   Tim      >The what people?<

23   Tiffany  FO:B.

24            (1.0)

25   Tim      <What's that.>

26   Lisa     Fresh off the boat. That's[a

27   Tim                                [FO::B↓

28   Tiffany  he[hheh

29   Lisa       [hehheh=

30            (1.2)

31   Lisa     =>Like if people call you a FOB that means you just got

32            to Canada< (.) you just got here (.) and you're=> >it's

33            not very nice but people say it all the time=I don't have

34            any<=

35   Tim      =so, so[me

36   Tiffany         [people who just (.) came here (.5) an[d don't(.)

37   Lisa                                                  [doesn't

38            speak really=who don't speak good English.
```
___

In lines 16-26, Tiffany invokes an identity distinct from, in her terminology, "All Asian": "fobby (.) people." This relational category seems to index Lisa's "not is all lost" assessment of their circumstances. Their subsequent overlapping laughter (lines 17 and 18) suggests that the category is potentially inappropriate to bring up in a formal interview (see also line 33). Tiffany responds to my question about the meaning of "fobby people" by invoking the acronym "FOB" (pronounced as one word, line 23), which Lisa then interprets in response to my request for an explanation as "Fresh off the boat." My repeating back FOB loudly causes overlapping unbridled laughter as I jointly co-construct the category. Lisa implies that the features "just got here" (i.e., Canada) and "not speaking good English" are characteristically typical of "fobby people" (line 21). Their employing

these alleged differences between them and "fobby people" can be read as creating social distance between themselves and "All Asian/FOB" and repositions them hierarchically between the "mainstream" but above "all Asian/FOB." Their back and forth talk, a distinctive feature of their interaction with me and with each other throughout the interview, is evident in their overlapping utterances and the completion/renewing of each other's utterances.

A surprising finding was that Tiffany and Lisa constructed a category-bound *a priori* relationship between Generation 1.5 and in-between-ness in increasing degrees of liminality despite their display of English language expertise, interactional competence, and location categorization, all of which can be understood as discursively constructing them as fully part of, not marginal to, the "mainstream." Equally significant was the way they used FOB as a resource to emphasize their distinctiveness from "all Asian/fobby people" in terms of 1) their length of stay in Canada (12 years, unlike FOBs who "just got to Canada," lines 31-32), and 2) their interactional proficiency (extremely high, unlike FOBs who reportedly "don't speak good English," line 38). This finding suggests that their organization of themselves into the group "non-FOB" was not "driven by some pre-existing and recognizable similarity but by agency and power" (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004, p. 371). Another significant finding was that the interview *itself* allowed Lisa and Tiffany to display their interactional proficiency in English (e.g., overlapping talk, lack of gaps or pauses between our turns, no need for me to clarify and repeat my questions), and distinguish themselves linguistically and culturally from FOBs. Their displayed strong distinction from "All Asian/fobby people" also can be understood as indirectly indexing and reproducing wider ideologies related to racism, discrimination, and linguicism, in circulation at CPU and in society (see page 19). The data suggest that for Tiffany and Lisa, the processes of identity construction relates to how they position themselves in relation to others and by recognizing and highlighting their differences in relation to others (Kumaravadivelu, 2008).

7.4. Jun

Jun immigrated to Canada with his family at 12 years of age. He completed six years of compulsory primary education in Korea prior to coming to Canada. In high school, he described having a lot of difficultly with English and "fitting in." He described being bullied throughout Grades 10-12, mostly by other students he described as "Persian." Because of his difficulties with English and the ongoing racially-motivated bullying, he began to skip class and his grades dropped. He ended up quitting high school and later completed his Grade 12 education online. He described speaking Korean, English, and some Chinese. In this next section, I present an analysis of a narrative text composed by Jun while he was enrolled in a section of AW 101 at CPU.

Excerpt 7.11. Fragment from Jun's narrative: All I knew

01	On September 2005, my whole family has decided to move to Canada.
02	It was the most adventurous decision that my family made because we
03	had to leave everything behind and give up a lot of things to start a new
04	life. I was just a 12 years old boy who did not know 'anything' about
05	culture, food or tradition or language. All I knew was the alphabet and
06	some simple words like apple.

In paragraph one, Jun narrates his family's move to Canada as what can be read as an adventure into uncharted waters. He accounts for the move being "the most adventurous decision my family made" by employing several extreme formulations (shown in bold) (Pomerantz, 1986) to substantiate his claim: "my **whole** family"; "give up **a lot**", "the **most** adventurous decision"; "leave **everything** behind;" did not know '**anything,**' "**All** I knew". His emphasizing a lack of Canadian cultural knowledge and rudimentary English can be understood as his assessment of himself as a newcomer to Canada. His narrative makes relevant several themes associated with becoming Generation 1.5: the relevance of non-Canadian birthplace, age of arrival in Canada, negotiating new and different cultural

values, and becoming an ESL student in Canada. Excerpt 7.12 continues where the previous except leaves off.

Excerpt 7.12. Fragment from Jun's narrative: Mixed up

07	Since then I am living a life in between Korean and Canadian. After
08	living here for a while I ended up become a Canadian citizen. Language
09	preference is still on the Korean side. However, ironically my culture
10	and perspective has been mixed up together and formed neither fully
11	Korean nor Canadian.

In paragraph two, Jun shifts to the present time frame and repositions himself as in-between two cultural worlds, which are described as Korean and Canadian. His use of the phrasal verb "ended up" (line 08) suggests that his becoming a Canadian citizenship was unplanned and/or happened by accident, complicating the "great adventure" narrative in the opening paragraph. He describes his language preference as on "the Korean side," which suggests that his Korean sense of self is built upon what he sees as something tangible that he can rely on for stability, but his transitioning to the next sentence with the device "However," followed by "ironically" can be read as making relevant an identity between Korean and Canadian that is unsteady and fragmented. Excerpt 7.13 continues with Jun where the previous except leaves off.

Excerpt 7.13. Fragment from Jun's narrative: Neither Korean nor Canadian

12	When I was in high school, I had a chance to go to a restaurant with my
13	Canadian friends. At first I obviously did not know anything about
14	Canadian dining etiquette so I just acted like I usually do with my
15	Korean friends. I ordered a bunch of food so that we can share
16	together, took over my friend's French fries, double dipped and so on.

17   After stealing half of my friends' food, I noticed that their face started to

18   look very irritated. Then I realized that I have done something wrong to

19   my friends. I asked if I did anything wrong, and I think that must be the

20   most embarrassing moment and it was the time when I neither Korean

21   nor Canadian.

By calling attention to his friends as "Canadian," Jun seems to suggest that at this time in the past he didn't yet consider himself a Canadian. He constructs an "obvious" (line 13) relationship between the category "newcomer to Canada" and the attributes "not knowing anything about Canadian dining etiquette" (lines 13-14). The actions he describes can be understood as "doing being" an ordinary (Sacks, 1992b) Korean: "just act[ing] like I usually do with my Korean friends" (lines 14-15). Ordering food to share, helping himself to his friends' food, and double dipping (i.e., dipping food he has already taken a bite out of into the communal sauce a second time)—what Jun constructs as "ordinary" actions for Koreans—in the presence of his Canadian friends, who reportedly were not impressed (line 17), are three resources Jun provides about why he felt neither Korean nor Canadian at that time.

I now present my analysis of two excerpts from an interview I conducted with Jun after he completed the the AW 101 course. I highlight how Jun generates and uses his understandings about "who-we-are-and-what-we-are doing" (Rintel, 2015, p. 125) in our situated identities as interviewer and interviewee. That is, I demonstrate how the interview itself is used by us "to both enable and constrain interactional understandings" (Rintel, 2015, p. 125). At the time of the interview, Jun was 21 years of age and had been in Canada for 9 years. The extract begins at 12:31. We had been talking to this point about why his family moved to Canada and his difficult high school days, during which time he alleged he was the target of racism. Prior to the data that are shown, I asked Jun if he had ever been asked, "Where are you from?" and if so, how he responded. Jun told me that is often asked this question. He reported feeing "sensitive" when asked to explain

where he was from back in high school since he felt those asking were being "aggressive," but reported that he no longer feels threatened when people ask him this question.

Excerpt 7.14. Jun interview excerpt: Weird

```
01 Tim   Um: So it sounds like you have you've um: pt you've got

02       multiple languages going on in your life, you've got Kor↓ean

03 Jun   Yup.

04 Tim   and you got En↓glish (.) other languages (.) mayb↑e.

05 Jun   Um: little bit of Chinese.

06 Tim   O:↓K, so you've got these languages ↑going on::um (.)you've

07       got ah: different cult↑::ure in your background (.)you've

08       you've got Canadian cult↑::ure=you're from Korea but you're

09       a Canadian cit↑iz[en, How do you kin[d of(.) time (.)

10 Jun                   [a: ↓::.          [That's we::↑ird right?

11 Tim   Is it=is it we↑ird?

12 Jun   Ya:::it's: ya,I feel I'm sometimes not=like I feel in-between.

13 Tim   Ya?

14       (1.0)

15 Tim   You, you, fe:el in-between?

16 Jun   Ya, in-between, I'm not truly truly Korean and I'm not truly

17       (.) like Canadian-minded, right?=
```

In lines 01-09, I reiterate what Jun told me up to this point in the interview, co-constructing him as a multilingual, multicultural student, a category Jun ratifies (line 03). My describing him as "from Korean but Canadian citizen" invokes two markedly different geographical regions (East and West) associated with vastly different histories, languages, and cultures. Jun orients to my attempts to reconcile these two seemingly disparate

identities. The overlapping onset in lines 09-10, higher pitch, stretched syllable, and stressed syllable indexes Jun's assessment of his circumstances as "we:: ↑ ird right?" (line 10). Jun orients to our shared orientation by agreeing with me in turn 12 ("Ya:::it's: ya"), highlighting the joint production of discourse concerning his identities. Jun accounts for his "weird" circumstances by telling me he sometimes feels "in-between" (line 12). The lengthy silence in line 13 can be read as attributable to Jun as I wait for Jun to explain what he means. With no uptake from Jun, I try to get him to answer by repeating what he just told me. Jun confirms that he indeed feels in between ("Ya, in-between"), and then recruits his perception of himself as what can be read as an "incredible of non-genuine" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) Korean or Canadian identity as a resource to justify his feelings of cultural in-between-ness: "I'm not truly truly Korean and I'm not truly (.) like Canadian-minded, right?=" (line 16-17). Excerpt 7.15 continues with Jun where the previous except leaves off.

Excerpt 7.15. Jun interview except: This environment actually changed people

```
18  Jun    =so um: last y↑ear was it? um: I went back to Korea to see my
19         my family but I noticed that um what they're thinking is not
20         what I'm thinking.
21  Tim    The things that they're interested in.
22  Jun    Ya, they're all different (0.2) like their mindset, their
23         personality and everything um: their even their goals like and
24         achievements, right. What they want to achieve were much
25         different from what I was thinking and I noticed that wow,
26         this environment actually changed people.
```

Jun's continuation of his turn can be read as his attempts to avoid topicalizing "Canadian-minded" (line 17-18), preventing me, as one who may be able to judge what Canadian-minded is, from offering a comment, which the tag question "right?" (line 17) invites me to do. Instead, he launches immediately into an account to justify his not being a "true" Korean. As he builds his account, Jun assigns the attributes having a different

"mindset" (line 22), "personality," "goals" (line 23), and "achievements" (line 24) to his extended family members in Korea. By using the word "actually" (line 26), Jun references that the power of the environment to change people is a generally held belief that he hadn't much bought into until he returned to Korea and witnessed how different he had become from his extended family. Although he described himself as not "Canadian–minded" (lines 16-17 above), here his seems to accentuate his being "Canadian-minded" (line 17), positioning himself in relation to, and distinct from, his extended family members in Korea.

The data analyzed in Jun's text and interview highlight how identity is a local accomplishment. In Jun's narrative text, his identity as Generation 1.5 can be understood as constructed by his invoking several features associated with Generation 1.5 students: the relevance of non-Canadian birthplace, moving from one country and cultural context to another, being and becoming ESL, becoming a Canadian citizen, and his reported in-between cultural positioning in social life. Jun's account resonates with Murie and Fitzpatrick's study (2009), who described Generation 1.5 as having to "juggle the simultaneous and sometimes contradictory demands and pressures of the multiple social worlds they inhabit, including family, community, workplace, and campus" (Murie & Fitzpatrick, 2009, p. 164). Jun's faux pas at the restaurant suggests that moving from a Korean home cultural context to the Canadian cultural context caused Jun to experience discontinuities between his cultures, languages, and social practices (Kim & Duff, 2012). Equally significant was how Jun's identities were co-constructed interactionally in the interview with me. Jun's poignant response ("That's we::↑ird right?") of my co-constructing him relationally as "from Korea but Canadian citizen" seemed to lead to his positioning of himself as not "truly" Korean nor Canadian-minded. The account of his visit to Korea also underscores how Jun's identities have evolved over time, changing with ongoing reflection and changing senses of self (Norton, 2013): "wow, this environment actually changed people" (lines 26- 26).

In this chapter, I illustrated how Kerstin, Eva, Tiffany and Lisa, and Jun did things with identities as social categories that exemplify what I understand as cultural in-between-ness. Despite having Canadian citizenship, Kerstin reportedly felt out of place in Canada

because she perceived her ethnicity, language, and visual appearance as different from the Canadian norm: "That's not me, (.) I don't fit that", line 119). Equally significant was the finding that in Korea and "here" in Canada, Kerstin's sense of self seemed to be impacted by how she positioned herself (as a visible majority in Korea, but as a visible minority in Canada) and is positioned by cultural discourses of normativity (in Korea) and otherness (here). In ways similar to Kerstin, Eva's sense of self appeared strongly linked to her "old world" culture. Her deployment of location categories organized concentrically according to nearness (here in Canada) and farness (back there in my old world) can be understood as locating herself in the middle, in the context of talking about Oudenhoven's (2007) quote. Like Kerstin's struggle to fit in, Eva's identities can be understood as site of struggle "constructed across time and space" (Norton, 2013, p. 45). Like Kerstin and Eva, the interview with Tiffany and Lisa provided important insights into how identity construction is tied to (perceived) differences in language, visual appearance, identity, and ethnicity. In the context of discussing what Generation 1.5 meant to them, Tiffany and Lisa constructed what can be understood as "identities of distinction" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) hierarchically located in-between what they understood as the mainstream and the social type "All Asian/fobby people." The notion that identities are a site of struggle (Norton, 2013) was evident in how Tiffany and Lisa represented themselves to me as not part of the "Canadian mainstream" (lines 08-09) despite their display of interactional proficiency. That they jointly constructed a category-bound *a priori* relationship between themselves and in-between-ness in increasing degrees of liminality was surprising, suggesting that ideas and beliefs associated with immigration, racism, discrimination, power, and legitimacy circulating in Canadian society significantly impact Tiffany and Lisa's identities as Generation 1.5 university students. The data also underscore identity as a dynamic, fluid, social process structured across time and space (Hall, 1996; Norton, 2000; 2013), changing with ongoing reflection and changing senses of self.

Similar to the Korean Generation 1.5 students in Kim and Duff (2012), Jun and Kerstin reportedly experienced discontinuities between their cultures, languages, and "normal" social practices. Like Kerstin, who had to surrender her Korean citizenship, which for her seemed to represent her identity as a Korean, Jun reportedly had to "give

up a lot," and "leave everything behind" in Korea. For Jun and Kerstin, difference seemed to be a key determiner in the processes of their identity construction (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). By recognizing and emphasizing how living in Canada had "actually" changed him, like Tiffany and Lisa, Jun interactionally accomplished an "identity of distinction" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) as more "Canadian-minded" compared to his family members in Korea. Yet difference in Jun's case may be less about "being Korean" as opposed to "being Canadian" or vice versa. It may be more about his perception that he had become in many ways (mindset, personality, goals, achievements) "much different" (line 24-25) than them. This finding suggests that Jun is less aware of how he has changed in Canada, but when he visits Korea the difference is more marked and comes to the fore. Finally, that all participants I interviewed in this chapter sited themselves in the middle is best understood as a "dynamically created thing" (Heritage, 2005, p. 105) designed *for* and *of* their interaction with me.

        In this chapter, I demonstrated how the participants, in their interactions with me and in texts assigned for class, produced identities that can be understood as in the middle between their countries of birth and Canada. I now turn to my final data chapter, *Old Me, New Me Identities.*

Chapter 8.   Old Me, New Me Identities

So far, this thesis has presented data that represents what I understand as *Identities from There, Here* (Chapter 6), and *Identities in the Middle* (Chapter 7). As was mentioned in Chapter 6, maintaining a close connection to a country, language, and culture associated with "home" seemed to significantly impact how Chloe, Samantha, and Jun represented themselves and others. In Chapter 7, I illustrated how Kerstin, Eva, Tiffany and Lisa aligned with identities different from the "mainstream" in terms of language, visual appearance, and ethnicity. The final data chapter of this dissertation (Chapter 8) focuses on identities that represent what I understand as "this-is-who-I-was back-then-but-this-is-who-I-am (becoming)-now-type identities, which I have thematized as *Old Me, New Me identities*.

I first present my analysis of Tiffany's contribution to the first focus group discussion held in Spring, 2012, with Wayne, Tiffany, Abbey, and Stefanie. I illustrate how Tiffany constructs herself as an outgoing, confident student who has "found herself again." Following this, I focus on three journal entries Tiffany kept (at my request) organized chronologically: *before* returning to Taiwan (for the first time in 12 years), *during* her time in Taiwan, and *after* she returned to Canada. I demonstrate how Tiffany downplays her "old me" Taiwanese identity and emphasizes a shared sense of belonging to the Generation 1.5 community ("new me"). Next, I present one interview extract with Wayne, highlighting what I understand to be a critical moment in his language learning trajectory. I demonstrate how Wayne indexes a "new me" type of identity by telling a story from his past about forgetting how to write some words in Mandarin, which caused him to have, in his words, an "identity crisis." I then return to the paper Chloe wrote for an Education course she took at CPU, which I analyzed in Chapter 6, and present my analysis of the first two introductory paragraphs (254 words). I demonstrate how Chloe represents herself as a hardworking immigrant/ESL student in the past and as a successful CPU university student now. I then return to the focus group data with Wayne, Abbey, Tiffany, and Stefanie, and illustrate how these students indirectly index a stance that more closely aligns with "local and mainstream" by directly indexing a stance distinct from, in their

terminology, "FOB" (Fresh off the Boat) through category-based attribution of non-linguistic features they commonsensically link to FOB. Finally, I present my analysis of an image—artwork by Genevie. To interpret this visual data, I draw on Sack's (1992) notion of the action of the "glance" to highlight the link Sacks saw between interlocutors' observations of each other's actions and interpretation of each other's motives. I illustrate how Genevie assembles membership categories and location categories (i.e., geographical locations which refer to places, generate distinctions, and provide inferences and predicates) to construct her identities as a social phenomenon (Lepper, 2000).

8.1. Tiffany

In this section, I focus on Tiffany's interaction in focus group one. The other participants present were Wayne, who did not know any of the other participants, and Abbey and Stefanie (Writing Centre volunteers who knew each other before the focus group). Tiffany did not know any of the other participants in the group. Following my analysis, I present my analysis of data from Tiffany's journal, in which she describes her thoughts and experiences before, during, and after her first trip back to Taiwan since she came to Canada twelve years ago.

My first prompt was designed to investigate what meanings participants ascribe to their identities and how discourses of Generation 1.5 may manifest in their lives. After a round of introductions, I asked participants to read the following descriptions of Generation 1.5 from the applied linguistics literature:

> These are students who are truly caught in the middle—between languages, cultures, and classrooms. (Oudenhoven, 2006, p. 243)

> Generation 1.5 students, by definition, are situated "between cultures". They must juggle the simultaneous and sometimes contradictory demands and pressures of the multiple social worlds they inhabit, including family, community, workplace, and campus. (Murie & Fitzpatrick, 2009, p. 164).

> These students [are often positioned] somewhere "between" first and second generation immigrants when they may have experiences,

characteristics, and educational needs which, in fact, differ markedly from both of these groups. (Roberge, 2002, p. 108)

I then asked:

What might these quotes mean to you in terms of ideas of self? What do you think about each definition? Do you agree, disagree, or partially agree/disagree and why? What does and does not resonate with you and why?

Tiffany is the first to respond to the prompt. Her utterance is significant, not so much for what she says, but for the timing of her utterance and what it interactionally accomplishes for her in terms of identity.

Excerpt 8.1. Tiffany focus group extract: Find myself again

```
01   Tiffany   I think all of them somehow applied here.

02   Tim       All of them::

03   Tiffany   like somehow fits in.

04   Tim       Can you give us an example?

05   Tiffany   Ya, like for example the fi↑rst one,

06   Tim       Ya.

07   Tiffany   um: languages, cultures, and class↓rooms (.), so of

08             course when (0.5) let's say when I first got here, I

09             couldn't speak any of the (.) any of the English

10             languages =so it was really hard to um: make friends.

11   Tim       Hmm:

12   Tiffany   and especially I went to the middle school a::nd there

13             was days where (0.2) I didn't speak a wo↑rd (0.5) in

14             sch↓ool (.), so it was really (.) it was really
```

```
15          different because (0.5) I used to be really out↑going,

16          and I felt like (.) I couldn't really express my↑self

17          (.) the way that I wanted (.) and of course there

18          would be a transition (.) to:(.) you know, wanting to

19          fi↓t in (0.5) so, I would try to:(0.3) do the things

20          that (.) are ex↑pected a::nd thinking that eventually

21          if I do things that (.)the (.) normal people do (0.2)

22          then I'll be able to find (1.0) I'll be able to find a

23          place to:: (.) socialize with people,

24   Tim    Hmm.

25          (2.0)

26   Tiffany  You know, find myself again, hehehe.
```

Tiffany's response that they "all" "somehow" apply "here" and "fit in" suggests that these descriptions apply to her. When prompted to give an example, she quotes Oudenhoven and begins an account (08-25), in which she mobilizes several features (shown in bold) and extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986) (in italics below) as resources indicative of what can be construed as a past and newcomer, ESL student identity. By framing her account around the notion of difference (line 15), Tiffany suggests that discourses of in-between-ness (as defined by Oudenhoven) problematically manifested in her elementary school life in Canada.

"when I first got here I **couldn't speak** *any*...**English**..." (lines 08-09)

"it was *really* hard to (1.0) um: make friends" (line 10)

"there was days where (.) **I didn't speak** *a* ↑*word* in school" (lines 12-13)

"I used to be *really* out ↑ going (line 15)

"I **couldn't** *really* **express my ↑ self** (0.5) the way that I wanted" (lines 16-17)

Taken together, these attributes/features/activities form what can be read as a relational category of self: a quiet, reserved, ESL student, who is not a normal student. But as Tiffany gives this account, with her emphasis on the past tense, she simultaneously invokes a new, outgoing, confident, no-longer-caught-in-the-middle, "normal" student, who is not afraid of putting her opinions on the line in front of strangers. The data presented here underscore Tiffany's identity as a social process that is fragmented, dynamic, fluid, changing, and subject to construction, negotiation, and hybridization (e.g., Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1996; Norton, 2000): "I used to be really out ↑ going" (line 15). Reed's (2001) theory of identity fastening and unfastening seems equally relevant here. By emphasizing how the different norms and rules for membership she encountered at school restrained her as an outgoing person, here in the present interactional context she accomplishes a relational identity as "normal" student (line 21), fastening her identities and claiming insider status for herself (Reed, 2001) in the presence of the other participants. The data suggest that Tiffany encountered different norms and rules for membership when she moved from one cultural context (Taiwan) into another (Canada). Her telling the group that she longed to "do things that (.) the (.) normal people <u>do</u>" (line 21) as a way to "find myself again" (line 26) can be understood as her part of the process of identity "unfastening" as she negotiated new and different cultural spaces and expectations in which "categories are not normalized" (Reed, 2001, p. 327).

At the time of the interview and focus group, Tiffany had not been back to Taiwan since she (and her twin sister, Lisa) immigrated to Canada twelve years previously. In Spring of 2012, Tiffany and Lisa returned to Taiwan for a visit. I asked both of them to keep a journal to record their thoughts and experiences before, during, and after their trip, but only Tiffany did so. Below is what Tiffany shared with me by e-mail.

Excerpt 8.2. Fragment from Tiffany's journal (Before)

---

01   I get along better with people who are like me – generation 1.5 because

02   we have more things in common and have more things to talk about such

03   as finding a balance between *two cultures.* Although I still feel that I am

04   "in between," I now recognized the benefits of having a dual national

05   identity because it is like having two homes. I have more options open to

06   me when I need to make a decision and I get to compare different things

07   to reach an optimal outcome. For instance, I may find a better working

08   opportunity with one more understanding of a language. Moreover, I am

09   more cultural sensitive because I have been exposed to very different

10   cultural norms.

Sharing characteristics ("people who are like me"), common interests ("things in common"), and cultures ("finding a balance between *two cultures")* are three reasons Tiffany provides (lines 01-03) about why she reportedly gets along better with other Generation 1.5 students "like me." Her appropriation of the Generation 1.5 research category and its theme of cultural in-between-ness seems to index my making this relevant in the interview and focus group she had previously participated in. In her second sentence (line 03), she backgrounds her feelings of cultural in-between-ness and foregrounds what she understands as the cultural fluidity and social capital associated with being/becoming Generation 1.5: the relevance of having a "dual national identity," two "homes," greater decision-making power, increased opportunities for employment, and enhanced "cultural sensitivity," due to exposure to "very different cultural norms" as they relate to Tiffany.

Excerpt 8.3.   Fragment from Tiffany's journal (During)

11   The two months that I was in Taiwan, I felt I was a foreigner who looks

12   local on the outside because I noticed that people wore masks on the

13   street and used umbrellas on sunny days. And I was very unfamiliar with

14	how things work around me such as the transit systems and the
15	interaction between people. It almost felt like a cultural shock all over
16	again, like when I first came to Canada. I felt that carrying a conversation
17	with a non-local was a lot easier than a local in Taiwan and same when I
18	came back to Canada. I felt easier talking to people who immigrated to
19	Canada and have medium understanding of the Canadian culture. As a
20	result, I find myself interacting more to non-Asians in Taiwan and
21	and interacting more to Asians in Canada.

Membership categories associated with "us-them" type identities seem to shape how Tiffany made sense of herself and others during her time in Taiwan: foreigner-local (lines 11-12), "non-local"-"local" (line 17), and "non-Asians in Taiwan-Asians in Canada" (lines 20-21). What Tiffany interprets as unusual social practices (wearing masks on the street and using umbrellas on sunny days), unfamiliarity with local social practices (how things work around me, transportation, interaction between people), and "culture shock" (line 15) are three reasons she provides about why she felt she was "a foreigner who looks local on the outside" (lines 11-2) in Taiwan. Despite being born and raised in Taiwan until age 12, Tiffany accentuates a "non-local" (line 17) Canadian immigrant (lines 18-19) identity. Difficulties conversing with "a local in Taiwan" (line 17), her ease at, and gravitation towards, "interacting more" (line 20) with "non-locals" (an inference-rich category which implies having "things in common" [lines 02] and speaking in English) and her "medium understanding of the Canadian culture" are three resources Tiffany provides in her account to make relevant a "non-Asian in Taiwan/Asian in Canada" (lines 20-21) type of identity. In the third and final section below, Tiffany reflects on her experiences in Taiwan back in Vancouver.

Excerpt 8.4.   Fragment from Tiffany's journal (After)

| 22 | I like the feeling of being back in Canada because I am already |

23	accustomed to the lifestyle here and I feel that there are more people
24	with dual nationalities. And I like to feel that I am part of a group instead
25	of an outsider.

Tiffany justifies her preference for living in Canada as opposed to Taiwan by referring to Canada's familiar lifestyle (line 22), multicultural diversity ("more people with with dual nationalities"), and feelings of inclusivity ("part of a group instead of an outsider"). In terms of how the three journal entries illuminate the theories and ideas in the literature review, the theme of this chapter, and my three research questions, in the *Before* data, Tiffany described herself and others "like her" me as "generation 1.5" (line 01), and represented herself as someone striving to find a "a balance between *two cultures* (line 03). She attributed meaning to her identity as a Generation 1.5 by describing herself as someone with a "dual national identity" (line 04-05) and "two homes," (line 05). In terms of the possible factors that impacted how and why she made this identity relevant, it is likely she may have wanted to show herself in a positive to way to me, as the researcher. Also, as a way to come to terms with who she was becoming (Hall, 1996), the data suggest that Tiffany set aside potentially more noticeable features of her identity in favor of "perceived or asserted similarities" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 383) with others "who are like me – generation 1.5" (line 01). While in Taiwan Tiffany saw herself as "a foreigner who looks local on the outside" (lines 11-12). By describing herself as a "foreigner" whose local connection to Taiwan is how she looks on "the outside," Tiffany seems to suggest that Taiwanese ethnicity informs who she is, but no longer completely defines who she is. She continues to pursue sameness by interacting more in Taiwan with people she represented as "non-Asians in Taiwan" (line 20) and "Asians in Canada" (line 21), individuals she perceives as sharing her "medium understanding of the Canadian culture" (line 19). Equally significant was Tiffany's construction of what can be understood as, from a theoretical perspective, "identities of distinction" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). Tiffany represented herself as distinct from local Taiwanese by orienting to what she saw as unusual and different (from a Canadian perspective) social practices (e.g., wearing masks on the street and using umbrellas on sunny days). This finding highlights the theme of

this chapter, *Old Me, New Me Identities*. The data strongly suggest that visiting Taiwan after 12 years caused Tiffany to experience discontinuities between her culture, language, and social practices (Kim & Duff, 2012). In her *After* entry, the lifestyle in Canada was reportedly a significant factor that impacted how she constructed her identity as a Generation 1.5 student. She also attributes meaning to her new identities by aligning with others she represented similarly as "people with dual nationalities" (lines 23-24).

8.2. Wayne

Having illustrated how Tiffany constructed a "new me" type of identity in the focus group and describing what she perceived as "similarities" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 383) with others "who are like me – generation 1.5" (line 01) in her journal, I will now move on to consider how Wayne makes a "new me" type of identity relevant in an interview by telling a story from his past associated with an "old me."   Born in Taiwan, Wayne immigrated to the Vancouver area when he was in Grade 8 (13 years old). Wayne spent a few years working after completing high school before coming to CPU so he was a few years older than the other participants. He described speaking Taiwanese, Mandarin, and English. Prior to the extract below, I asked Wayne about his background, his age on arrival in Canada, and his experiences in ESL classes in high school, which he reported were not helpful. He told me that he learned most of his English on his own by reading novels and playing the video game *Counterstrike* as part of a team of online players he described as "Caucasian," who he credited with helping him improve his spoken English. Wayne also told me he regularly visits Taiwan for extended periods (1-2 months). In describing the purpose of my study, I introduced the Generation 1.5 category (which he had not heard of before) and shared with him what I understand as at least two major ways Generation 1.5 have been positioned in the educational literature: stuck in the middle between languages and cultures, and/or able to shuttle smoothly between languages and cultures. While talking about his latest visit to Taiwan (about half way through the interview at 13:20), I asked Wayne whether he feels more Canadian or Taiwanese or equally both when he is in Taiwan.

Excerpt 8.5. Wayne interview extract: Who the hell am I?

```
01  Tim    So, when you go back to Taiwan do you feel (0.2) do you

02         feel (.) maybe a little more Cana:dian than Taiwanese

03         or equally bo↑th?

04         (1.5)

05  Wayne  Um:::

06         (2.5)

07  Tim    Or more Taiwanese than Canadian when you're in Taiwan?

08  Wayne  Well, sometimes I do get that identity crisis right, like

09         I feel like >maybe I'm Cana↑dian< (0.2) but (.) I'm not

10         Can↓adian (.) like (.) ya.

11         (1.0)

12  Tim    When you're back in Taiwan?=

13  Wayne  =When I'm back in Taiwan=or even here.

14  Tim    Ya?

15  Wayne  Like,

16  Tim    You said you have an identity crisis?

17  Wayne  Oh, ya, when I was in um: Junior high school.

18  Tim    Ya?

19  Wayne  Now I'm fine.

20  Tim    Now you're fine?

21  Tim    Tell me about that=how did that impact you (.) like that

22         identity crisis as you said=

23  Wayne  =>Like I cause I like< (1.0) once maybe (.) a:f::ter three

24         years=>three or four years after I came to Canada<, I
```

```
25        went back Taiwan and (1.2) like one day I was writing (.)

26        trying to fill in an application f↑orm (0.2) in Taiwan,

27        and it has to be in Mandarin, right, then I ju:st (0.2)

28        did not know how to write a couple words=>I actually

29        forget it cause you don't use Mandarin here< (.) to write,

30        right?

31   Tim  Right.

32   Wayne Tha::t's: (.) sort of hit me, cause like I was like

33        Hmm:>I'm losing my Ma↑ndarin sk↑ill<,

34   Tim  Hmm:

35   Wayne but in the meantime my English skill is >not that great<

36        So, >Who the hell I am?< hehehe.
```

Wayne orients to my turn 01 question with a lengthy silence, followed by a drawn out "Um::: (line 05) and a further 2.5 seconds of silence (line 06), which could suggest he may not want to volunteer an answer or he may need time to think. Wayne invoking "that identity crisis" (lines 08-09) seems to index the arguments I presented to him earlier about the different ways Generation 1.5 students have been positioned in the literature. Wayne accounts for his "identity crisis" (lines 08-10) by questioning his authenticity as Canadian regardless of the (Taiwanese or Canadian) cultural context he finds himself in. His account suggests that "here" in Canada (line 13) Wayne may see himself as positioned as a visible minority, while in the Taiwanese context, his place of birth, his Canadian identity is likely not as relevant. In my line 16 turn, I repeat what Wayne has just told me, attempting to hold him accountable, but he dismisses his identity crisis as just a temporary Junior high school phase. Despite my repeated attempts (line 18 & 20) to encourage him to elaborate, he repositions himself in the present as "fine" now (line 19). I then attempt a more direct line of questioning in turn 21. The lack of any gap between the end of my line 22 turn and the beginning of his line 23 turn, the increased speed of his talk (compared to his surrounding speech), the emphasis he gives to the words "=>Like and "cause," (line

23) and the full second of silence followed by his assessment "once maybe" seem to index Wayne's reticence to comply with my request. Half-way through turn 23, Wayne begins an account, but distances himself from the present by telling a story from the past when had to use Mandarin to fill out some official documents in Taiwan. Wayne allegedly forgetting how to write "a couple words" in Mandarin, what he states as the unnecessary role of written Mandarin "here" (in Canada), and his assessment of his English as "not that great" are three resources employed in the account Wayne provides about why, at that time in his life, he questioned his identity: ">Who the hell I am?<" (line 36).

Relating the data to the theme of this chapter and the ideas and theories discussed in Chapter 3, an important finding was Wayne relating his "identity crisis" (line 08) to an "old me" identity located in a specific time in the past ("three or four years after I came to Canada," line 24). This finding highlights the complex relationship between language learning, identity, and the social world: Wayne directly questioning his identity ("Who the hell I am?<") can be seen as a critical moment in his language learning trajectory, illustrating the notion that "language is the place where actual and possible forms of social organization...are defined and contested, yet it is also the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is constructed" (Norton-Peirce, 1995, p. 21). In terms of how the data shed light on my first research question, which sought to determine the types of identities and representations of self and other made relevant in the process of being and becoming Generation 1.5, it is plausible to understand Wayne's "old me-new me" identities as dynamically constituted through a social process characterized by fluidity, change, negotiation, and hybridization (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1996; Norton, 2000). These changes seemed to manifest in his life at a time when he questioned whether he could claim Canadian insider status for himself (Reed, 20010) as Taiwanese while living in Canada, the implications of which point to wider social discourses in Western educational contexts related to privilege, power, language, visual appearance, identity and ethnicity, and how these discourses may impact how he positions himself and is positioned by his social interactions with White Anglophones (Norton-Peirce, 1995: Miller, 2001).   In the Taiwanese context, his reported reticence to think of himself as Canadian may be related

to his familiarity with the local language, "a contingent marker of ethnic identity," and in some cases, "a key signifier of allegiance to [his] home nation" (May, 2000, p. 373).

8.3. Chloe

Chloe was 12 years of age when she immigrated to Canada from Hong Kong with her family. She completed six years of primary education in the Hong Kong public school system and Grades 6-12 in the public-school system in Canada before coming to CPU directly from high school. She described being fluent in Cantonese and English and visiting relatives in Hong Kong at least once a year. In this section, I present an analysis of the introduction (the first two paragraphs, 254 words) from the 15-page final paper written by Chloe for Education course she took at CPU. In Chapter 6, I presented my analysis of two paragraphs from the body of this paper, highlighting the processes by which she accentuated what I interpreted as a "core" identity as a Chinese immigrant student. Here, I illustrate Chloe's common-sense practical reasoning (Hester & Eglin, 1997) vis-à-vis her constructing an old version of herself as an ESL student and a new version of herself as a successful university student. Given that this paper was written for a credit-bearing course at CPU, Chloe's positioning of herself in this way could have been a strategy she employed to show herself favorably to her professor/TA (i.e., as a good, hardworking immigrant student) and get a good grade on her paper.

Excerpt 8.6. Fragment from Chloe's essay: Overcame the burden

01   Born in Hong Kong, I immigrated to Vancouver during my sixth grade to continue

02   my studies. When I first attended school in Vancouver, I was worried that if I

03   would be able to catch up with the learning standards in Canada; however, after

04   a long period of hard work, I have successfully overcame the burden and learnt

05   the materials that I needed to continue for my further studies in Vancouver.

06   Although it was difficult to learn a different language, luckily, I took some English

07   courses before coming to Vancouver; therefore, during my first day of school. I

08	was able to communicate with my classmates using few simple English
09	sentences. Today, I am a lucky university student studying in one of the well-.
10	known Universities in Vancouver.

Chloe's opening sentence makes relevant several themes associated with being a Generation 1.5 student: the relevance of non-Canadian birthplace, moving from one cultural context to another, age/grade upon arrival, and a disruption-continuation in formal schooling. Chloe beginning her essay in this way could be read as a strategy she employs to show her professor that English is not her first language so that this is taken into consideration when grading her paper, and equally strategic, to forecast her ability to offer valuable insights on the essay topic because he has been educated in two different educational systems. By emphasizing her initial concerns about catching up to new learning standards in Canada, she constructs herself as an immigrant student. In the following sentence (lines 03-05), however, she contrasts this potentially disadvantaged representation of herself with what can be read as an "Ellis island" type (Harklau, 2000) of immigrant in the next clause by describing herself as a determined, hard-working student who overcame challenges (in her words, "the burden") associated with being an immigrant student "after a long period of "hard work" (lines 03-04). She then constructs herself in the past in what can be read as a "beginning–level ESL student" by stating that learning "a different language" was "difficult" and attributing her success at being able to communicate with her new classmates "using few simple English sentences" to her "lucky" decision to learn some survival English before immigrating to Vancouver. Transitioning from describing her past difficult circumstances to the present with the sentence opener "Today" (line 09), Chloe marks a processual change in her identity construction. As a way to show her reader how far she has progressed, she describes CPU as a "well-known" university. Her assessment can also be read as a type of "apple polishing," validating her and her professor's membership in an academic community with (what might be inferred as) a higher than average amount of prestige and social capital. Excerpt 8.4 continues with Chloe where the previous extract leaves off.

Excerpt 8.7.   Fragment from Chloe's essay: Who I am today

---

11   Since I was born in Hong Kong and came to Vancouver, I have experienced

12   both Education systems in both places. The education systems in both of these

13   places are very different. In Hong Kong, the learning atmosphere is very strict;

14   on the other hand, the learning environment in Vancouver is much more calm

15   and relax. In my opinion, there is not a system better than the other, both of the

16   systems are educational in their own ways. It is these two systems that

17   made me a lucky university student now. In this paper, I will discuss the four

18   different social mechanisms of authority, reproduction, recognition, and

19   resistance used in these systems. Also, I will discuss how these systems are

20   important in teaching me who I am today.

Chloe begins paragraph two by making her non-Canadian birthplace relevant again, reminding her reader that she can speak to the assigned topic credibly because she has studied in two "very different" (line 13) education systems. Chloe's positioning of herself in this way can be read as authenticating her identity as "credible or genuine" writer (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p, 385). To accomplish this credibility and make relevant the sociocultural dimensions of her learning contexts, Chloe employs an affective and epistemological disposition (Ochs, 1990) vis-à-vis her proposition that classrooms in Hong Kong are "very strict" but classrooms in Vancouver are "much more calm and relax," which suggests her preference for learning in the Canadian context. However, in the following sentence, by making it clear that her assessment of classroom learning in these contexts is only her "opinion," and adding that both systems are "educational in their own ways" (line 16), Chloe represents herself as an objective, but opinionated academic writer. Chloe suggests that the processes of her identity construction as a "lucky university student now" were forged (in her words, "made me," line 17) directly through her experiences learning in both education systems. In lines 17-20, Chloe constructs herself as a competent academic writer (and significantly as a non-ESL student) in (at least) three ways: 1) conforming to academic convention by beginning with a purpose statement, 2) linking the

154

assignment task to her experiences with "these two systems," and 3) foregrounding how the paper will unfold, with a focus on how these two systems have informed how she understands "who I am today" (line 20). Contrasting the past with the present in each of her concluding sentences by employing the word "today," Chloe accentuates her "new me," CPU student identity, and relationally distances herself from her "old-me" ESL student identity (lines 09 & 20). Her competence as an academic writer is also evident in the ways she adeptly packages information in sentences through thematic progression (e.g., "It is *these two systems* that made me a lucky university student now"), co-ordination (e.g., "I was worried that if I would be able to catch up with the learning standards in Canada; however, after a long period of hard work, I have successfully overcame the burden…"), and subordination (e.g., "Since I was born in Hong Kong and came to Vancouver, I have experienced both Education systems in both places") and employs a variety of strategies to create strong links between her ideas and show her reader how her ideas are connected (e.g., referencing, lexical repetition, and linking words and phrases, such as "The education systems in both of *these places* are very different," lines 12-13; "It is *these two systems*" (line 16).

In terms of how the data relate to the theme of this chapter, *Old Me, New Me Identities*, my research questions, and the ideas and theories in the literature review, Chloe's construction of herself, on the one hand, as an immigrant/ESL student from Hong Kong, and a "new-me" identify as "a lucky university student" now (line 09) was a significant finding. The data suggest that Chloe's "old me" identity still informs, but may no longer primarily define, who she understand herself to be ("who I am today," line 20), and significantly, is recruited as an important resource to construct herself as a *credible* academic writer (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004). One unanticipated finding was that Chloe's representation of herself as a hard-working immigrant ESL student seemed to closely resonate with institutional representations of Generation 1.5 students in Harklau's (2000) study as "good kids"—well-behaved, hard-working, and persevering. In a similar way, Chloe's representation of herself in this academic paper as hard-working can be understood as shaped by ideas and beliefs which serve "to reinforce broader societal notions about the immigrant experience" (Harklau, 2000, p. 51). In terms of the types of

identities and representations of self and other Chloe makes relevant, a significant finding was her representing herself as having been shaped by her dual educational experiences in Hong Kong and Canada: "It is these two systems that made me a lucky university student now." Chloe's "long period of hard work" (line 04) and commitment to improving her English language learning (lines 06-07) may also be seen as an investment in a new social identity (Norton, 1997). This finding relates to Norton's (2013) point that identity is "how a person understands his or, her relationship to the world, how that relationship is structured across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future" (p. 45). Spanning two languages, countries, and cultures, Chloe's educational experiences can be understood as enabling her to understand her relationship to the world—who she was then, "who I am today" (line 30), how that relationship has changed across time (from elementary school to university) and space (Hong Kong and Canada) and, looking to the future, what she might become (Hall, 1996). As a text written for a credit-bearing course for a specific audience, the data also shed light on Chloe's processes of identity construction as a relational and socio-cultural phenomenon (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004). Positioning herself in a favorable way, Chloe constructs a "credible or genuine identity" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) as academic writer who can demonstrate the academic conventions of her discipline and competently address the essay topic because, as a Generation 1.5 student, she has been educated in both educational systems.

8.4. Wayne, Abbey, Tiffany, Stefanie

As was pointed out in the introduction to this chapter, I conducted my first focus group in Spring, 2012, which was attended by Wayne, Tiffany, Abbey, and Stefanie. I Abbey came to Canada from Beijing, China, when she was 11 years old after completing six years of formal schooling in Mandarin in China. She completed her Grade 6-12 education in the public-school system in Metro Vancouver. She described speaking Mandarin with her parents and mostly English with her friends at school. Stefanie was an international student from Germany who had arrived in Canada when she was 18 years of age after completing two years of high school in Metro Vancouver. She described being

proficient in German and English and being "more than ready" for university, coming from one of the top schools in Germany. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate how these participants use categories as resources to carry inferences and do implicative identity work related to the theme of this chapter, *Old me, New Me Identities.* Led by Wayne and Abbey, I illustrate how participants distance themselves from the social type FOB ("Fresh Off the Boat")—an identity Wayne derisively attributes to people from Richmond (a suburb of Vancouver)—and align themselves implicitly with "local" identities. This section contains five extracts of data beginning with my second prompt, in which I asked the group to imagine they were researchers writing a book for educators about Generation 1.5. I asked them to share their ideas about how they would to describe and/or introduce themselves to educators so that they might understand their experiences, characteristics, and needs. My line 01 turn begins about half way through the discussion at the 30:16 mark.

Excerpt 8.8. Focus group extract: Just like that

```
01  Tim     So you're the researchers now, what would you tell your

02          readers?

03  Wayne   Two capabili:ty.

                (kæpəˈbɪləti))

04  Tim     Sorry?

05          Two capabili:ty=like, so you know like in linguistic right,

                (kæpəˈbɪləti))

06  Tim     Ya.

07  Wayne   There's something called (.) code switch↑ing.

08  Tim     Code-switch↓ing.

09  Wayne   Ya, so >basically it means you speak two language, and

10  Wayne   you can switch it< (.) up and like depending where you are

11          or who you're talking to, right?
```

```
12  Tim     Ya.

13  Wayne   So, like for ME:::, it's just like that depending on where

14          I am, I'm switching using different identity.

15          (1.5)

16  Tim     Using a different ident↓ity.

17  Wayne   Ya::, Just like a Canadian one, or [like,

18  Tim                                        [Depending on the

19          language you use=

20  Wayne   =Ya:: and where I am.
```

Wayne starts the discussion, invoking a characteristic he believes is unique to the category Generation 1.5: "Two capabili:ty" (kæpəˈbɪləti). However, the way I treat his response (line 03) shows that it is a source of interactional trouble for me so I ask him to repeat (line 04). Wayne pronounces "capabili:ty" exactly the same way (kæpəˈbɪləti) as his first turn (line 03) and then uses the term "code-switching" (line 07) to elaborate. By glossing code-switching as "you speak two language and you can switch it depending where you are or who you're talking to" (lines 10-12), Wayne invokes a theme associated with Generation 1.5: the relevance of being bilingual/bicultural. The metaphor Wayne uses here to describe Generation1.5 contrasts sharply with representations of Generation 1.5 in the literature that construct Generation 1.5 as, for example, "in a kind of developmental limbo where they struggle with mastering elements of language and discourse" (Connerty, 2009, p. 111), or as people who "didn't even know the language" (Horning, 2004, p. 138), or are "stuck in a sort of interlanguage" (Blanton, 1999, p. 124). Immediately after my line 12 turn, Wayne emphatically attributes this feature to himself: "So, like for ME:::, it's just like" that (line 13). He then invokes location ("depending on where I am," lines 14-15) as triggering the change in his identity. Wayne's claim that he can switch his identities depending on where he is could be read as difficult for me to accept, as the lengthy silence (line 15) preceding my evaluation of his proposition seems to indicate (lines 16 & 18-19). Wayne, however, does not seem to notice, but instead

reaffirms his ability to switch his identities. As an example of an identity he switches to, Wayne invokes "Canadian" (line 17), invoking his identity as a Canadian citizen, but I interrupt him, preventing him from invoking other identities ("…or like,"). My inquiry (lines 18-19) questions Wayne's account and he reiterates what he understands to be a significant factor impacting his identity construction: "where I am" (line 20). Excerpt 8.9 continues with the focus group where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 8.9.   Focus group extract: Dress a little more Westerner

```
21  Wayne     Like, if I go to Richmond, I just change to my like Chin-

22            like=

23  Tim       =So it sounds like you are code switching the language

24            but maybe code switching the identity [as well?

25  Wayne                                          [Ya, cause it's

26            Richmond, right? hehehe.

27  Abbey     Hehehe.

28  Wayne     But if I like go to downto:wn, like, I know I will dress

29            more a little more Wester↑ner.

30  Tim       Oh, OK.
```

In the remaining three excerpts, categories, as well as their associated predicates, described by Hester and Eglin (1997) as "rights, entitlements, obligations, knowledge, attributes and competencies" (p. 5), become highly salient "in the local specifics of categorization as an activity" (Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 46). These features provide important insights into the processes of the group's identity construction in relation to others they see as different from them and directly informs my first research question. In his turn 21 turn, Wayne moves his account forward, identifying "Richmond" as a place where he undergoes an identity change. He begins to describe himself as Chinese ("like Chin-, like=" lines 21 & 22), but abandons this identity formulation part way, which I believe could be suggesting he may be uncomfortable describing himself as Chinese (He is from

Taiwan and returns regularly to visit) in the presence of the other participants, especially Abbey (who is from Beijing) and Tiffany (who is also from Taiwan). My line 23 inquiry interrupts Wayne, preventing him from invoking the category Chinese and may be seen as a way for him to save face (Goffman, 1967) by preserving his Taiwanese identity. Wayne treats my assessment of his code-switching as involving a concomitant change in identity as commonsensical: "Ya, cause it's Richmond, right? hehehe" (lines 25-26). His repeating the location category "Richmond" and ending with the tag, "right?" followed by laughter positions me and the focus group members as locals who would be expected to be able to infer the source/targets of his humour. Abbey's laughter in line 27 suggests that she understands the sociocultural meaning (Ochs, 1990) Wayne implicitly conveys about Richmond through his affective and epistemological stance (Ochs, 1990). Wayne continues his turn, invoking the location formulation "downtown," a place he seems to be familiar with and understands as implying a different set of expectations about how to behave, the most important of which he describes as "dress a little more Wester↑ner" (line 30). Wayne's making relevant the need to conform to a stereotypical dress code when he goes downtown can be understood as a strategy he adopts to avoid potential "accusations of inadequacy or inauthenticity" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 373) associated with what he indirectly indexes as what can be read as non-mainstream, marked social types. Wayne's dressing "a little more Wester↑ner" (line 30) can also be seen as performing important face-work (Goffman, 1967) by his taking "into consideration the impression [people in these places] have possibly formed of him" (Goffman, 1967, p. 5). By invoking these two location categories—Richmond and downtown—Wayne conveys meaning at two levels, one referential and the other pragmatic or contextual, and constructs me and the other participants as locals who share not only common geographical knowledge (referential meaning), but also cultural knowledge about how people who live in or frequent these places should, must, or do speak, dress, and act (pragmatic or contextual meaning). Excerpt 8.10 continues with the focus group where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 8.10. Focus group extract: Those Richmond people

```
31            (1.2)

32 Wayne      Cause (.) there's something called FOB, right? FOB,(0.5)

33            you guys should know, right? ((addresses the other

34            participants ))

35 Stefanie   He[hehe.

36 Tiffany      [Hehehe.

37 Tim        Something called FOB?

38 Wayne      FOB. F-O-B.

39 Abbey      FOB, FOB, Ya.

40 Wayne      Those look like those Richmond people, how they dress,

41            right,

42 Abbey      Ya, ya, ya. Very colorful and FOB.

43 Wayne      Richmond guys, Richmond girls, (0.5) they have a certain

44            way of (.) dressing.

45 Abbey      FOB is like, fresh off the boats.

46 Stefanie   Heheh[e.

47 Tiffany         [hehehe

48 Abbey      Like people w(he)o (.) like newbies here.

49 Tim        Newbies.

50 Abbey      Like people who can't (.) fit in.

51 Wayne      Like you can just [tell [from the way [(.)

52 Stefanie                     [Ya, exactly.

53 Abbey      They dr[ess.

54 Wayne             [They dress, they are not local.
```

```
55  Tim      But when you go to Richmond do you dress like them?

56  Wayne    Not really (.) intentionally, but like I would (0.2) um,

57  Abbey    Kind of like have the Taiwanese side on (.) right?

58  Wayne    Ya, well if I have a T-shirt that's more like Chinese

59           side, I would dress it to go over there.

60  Tim      So you dress to be more like them.

61           YA, BUT I WOULDN'T DRESS LIKE THAT TO GO TO DOWNTOWN.

62  Abbey    Hehehe.

63  Tim      Why not?

64  Abbey    People are going to say you're a FOB, hehehe.
```

After a full second of silence, Wayne delivers what can be construed as a punch line: "Cause (.) there's something called FOB right?" (line 33). Wayne solicits the support of the other group members, referring to them collectively as "you guys" ("you guys should know, right?" line 34), a category which interactionally makes relevant their joint Generation 1.5 membership. My turn 38 inquiry suggests I am unfamiliar with FOB and the social implications Wayne references. Wayne orients to my turn by repeating the category FOB, and utters each letter individually, treating me as not in the "know" (line 33). In her line 39 turn, Abbey orients to the category FOB as conveying "intelligibility 'at a glance'" (Licoppe 2015, p. 72): "FOB, FOB, Ya" (line 39). Abbey's joining in proves to embolden Wayne, as he then proposes "those Richmond people" as incumbents of FOB, treating the feature "how they dress" as a category-bound relationship (i.e., taken for granted; Sacks, 1972b). In this way, he treats Richmond as iconically representative of FOB (Irvine & Gal, 2000). By ratifying Wayne's assessment ("Ya, ya, ya") and adding the category feature "very colorful" (line 43), Abbey proposes that the feature "how they dress" is indeed the correct category-bound relationship. Wayne then collects "those Richmond people" as "Richmond guys, Richmond girls," constructing what can be read as a gender-inclusive archetypal FOB "figure" (Goffman, 1981) (see also Talmy, 2015), and proposes that it is their sense of style that marks them as FOBs: "they have a certain way of dressing"

(lines 43-44). In this way, he entwines the category feature "dressing" with a moral ordering, making this behaviour normatively sanctionable through category-based attribution (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015). In his line 40 turn, Wayne's use of the determiner "those" and the pronoun "they" ("Those look like those Richmond people, how they dress") positions the focus group members and "those Richmond people" in a bifurcated categorization (us and them) constituted by differences in appearance. In her line 38 turn, Abbey states: "FOB is like, fresh off the boats" (line 45). Abbey's definition proves to be somewhat provocative and funny at the same time as Stefanie and Tiffany begin to laugh uncontrollably. Abbey's next series of turns can be read as specifically designed for me, as I am the only one in the group who questioned what FOB meant (line 37). She expands her description, upgrading FOB to "newbies," the embedded laughter in her turn suggesting that she orients to the potential impropriety of her utterance, but nevertheless, continues: "Like people w(he)o (.) like newbies here" (line 48). She then constructs an implicit category-bound relationship between "newbies" and the feature "can't (.) fit in" (line 50). Wayne then re-enters the discussion, proposing that FOBs are easily recognizable as "not local" from the way "they dress" (line 54). Stefanie shows that she agrees with Abbey and Wayne's assessment, as indicated by her overlapping turn ("Ya, exactly") and Abbey and Wayne display their shared common-sense practical reasoning by jointly completing Wayne's initiated utterance, "They dress" (lines 53-54).

My inquiry in line 55 (orientating to "them") contributes to the co-construction of the FOB category from Richmond. Abbey orients to Wayne's hesitation (line 56) by proposing that when he goes to Richmond he has "the Taiwanese side on (.) right?" In this way, she seems to respond to Wayne's earlier hesitation to label himself "Chinese" (lines 21-22) and makes it possible for Wayne to employ facework (Goffman, 1967) for himself by acknowledging his "Taiwanese side" (line 67). Abbey's acknowledging Wayne's Taiwanese identity can be read as accomplishing important relational work between them by allowing Wayne to freely describe himself as Chinese, an identity position he adopts in answering my question in his next turn: "Ya, well if I have a T-shirt that's more like Chinese side, I would dress it to go over there" (lines 58-59). By describing Richmond as "over there," Wayne evokes a demarcation of familiar and unfamiliar spaces, the familiar

163

associated with what could be read as local, mainstream society (unmarked and normal) and the unfamiliar with the social group "newbies," or FOBs (marked and non-normal). In this way, he reduces "complex social variability to a single dimension: us versus them" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 384). Prior to this point in the talk, the participants, led by Wayne and Abbey, do not identify FOB with a particular cultural or linguistic group, but iconically link FOB to Richmond, suggesting that "they" are "not local" (line 54) by "their way of (.) dressing" (lines 43-44). But Abbey describing Wayne as "Taiwanese" and Wayne describing his T-shirt as "more like Chinese" may be understood as ideologically linked to beliefs about race, language, and immigration in the local context that align with FOB as newly-arrived Chinese speaking immigrants. When crossing "over there," Wayne acts out what could be read as a Chinese "line" (Goffman, 1967) by wearing more "Chinese style" clothing to fit in. Wayne agrees with my proposal in line 67, but then categorically makes it clear that he would not dress this way to go downtown. When I inquire why not, Abbey chimes in, proposing that Wayne's fashion choices will cause people to "say you're a FOB, hehehe" (line 71), potentially resulting in Wayne being singled out as a FOB from "over there." In this way, both Wayne and Abbey make wearing "Chinese-type" clothing downtown normatively sanctionable through category-based attribution (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015). Excerpt 8.11 continues with the focus group where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 8.11. Focus group extract: This fob thing

```
65  Tim        This fob thing seems like a bad word=

66  Wayne      =It [is a bad word.

67  Abbey          [it::: is a bad wo[rd.

68  Tiffany                         [Because you could become the

69             elephant in the room.

70             (2.5)

71  Tim        What do you mean, tell us more about that.

72  Tiffany    Like you kind of, (0.7)
```

```
73  Tim       As a FOB you mean?

74  Tiffany   Ya, because you just, like you kind of stand [out in the

75  Abbey                                              [Outsider,

76  Tiffany   back.

77  Abbey     ((claps hands together once loudly) FOB means outsiders,

78            nobody likes to be (.) an o[utsider.

79  Wayne                                [Alien.

80  Tim       Alien?

81  Wayne     I'm not trying to sugar coat it.

82  Abbey     Outsiders, ya, it's a very mean word, like one year

83            (.)when I was in high school my friend used to ask me,

84            ((quoting voice)) "Abbey >why are you hanging out with

85            those fobs<?"
```

I summarize the talk to this point as "this fob thing" (line 65). Rather than asking what kind of word it is, I propose that it is "a bad word." In his turn 66 utterance, Wayne appropriates my assessment and plainly states, "It is a bad word," as does Abbey, albeit in a slightly less direct, yet nevertheless emphatic manner. After playing a relatively passive role for the approximately two minutes that have elapsed since I introduced my second prompt, Tiffany suddenly interjects: "Because you could become the elephant in the room" (lines 68-69). Her employing this metaphor to explain why FOB is a "bad word" is met with 2.5 seconds of silence, suggesting that Tiffany may expect the focus group members to know what she references and offer support. My inquiry questions this assumption and Tiffany elaborates: "Like you kind of stand out in the back" (line 74). Her description positions FOBs as a highly recognizable ("stand out") stigmatized ("in the back") group. Orientating to the word "out" in Tiffany's explanation, Abbey starts her turn just before Tiffany ends hers, and in a sort of "ah ha moment," upgrades FOB to "outsider," claps her hands once, and declares "FOB means outsiders." In this way, she explicitly

constructs FOB as deviating from the norm and failing "to measure up to an implied or explicit standard" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 372). What Abbey seems to understand as the universal need to fit in and be accepted is given as the reason FOB is a bad word: "nobody likes to be (.) an o[utsider" (line 78). Wayne's line 79 utterance upgrades "outsider" to "Alien," derisively evoking a social other. Abbey and Wayne describing FOBs as outsiders can be understood as helping to implicitly establish their (and the other participants') social identities as "local" and part of the Canadian "mainstream" and the social relationship between them and FOB as "us versus them" (Ochs, 1990). The pitch rise on my line 80 turn can be read as indexing my assessment of Wayne's construction of FOB as "Alien" as inappropriate. Wayne, however does not orient to my affective stance, but rather implies that his views are the raw, uncensored "truth:" I'm not trying to sugar coat it" (line 81). Abbey then reiterates the meaning of FOB as "outsiders," but by reformulating FOB as a "*very mean* word," she directly indexes a more delicate affective disposition compared to Wayne's coarseness (Ochs, 1990). Abbey then begins an account by telling a story from high school when her friend criticised her for associating with students her friend perceived as deviating from the normative social group at her school: "Abbey >why are you hanging out with those fobs<?" (line 85). In this way, her friend proposes an identity she purportedly shared with Abbey—local—by positioning "those fobs" (line 85) against herself and Abbey, who she sees as "socially constituted as the same" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 371). Excerpt 8.12 continues with the focus group where the previous the excerpt leaves off.

Excerpt 8.12. Focus group extract: I can see myself being a FOB back then

```
86   Tim     Have any of you ever been called that?

87   Abbey   Oh, I was called that for like one year.

88   Tim     Who call[ed you that, Abbey?

89   Abbey   Everybody in my school, in my elementary school everyone

90           because I was a fob, I dressed differently, I spoke

91           differently and then how I acted was different so they're
```

```
92              like ((quoting voice)) ah:: what a fobby girl,(.) and just

93              like that.

94    Wayne     Like I stay in Vancouver for a couple of years, right,

95              and so like I always hung out with all ESL people.

96    Abbey     Me too. hehehe.

97    Wayne     So we all dressed a little bit different from the local,

98              like I used to have really long hair too.

99    Abbey     Hehehe, ya, ya I know.

100   Wayne     I mean I can see myself being a FOB back then.
```

In line 87, Abbey treats it as obvious that she would have been called FOB, implying that my inquiry questions what might have been presupposed from the story she just shared in lines 84-85 (Heritage, 1998). My turn 88 inquiry leads to a category based account, in which Abbey employs the extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986) "everybody" and "everyone" in her elementary school to substantiate how ordinary it was for her to be called a FOB. Dressing, speaking and acting differently from what could be taken as the "mainstream" are three resources recruited in the account Abbey provides about why she was routinely called a FOB by "everyone" in her elementary school. But by framing these actions in the past (dressed, spoke, acted), she constructs what can be read as an "old me" type of identity that was relevantly recognized in the past as "FOB" by her classmates. Abbey's account proves to inspire Wayne, as he begins to share a personal story from his past in which he reportedly "always hung out with all ESL people." By recruiting the extreme case formulations "always" and "all" and the category "ESL people" (line 95), Wayne substantiates his claim that he too was *once* a newbie, an ESL person, a FOB. Abbey shows her support for Wayne by also constructing herself as someone who also hung out with "ESL people" (line 95). Dressing "a little bit different from the local" (line 97) and having really long hair" (line 98) are two resources recruited in the account Wayne provides about why he *used to be* a FOB. By displaying an orientation to the "ESL people" (line 95) group in the past and describing himself as a

"FOB back then" (line 100) who "dressed a little bit different from the local" and had "really long hair," Wayne retrospectively indexes not only his past *old me* identity, but his current and future *new me* identity as "local" and part of the "mainstream" as well (Ochs, 1990). In this way, he is able to "redefine his prior contexts, that is to *recontextualize*, and anticipate future contexts, that is to *precontextualize*" (Ochs, 1990, p. 298). In both her turn 96 and 99 utterances, Abbey displays an orientation to the categorical relevances of Wayne's account as obvious and commonsensical, highlighting how membership categorization functions "as some kind of *generic* machinery, providing intelligibility 'at a glance,' for *any* member (Licoppe, 2015, p. 72).

In terms of the how the data connect to the theme of this chapter, *Old me, New Me Identities*, a recurrent theme in the data was a sense amongst participants that despite being positioned as, and even identifying with, "ESL people" (line 95) or "FOBs" (line 100) *at one time in the past* (old me), they no longer perceive themselves as "outsiders" (line 77) or "Alien" (line 79), but rather as a homogenous group distinct from FOB and closer to the so-called "Canadian mainstream" (new me). These identity categories were made relevant and held constant across sequences of talk by the participants' "exploitation of the *structures of conversation*" (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 3), illustrating the mutually informing relationship between the sequential organization of talk and the local production of identity in categories (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006). Wayne's account in Extract 8.5 of his location ("depending on where I am," line 13-14; 20) impacting his "code switching" capabilities (lines 13-14) led to a provocative discussion about the inference-rich location categories "Richmond" and "downtown" and the social types or FOBs (described by Wayne as "those Richmond people," line 40) who allegedly live "over there" (line 59). Significantly, by invoking these location formulations Wayne made his, and by association, the other participants' identities as "local" and "Canadian" (line 17) relevant to the interactional business at hand: how they might describe Generation 1.5 to educators (my prompt). This alignment with a local identity was indexical, occasioned, and interactionally accomplished vis-à-vis the participants' recruitment of presumed differences between themselves and FOBs—in particular what they understood as their "certain way of dressing" (lines 43-44)—to distance themselves socially from FOB and (re)position

themselves as locals who no longer, as Tiffany remarked, "kind of stand out in the back" (lines 74-75). As Wayne put it, "I can see myself being a FOB *back then*" (line 100, emphasis added). This finding corroborates the ideas of Bucholtz and Hall (2004) who suggest that "[T]he perception of a shared identity requires as its foil a sense of alterity, of an Other who may be positioned against those socially constituted as the same" (p. 371).

I now describe how the data relate to conceptualizations of identity and research on Generation 1.5 discussed in the literature review. Following this, I discuss how the data help to answer my research questions. The finding that identify is indexical, occasioned, and procedurally consequential in the here and now context of social interaction is consistent with other studies on identity as a discursive feature of social interaction (e.g., Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; Bucholtz & Hall, 2004; Hester & Eglin, 1997; Ochs, 1990). Together, these five data extracts provide important insights into identity as a discursive feature of interaction: "*who people are to each other*, and how different identities are produced in spoken interaction..." (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 6). Utilizing the discourse analytic principles of CA and MCA, I highlighted how identity is constituted in discourse in relation to the participants' descriptions of themselves implicitly as non-FOBs and other ("Richmond") people as "FOBs," "outsiders" and "Aliens," and the inferential resources they treated as being associated with these descriptions. These identities are best understood as "performed, constructed, enacted, or produced, moment to moment…" (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 49) for the business at hand—the interactional context of my prompting the participants to talk about how they would to describe and/or introduce themselves to educators as Generation 1.5 students.

One of the most interesting and unexpected findings was Wayne's claim to be able to "codeswitch" his identities "depending where I am" (lines 13-14), a process he described as "Two capability" (line 03). This result is consistent with Reed (2001) who suggests that identity is a process of fastening, unfastening, and refastening. Wayne wearing Chinese stylized clothing when he goes "over there" (line 59) to Richmond can be understood as part of the process of "fastening" his "Chinese side" (line 58-59) in order "to claim "insider

status" (Reed, 2001, p. 329) for himself. As a Generation 1.5 from Taiwan, Wayne fastening his Chinese identity in Richmond is reportedly straightforward: wear "a T-shirt that's more like Chinese side" (line 58-59). Given that Richmond has the largest percentage of residents who claim Chinese as their mother tongue (approximately 45%) and home language (approximately 46%) compared to other municipalities in the Metro Vancouver (Statistics Canada, 2016 Census), Wayne would not likely be seen as a visible minority in Richmond, therefore normalizing the processes of identity fastening as a Chinese. But when moving from Richmond to downtown, "where the norms and rules for membership [are reportedly] different" (Reed, 2001, p. 329), Wayne unfastens his Chinese identity and refastens what could be understood as a more Western version of himself, submitting to cultural expectations by dressing "a little more Westerner" (line 29) to avoid being identified as a FOB in a place where Chinese categories and FOB fashion is reportedly "not normalized" (Reed, 2001, p. 28). However, the data also suggest that Wayne's ability to "switch" or refasten to a "Westerner" (line 29) identity and maintain this "line" (Goffman, 1967) downtown is a more fragile process (which Abbey made relevant in line 64: "People are going to call you a FOB, hehehe") because Wayne may risk being perceived as a visible minority, or worse, as a FOB (line 64) if he doesn't dress the part. Thus, his ability to refasten his identity from Chinese to Western and be accepted as a local in the downtown context seems to hinge on his careful stylistic representation of himself as non-FOB or in his words, "a little more Westerner" (line 29). While Wayne invoked and defended a local non-FOB identity throughout the focus group discussion, his account nevertheless suggests that he might not align with "the mainstream" unless he outwardly dresses differently, something that Wayne seemed to painfully realize: "BUT "WOULDN'T DRESS LIKE THAT TO GO TO DOWN<u>TOWN</u>" (line 61). Thus, as Wayne (and Tiffany to a lesser degree in the focus group, but more significantly in the interview; see Chapter 7, Excerpt 7.9, p. 127) alluded to, the data suggest that Wayne's production of a relational local Canadian identity seemed to hinge on his maintaining the construction of a FOB figure from Richmond across sequences of talk, thereby representing a social order with FOB positioned hierarchically lower in relation to him and the other participants.

An equally significant finding was Stefanie's minor role in the unfolding production of the FOB figure. In these extracts, her contributions were limited to some laughter (line 43) and an emphatic ratification of Abbey's construction of a category–bound relationship between FOB and "can't fit in" ("Ya, exactly") in her overlapping line 52 turn. It seems plausible that Stefanie may not relate to FOB the same way the other participants do since as a White person from Germany she may not face the same kinds of racially-motivated discrimination as non-White newcomers to Canada. This finding seems to be consistent with Miller's (2000) study of Generation 1.5 Chinese students at an Australian high school. Miller found that the while the White immigrant students at the school did not have as much trouble fitting in, the Chinese students all reported feeling marginalized and discriminated against to varying degrees from their Anglo-Australian peers. Miller maintains their exclusion was based not only on their limited English ability, but more so on their marked physical appearance. In Stefanie's case, then, claiming a new Canadian for herself may not be as "disorienting" (Reed, 2001, p. 329) or complicated as Wayne, Abbey and Tiffany's accounts suggest and perhaps for this reason, she played a passive role in these extracts of focus group data.

The present findings in this section are in many ways consistent with Talmy's 2.5-year critical ethnography (2005) of "old-timer ESL" or Generation 1.5 students at a high school in Hawaiʻi. In particular, Talmy's 2015 study is relevant to note here. A significant finding consistent with the data presented in this section was that the local ESL students in Talmy's research distinguished themselves from lower English proficient students and their newcomer classmates through the construction of the identity category "FOB." However, the data in this section differs significantly from Talmy's study in that, rather than using "Mock ESL" to index "a racialized outgroup or 'foreign' persona" (Talmy, 2015, p. 356), the focus group members, led by Wayne and encouraged by Abbey, established a category-bound relationship between Chinese newcomers to Canada and what may be construed as "FOB-fashion" by explicitly associating FOB with "those Richmond people, how they dress" (line 41). While the local ESL students in Talmy's study performatively displayed their distinction from FOB through Mock ESL, the focus group participants displayed what they understood as (and what I ascribed to them in my prompt) a shared

171

social identity (Generation 1.5) distinct from FOB which aligned with what can be construed as closer to "local" by binding the features "how they dress" (line 40), being from Richmond (line 40), being "ESL" (line 95) being "Chinese" (line 58), and having "really long hair" (line 98) to FOB, and making these features normatively sanctionable through category-based attribution (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015).

In the context of my prompting the participants to talk about how they would describe themselves to educators, a common view amongst the participants was that while they reportedly could see themselves "being a FOB" or an "ESL person" "back then" (line 100) (see also Tiffany's account in Excerpt 8.1 of this chapter) they no longer perceived of themselves this way now. The processes of their identity construction can be understood as what Ochs (1990) has described as relations of direct and indirect indexicality, whereby participants indirectly indexed a stance that more closely aligned with social types associated with the "Canadian mainstream" by directly indexing a stance distinct from FOB through category-based attribution of features they commonsensically associated with FOB. It seems possible that by underscoring the many ways in which they perceived themselves as distinct from FOBs (i.e., not being from Richmond, dressing differently from locals, no longer having really long hair, no longer being a "newbie," not hanging around with with "all ESL people" (line 95), they manufactured "a common identity" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 371) as Generation 1.5. There was a sense amongst the participants of being hierarchically superior to FOBs. The data suggest that by aligning with local and mainstream identities, the participants were "not driven by some pre-existing and recognizable difference but by agency and power" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 371). A possible explanation for the "us-them" finding in the data might be attributable to their perception that they had become in many ways (e.g., length of stay in Canada, citizenship, local dress, "dual capability," English language proficiency) much different than newcomers. In terms of what may have motivated the participants to construct identities distinct from FOB, a possible reason may be found in an intersubjective tactic described by Bucholtz and Hall (2004) as "*distinction…* the mechanism whereby salient difference is produced" (p. 384). The data suggest that by explicitly attributing features to FOB that were different from who they perceived themselves to be, the differences between them

and FOB were "underscored rather than erased" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 384). These results would seem to suggest that through "the production of contextually relevant sociopolitical relations of similarity and difference…" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 382), the participants were able to construct "credible or genuine identities" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 382) as members of "mainstream" Canadian society and construct "[Those Richmond people" (line 40) as "incredible or non-genuine" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385) by assigning them the identity category FOB based on "how they dress" (line 40).

8.5   Genevie

Genevie was born in South Korea and completed six years or primary school and one year of secondary school in the Korean public-school system prior to immigrating with her family to Canada at 14 years of age. Her teenage years in Canada were reportedly a tumultuous time in her life, as she resisted her parent's decision to send her to a parochial school, and as result, she ended up attending two different public high schools in the Metro Vancouver region before coming to CPU to study Psychology. She described speaking Korean and English.   In this section, I present an analysis of an image (shown below) as a social phenomenon (Lepper, 2000) drawn by Genevie as a project in her high school Art class when she was 17 years of age. To interpret this visual data, I use the principles of MCA to examine the local production of identity. In ways similar to how interlocutors' routinely use "glances" (Sacks, 1992) to observe and interpret each other's actions and motives—something which Sacks (1992) saw as fundamental to human interaction, context, and culture (Lepper, 2000)—it is possible to see how Genevie enables her observers to see what meanings she attributes to her identities by representing herself as a member of the social classes she has in common with them. That is, by making relevant these identity categories, Genevie, as the one being observed, "sees what the observer is, and is seeing" (Sacks, 1992, p. 188). Equally significant, in referring to the action of the glance, Sacks (1992) maintains that "there are many whomsoevers, who are not members of this or that class, who are able to see what it is that one is looking at (Sacks, 1992, p 88). Sacks point underscores how MCA highlights member's common-sense practical reasoning (Hester & Eglin, 1997). In particular, this reasoning can be observed

173

in Genevie's use of location categories (i.e., geographical locations which refer to places, generate distinctions, and provide inferences and predicates) to make implicit "possible paths of shared understanding" (Lepper, 2000. p. 90) into the processes of her identity construction as a Generation 1.5 student.

Figure 8.1.   The Dream

Note: Artwork by Genevie. Used with permission.

Location categories that signal the presence of two (or more) languages, cultures, and literacies tied to her what can be observed as a dual Korean and Canadian national

identity are made relevant in the image. In the image, location categories can be seen operating on three levels: 1) left/right, 2) front/back, and 3) here/there.[12]

Left/Right. The architectural style of building and flag on the left, and what is likely understood as a totem pole on the right, are emblematic of East-Asian and Canadian (Northwest Coast Indigenous) cultures respectively and the kinds of activities that might ordinarily be expected to happen there. The text on the flag 東洋 (The Orient) and 韓国 (Korea) points towards South Korea as the setting, invoking a theme associated with Generation 1.5: the relevance of non-Canadian birthplace, as it relates to Genevie.

Front/Back. The geographic locations associated with the building, flag, and text on the left (Korea), and the totem pole on the right (Canada), and the kinds of activities that might be expected to happen there, are accentuated in the visual appearance of the two young women in the front centre, who the observer is likely to see as representative of these cultures. The woman to the left of centre wears a traditional dress (*hanbok*) associated with Genevie's country of birth, South Korea, while the woman on the right side of centre wears regalia associated with what can be understood as First Nations culture in Canada. Directly between them in the background is a large gate on a stone wall, and behind it, a building, the architectural style of both point towards South Korea as the setting.

Here/There. The two women appear to walk together along a wide path to an ancient gate in the stone wall. The woman in the *hanbok* seems to lead the way to the gate. An artifact used to "catch dreams" associated with First Nations culture is attached to the centre of the gate, its centre emblazed with a symbol associated broadly with the Eastern philosophy of ying/yang, symbolizing balance, and more specifically, with Korean national identity, as represented on the Republic of Korean flag. The gate is likely to be understood as a metaphor for new a beginning, of immigrating to Canada to start a new

---

[12] Inspiration for this way of structuring the data came from Lepper (2000).

life, which the viewer is likely to understand as "a dream come true" for Genevie. On the other side of the gate, the text (Canada written in Hangul and Japanese) point to Canada as the destination.

The first question in this study sought to determine what types of identities and representations of self and other are made relevant in the processes of being and becoming Generation 1.5, the second, to determine what meanings Canadian Generation 1.5 university students attribute to their identities, and third, to explore possible reasons why these identities are constructed. I will now highlight how the visual helps to answer these questions by referring to the ideas and theories discussed in Chapter 3. I will also show how the data relate to the theme of this chapter, *Old Me, New Me Identities*. First, by making implicit resources (likely to be observed as) associated with Korean history, language, and culture, Genevie accentuates her sense of belonging to a "core" national Korean identity (Phan, 2008). Although this "core" ethnic identity seems to clearly inform who she understands herself to be, it is possible to state that this identity no longer exclusively defines who she understands herself to be, but rather serves as a foundation on which she constructs a "new me" type of identity associated with what she understands as traditional Canadian history and culture. Second, as mentioned in the literature review, these results suggest that identity, as represented in the drawing, is a social process: fragmented, dynamic, fluid, changing, and subject to construction, negotiation, and hybridization, a finding consistent with those of other studies (e.g., Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1996; Norton, 2000). Equally significant, the image invokes several themes associated with being and becoming Generation 1.5, made relevant in Genevie's symmetrical and fluid representation of herself as navigating in, between, and across different cultural contexts. These findings also enhance our understanding of identity as a social phenomenon (Lepper, 2000), and as a matter of being and becoming.

In terms of the possible motivations Genevie might have had for representing herself in these ways, getting a good grade in Art was likely a significant incentive. Given that English is not Genevie's first language, the visual may have been an important way for her to express herself in ways that words may have prevented her from doing.

Theoretically, as mentioned in the literature review, Bucholtz and Hall's (2004) intersubjective tactics of *adequation* and *distinction* are important to note here. The first of these tactics, *adequation*, can be seen as functioning in ways similar to how Hee Young (who was also from Korea, see Chapter 6) made relevant her Korean community identity in my interview with her. It seems possible that the time Genevie drew this image (age 17, roughly three years after she immigrated to Canada) coincided with the problems at home she reported to me in my interview with her (data that is not included in this thesis, but described at the beginning of this section). Thus, the visual may have been an important way for her to explore who she was *becoming* (Hall, 1996) by symbolically representing her connection to a shared "community identity in the face of dramatic cultural change" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 383). Bucholtz and Hall theorize this action as "the pursuit of socially recognized sameness" (p. 383). This representation of herself may be understood not as "an objective and permanent state but as a motivated social achievement that may have temporary or long-term effects" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 383). In contrast, Genevie making implicit resources she likely wanted her observer to see as commonsensically distinct from Korea and symbolic of Canada (i.e., represented in parallel fashion in the geographical location on the right, totem pole, and First nations figure) highlights what can be understood as the second of these paired tactics: *distinction…*"the mechanism whereby salient difference is produced" (p. 384). By producing this distinction, but maintaining a sense of balance in how she carefully depicts these elements as symmetrical and harmonious, Genevie seems to underscore cultural differences, but significantly, retain a sense of being fully part of both cultures.

The purpose of this chapter was to illustrate how Tiffany, Wayne, Chloe, Lisa, Abbey, and Genevie did things with identities as social categories that exemplify what I understand as *Old Me, New Me identities.* Like Wayne, whose construction of "new me" identity was interactionally accomplished by his recounting an "identity crisis" (line 08) linked to language ("Who the hell I am?<", line 36), Tiffany made relevant a similar type of identity crisis by recounting how she "couldn't really express my↑self (0.5) the way that I wanted" in English (lines 16-17). Tiffany interactionally accomplished a new and improved version of herself as outgoing, confident, and now able "do things that (.) the (.) normal

people <u>do</u>" (line 21). These two cases suggest that as newcomers to Canada, Generation 1.5 students navigate complex social, linguistic, academic, and cultural terrain as they adjust to their new academic communities (Kim & Duff, 2012). The results reported here support the idea that "language is the place where actual and possible forms of social organization...are defined and contested, yet it is also the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is constructed" (Norton-Peirce, 1995, p. 21).

My analysis of Tiffany's *Before*, *During*, and *After* journal data and the introduction of Chloe's final paper supported current trends in applied linguistics research that conceptualize identity as a social process "structured across time and space" (Norton, 2013, p. 45), and shed light on my research questions. Tiffany's construction of herself while she was in Taiwan as "a foreigner who looks local on the outside" (lines 11-12) underscored the extent to which she saw herself as having changed. Finding meaning in this new self, Tiffany' described herself as more socially connected to others she perceived as more like her: "non-Asians in Taiwan" (line 20) and "Asians in Canada" (line 21), and "people with dual nationalities" (lines 23-24). Likewise, I demonstrated how Chloe accomplished a dual national identity by invoking what can be understood as categories and category-bound features associated with Hong Kong and Canada. I illustrated the theme of this chapter by demonstrating how Chloe represented herself as, one the one hand, as a former ESL student from Hong Kong, and on the other as "a lucky university student" now (line 09) to accomplish an identity as a credible academic writer (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004). An unexpected finding was Chloe's representation of herself as a hard-working immigrant ESL, which resonated with institutional representations of Generation 1.5 students in Harklau (2000), reinforcing "broader societal notions about the immigrant experience" (Harklau, 2000, p. 51).

I now turn to my summary of the focus data, which was perhaps the most interesting in terms of illustrating what identity categories were made relevant, how categories were held constant across sequences of talk by the participants' "exploitation of the *structures of conversation*" (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 3), and the mutually informing relationship between the sequential organization of talk and the local production

of identity in categories (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006). In the context of my prompting the participants to talk about how they would describe themselves to educators, a recurrent theme in the data was a sense amongst the participants that they were no longer "ESL people" (line 95), but more like what could be understood as "local and mainstream" (see also Talmy, 2015). This distinction surfaced mainly in the participants indirectly indexing (Ochs, 1990) a stance that more closely aligned with social types associated with the "Canadian mainstream" and conversely directly indexing a stance distinct from FOB. Through this process of indirect and direct indexicality, participants were unable to establish and justify power inequities between themselves and FOBs (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004). The data suggest that the participants orientated to a moral ordering by making wearing "Chinese-type" clothing downtown normatively sanctionable through category-based attribution (Reynolds & Fitzgerald, 2015). An equally significant finding was the way location categories and the category-bound features (dress) were employed by participants (mostly by Wayne) to construct "identities of distinction" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Talmy, 2015). Rather than driven by "some pre-existing and recognizable difference" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 371), it was found plausible that Wayne and Abbey's manufacturing of "a common identity" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 371) as Local ESL or Generation 1.5 was motivated by agency and power.

Finally, my MCA analysis of Genevie's drawing highlighted Genevie's common-sense practical reasoning (Hester & Eglin, 1997) vis-à-vis her use of location categories, which made implicit "possible paths of shared understanding" (Lepper, 2000, p. 90) into the processes of her identity construction as a Generation 1.5 student. The finding that identity is a social process, fragmented, dynamic, fluid, changing, and subject to construction, negotiation, and hybridization was consistent with current trends in the applied linguistics literature (e.g., Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1996; Norton, 2000). Equally significant, several themes associated with being and becoming and Generation 1.5 were made relevant in Genevie's symmetrical and fluid representation of herself as navigating in, between, and across different cultural contexts. These findings also enhance our understanding of identity as a social phenomenon (Lepper, 2000), and as a matter of *becoming* (our "routes") and *being* (our "roots), as defined by Hall (1996). The most

interesting finding was Genevie's making relevant features symbolic of Korean history, language, and culture to accentuate her "core" national Korean identity (Phan, 2008). It seemed plausible that this "core" ethnic identity, while informing who she understands herself to be, no longer primarily defines her, but rather serves as a foundation on which she constructs a "new me" associated with what she understood as traditional Canadian history and culture.

In the next and final chapter of this thesis, Chapter 9, I conclude with a summary of my approach, rationale, and methods as well as a synthesis of the major findings. I also summarize the answers to each of my research questions, address the limitations of the study, and suggest implications for teaching and learning and possible directions for future research.

Chapter 9.   Conclusion

In this final chapter, I include a summary of my approach, rationale, and methods as well as a synthesis of the major findings. I summarize the answers to each of my research questions, address the limitations of the study, and suggest implications for teaching and learning and possible directions for future research.

9.1. Summary and Rationale

My research objectives in this thesis were to contribute to applied linguistics research on language, culture, and identity by exploring the processes of identity construction for Generation 1.5 students in Canada, specifically at CPU in Metro Vancouver. Throughout the study, I referred to the participants as Generation 1.5, knowing that I may run the risk of essentializing participants' identities, and despite being uncomfortable with this category when it comes to how I know or think about the participants.

To conduct this study, I used qualitative methods. I chose a qualitative approach because it gave me the methods (interviews, focus groups, textual, and visual analysis) to engage in a more interpretative framework and interact more with participants versus being an objective observer. Qualitative methods were also in line with the ways in which I wanted to find answers to my research questions. I was transparent about my identity as a culturally and historically positioned researcher, and how my privileged position in a Western research context as White, Canadian, English-speaking male may have impacted this study and how our son's experiences with in-between-ness led me to this topic and positioned me well to conduct the study. I recruited thirty participants, all of whom immigrated to Canada during their preteen/teenage years after completing some years of formal schooling in their countries of birth. Participants were recruited from four researcher-generated categories: Writing Centre Students (6), Writing Center Volunteers (12), Academic Writing 101 Students (8), and Other (4). I limited my analysis of data to

contributions with eleven focus students: Chloe, Samantha, Hee-Young, Kerstin, Eva, Tiffany, Lisa, Jun, Wayne, Abbey, and Genevie. I organized my data into three chapters according to three major themes: *Identities from There, Here,* (Chapter 6*), Identities in the Middle* (Chapter 7), and *Old Me, New Me Identities* (Chapter 8). I choose these categorizations to reflect my interpretations of the diversity of identities and representations of self and other the participants made relevant in the data. I structured my sub-headings around the participants' names to highlight their reported experiences.

I conducted twenty-eight semi-structured interviews (Creswell, 2009; Mason, 2002) and three focus group discussions attended by 14 students. I interviewed each participant once in English, my first language, and the second or third language of the participants. I varied the approach I took with each participant in terms of prompts and data instruments. In total, I generated 17.86 hours of interview data and approximately 5 hours of focus group data. I theorized my interviews as social practice (Talmy, 2010a; 2011). Focusing my attention on both the whats and the hows of the interview (Holstein & Gubrium, 1997), I treated the interview data as situated, co-constructed representations, which involved "the generation of versions of social reality" and the "local production […] of versions of a moral order" (Baker, 2004, p. 163). I took the position that my interview data do not simply reflect participants' mental states, or mine, but perform social actions (Talmy, 2011). Although the interviews and focus groups were researcher-generated and not the type of naturalistic recordings of talk-in-interaction conversation analysts and discursive psychologists prefer to work with, a distinction that some conversation analysts see as somewhat blurred (Speer, 2008; ten Have, 2007), I aimed to conduct the interviews and focus group discussions as informal conversations as much as possible as a way to examine participants' interpretative reasoning practices. I transcribed the interview and focus group data using transcription conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (Wooffitt, 2001) to highlight both what and how something was said (Hepburn & Bolden, 2014). I chose to use the Jeffersonian system since it "makes most apparent the jointly constructed, socially engaged nature of what is going on, including the close dependence of what the interviewee says on the interviewer's question (and vice versa) in all its specifics" (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 289). I also collected data from participants' formal (an essay) and

informal (low stakes writing, a journal, and an e-mail) written texts and one visual image to gain more insight into their processes of identity construction.

To analyze the data, I adopted an interpretive, social constructionist (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) framework that utilized, in part, applied conversation analysis (CA) (Antaki, 2001) and membership categorization analysis (MCA) (Sacks, 1992; Hester & Eglin, 1997). I applied these methods to the interview and focus group data to examine the mutually informing relationship between the sequential organization of talk and the local production of identity in categories (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006). Using CA in this way as opposed to doing CA in the Schegloffian tradition (2007) with its agenda of "unmotivated looking" allowed me to move beyond just producing knowledge of the infrastructure of talk in interaction (the limits of a basic/pure CA analysis) and the theoretical room to adopt a more "'critical' stance towards current arrangements in society" (ten Have, 2007, p. 58). To analyze this textual/visual data, I used MCA to examine how participants used membership categories as culturally available resources to describe, identify, or make reference to other people and themselves. I demonstrated how the identities participants made relevant were indexical, occasioned, and procedurally consequential (Hester & Eglin, 1997). I used MCA because it allowed me to examine categorical (i.e., identity, my primary interest) rather than sequential issues, giving me "an empirically tractable method for studying [identity], as members', rather than analysts', categories" (Stokoe, 2012, p. 4). In this way, I was able to analyze the common-sense practical reasoning or "culture in action" (Hester & Eglin, 1997) participants made relevant in the data.

9.2. Summary of Research Questions and Synthesis of Major Findings

I organize this section around my research questions and synthesize the major findings within each question around three key, closing concepts: difference, belonging, and change.

9.2.1. Q1. What types of identities and representations of self and other are made relevant in the processes of being and becoming Generation 1.5?

Difference

I determined difference to play a key role in the processes of being and becoming Generation 1.5. Participants made difference relevant in how they represented themselves and others—in some cases in a bifurcated categorization (us versus them)—in terms of visual appearance, dress, language, mindset, social practices, personality, goals, and achievements. I determined that these self-representations were associated with the languages and social practices of their countries of birth, in liminal spaces among a continuum between Canada and their countries of birth, and a spectrum of related cultural representations. By recognizing and highlighting these differences in relation to others (Kumaravadivelu, 2008), I found that participants constructed "identities of distinction" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). I also determined that becoming Generation 1.5 caused participants to experience discontinuities between their cultures, languages, and social practices in their day-to-day lives (Kim & Duff, 2012). Instances of these discontinuities included losing the ability to speak the language perfectly, feeling pushed and pulled between cultures, languages and countries, marginalization from "mainstream society," not fitting what a typical Canadian looks like, feeling like a foreigner on the inside and a local on the outside when visiting one's country of birth, realizing the power of the environment to actually change people, resisting forging friendships with racially different people, and the sense of disillusionment caused by losing the ability to write one's first language while not making progress in English. I also determined difference was intimately connected with language, a finding which supported Norton Peirce's (1995) notion regarding language and the role it plays in defining our sense. These dilemmas associated with difference underscored the idea that identity as a site of struggle "constructed across time and space" (Norton, 2013, p. 45), subject to construction, negotiation, and hybridization.

9.2.2.   Q2. What meanings do Generation 1.5 university students attribute to their identities?

Belonging

The second key concept that I conclude with is belonging, which informed my second research question. I suggested that many participants attributed meaning to their identities vis-à-vis their first languages. In some cases, I found that parents, family members, and friends played a significant role in this process and shaped their identities. I determined that speaking first languages at home, with friends, at Chinese school, and other cultural events enhanced participants' group solidarity and contributed to the stability of their emerging identities as Generation 1.5 in Canada. I found that these first language practices reinforced their sense of belonging to a "core" (Phan, 2008) national identity and played a fundamental role in their identity formation (Joseph, 2004). I determined that the participants' first languages were an important resource for the maintenance of a sense of community away from "home," first language support and maintenance and related social practices, and for the construction of a "fun" space to engage in pre-established interactional norms. In addition to the role language played in the processes of identity construction, I determined that for some of the participants, their sense of belonging was in flux and conflicted. While I found that in some cases this conflicted sense of belonging was based on participants' perceptions White Canadians may have of them (e.g., visible minorities who do not speak English), in other cases I found liminality to be related to having to relinquish the nationality of one's country of birth in the process of becoming a Canadian citizen. In contrast, I determined that some of the participants constructed what could be understood as belonging equally to two cultures, two languages and two countries—not fragmented and stuck— (Oudenhoven, 2006), but as fluid, balanced and symmetrical. I found that this identity construction was accomplished through the use of membership categories that represented (what was likely understood as) two cultures, and through the use of location categories to refer to places, generate distinctions, and provide inferences and predicates to make implicit "possible paths of shared understanding" (Lepper, 2000, p. 90). In contrast, for the focus group members, I found

186

that that belonging was relational: us (local and mainstream) and them (Other/FOB), a distinction constructed by category-based attribution of non-linguistic features (dress).

9.2.3. Q3. What motivates university students to construct their identities as Generation 1.5?

Change

In terms of the possible motivations behind their identity constructions, I determined that change was a major finding that motivated individuals to "claim insider status" for themselves (Reed, 2001, p. 329) in a new, unfamiliar cultural context in Canada where they faced different "norms and rules for membership" (Reed, 2001, p. 237). In some cases, participants were motivated to pursue relationships with others who spoke the same first language/language other than English and engaged in the same social practices in order to maintain a sense of "core" cultural (Phan, 2008) distinctiveness. In other cases, participants were motivated to represent themselves as different from others they saw as socially distinct from them in terms of dress, place of residence, length of stay in Canada, and English proficiency. I determined that this behaviour was motivated not by "some pre-existing and recognizable similarity but by agency and power" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 371) and was "more situationally relevant" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 383). This corroborated the ideas of Bucholtz and Hall (2004), who suggest that "[T]he perception of a shared identity requires as its foil a sense of alterity, of an Other who may be positioned against those socially constituted as the same" (p. 371). I determined that participants' representations of self and others were not objective and permanent but motivated social achievements (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004).

Belonging was informed by language, and in some cases, by participants' construction of "credible or genuine" identities (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 385). In other cases, I found that identity construction was related to individuals' circumstances. For example, I determined that in some cases not being able to converse with English speaking locals and in other cases learning in classrooms for the first time with students from other ethnic groups were factors that pushed participants towards forging friendships

with others with whom they felt an affinity. Thus, I determined that for some of the participants, representation, meaning, and motivation were tied to first language social practices, "the place where [their] sense of [themselves], [their] subjectivity, is constructed" (Norton-Pierce, 1995, p. 21). Some of the participants constructed "identities of distinction" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) outside of the Canadian "mainstream" in an attempt to create a place of belonging for themselves driven by "agency and power" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 371) below "Canadian mainstream" but hierarchically above newcomers or those they described as "FOB" (Fresh Off the Boat). I also determined that the processes of participants' identity construction were motivated by changes brought about by moving to Canada. As a major finding, change was related to participants' motivation to construct identities that were more Canadian–minded and outgoing compared to friends and family in their countries of birth. Others were motivated to display how much they had changed and constructed identities as new, outgoing and confident as opposed to quiet, reserved, and ESL. Others were motivated to represent themselves as having undergone an extraordinary processual change in identity construction from ESL to student of a "well-known" university. I determined that this new and changed identity construction was a social process, fragmented, dynamic, fluid, changing, and subject to construction, negotiation, and hybridization (e.g., Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1996; Norton, 2000).

9.3. Limitations of the Study

The findings in this study are subject to at least three limitations. First, framing my study around an analyst's category (Generation 1.5) while applying CA/MCA concepts to study identity as a member's resource was a limitation and methodological challenge I faced. Although I strived to privilege the participants' perspectives by highlighting the categories that the participants invoked and/or make relevant and their understandings about those identity categories, my wanting to privilege the participants' perspectives in my interviews was not entirely possible. As the researcher, I initiated everything from my position of power and for my research aims. A second limitation was related to my data instrument. When I introduced a category, such as Generation 1.5, I did so with the specific purpose of understanding how participants worked with this research category.

Rather than taking the meaning of Generation 1.5 for granted, I made the category open for discussion. However, my introduction of problematic representations of Generation 1.5 students from the applied linguistics literature in some of my early interviews and focus groups was another limitation to consider. While I am able to justify these prompts as a way to elicit information that might cast light upon how participants understood the possible implications of these discourses as they manifest in their lives, the prompts inevitably affected how the participants responded, and with this "expert knowledge" and my position of power and seniority, it may make it more likely that they reproduced these discourses. This limitation means that the study findings need to be interpreted cautiously. A third limitation of this study is that most of the data I generated was through interviews and focus groups in an institutional setting. Moreover, Chloe's essay, although not produced for my research, was produced for her credit-bearing course, which may have influenced how she represented herself to get a good grade. Conducting some in-class observations and or recording class interactions and off campus interactions (domestic settings) may have provided me additional understandings of how this group of Generation 1.5 students constructed their identities. These are issues for future research.

9.4. Implications for Teaching, Learning, and Research

The findings of this study suggest several implications for teaching, learning, and research. First, in terms of teaching and learning, the study highlights the complexity of the identities of multilingual students. This complexity can be understood as problematizing modernist assumptions embedded in formal schooling related to language, culture, and generational status as cultural identifier that persist in variety of ways such as: the (unproblematic and undertheorized) practice of naming and labelling students, often associated with identities that invoke deficit, remedial discourses; traditional monolingual-oriented curricula and teaching beliefs and practices; and a lack of targeted curricular strategies that acknowledge and address the learning needs of multilingual immigrant students. These assumptions can be understood as being associated with "the demarcation of nation states through a national language (one language=one nation=one culture), with native speakers being representative of a homogeneous speech community"

(Byrd Clarke, 2016, p. 4). The findings of this study suggest that alternative disciplinary thinking—what Byrd Clark (2016) refers to as "transdisciplinary approaches" (p. 5)—particularly as they concern language, teaching, and learning are, necessary in these postmodern times of mass migration and increasing immigration.

Thus, there is a need for various units on university campuses—faculty, staff, and administrators across disciplines to work collaboratively to support the learning needs of multilingual/translingual students in tangible ways, rather than, for example, dealing with "the ESL problem" in piecemeal manner, and/or assuming that supporting students academically is the sole (co-curricular) responsibility of units such as Writing Centres on campus. My research suggest that is time to discontinue the remedial, deficit model and adopt a holistic approach that embraces the complexity of immigrant students' identities and social practices, and acknowledges their diverse linguistic repertories as asserts rather than as problems.

Second, in terms of my chosen methodology, there is a general view that (basic) CA is overly formal and micro analytic (e.g., see Billig, 1999), and as a result, works with a restricted notion of social context. CA's insistence that analysts remain neutral and refrain from imposing an interpretation on the data that the participants themselves do not orient to—what Stokoe & Smithson (2001) refer to as approaching the data with a "clean gaze" (p. 6) —is often regarded as naïve (Billig, 1999). In contrast to basic CA's aim to produce knowledge of the infrastructure of talk, applied/institutional CA and MCA provides analytic value to "support efforts to make social life 'better' in some way" and provide data-based analytical suggestions for, or critiques of, the ways in which social life can be organized" (ten have, 1999, p. 162). This is because applied/institutional CA and MCA can illuminate how and why ideas and beliefs related to broader "macro-level" forms of social organization such as power, discrimination inequality, racism are transcended in and through talk, texts (Baker, 2000), and social interactions. Further, with its focus on the commonsense practical reasoning members of society routinely use in text and talk, including matters of morality (Jayyusi 1991), MCA's culture-in-action approach (Hester & Eglin, 1997) could also be utilized in the training of student volunteers and staff who work

closely with both domestic and international multilingual students by providing an alternative framework from which to examine culture. As Baker (2000) notes, situating culture inside action:

> …is a release and relief from conventional formulations of culture—as the way of life of a group, including norms, values, artefacts etc.—that are prevalent at least in the field of education. It is a relief from the weight of a notion of culture where people 'share' and things, connect and ideas relate, and a release from a unitary notion of culture as a single thing that a group has […]. Situating culture inside action opens the possibility of seeing the different, competing ways in which culture might be done. (p. 101)

Further, MCA has proven to be an important qualitative method in program evaluation and planning (Paulsen, 2018) by allowing "evaluators to gain insight into the boundaries individuals adhere to and/or adopt because of their category" (Paulsen, 2018, p. 138). Thus, MCA may prove fruitful in the training of Writing Centre student mentors, helping them understand, at a deeper level, how their volunteer roles entail boundaries— e.g., the rights, entitlements, knowledge, obligations, responsibilities—by elucidating this taken-for-granted information.

Additionally, this study contributes to much needed empirical research on identity that combines principles of CA and MCA research. By demonstrating how "both the sequential and categorizational aspects of social interaction inform each other" (Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 2), this study heeds Stokoe's (2012) call for further studies that utilize MCA principles to provide a "clear approach to the identification of robust, systematic categorical practices" (p. 6). Stokoe (2012) argues that these types of studies are necessary for MCA's survival as a respectable discipline on its own or within CA. Stokoe (2012) does not distinguish between "naturalistic" and "contrived" data, but suggests that in order to do MCA, as a first step, researchers "collect data across different sorts of domestic and institutional settings" (p. 280). The data she provides as examples in her article include a variety of domestic and institutional online interactions such as radio broadcasts, web forums, television programs (including a scripted extract from an episode from the American TV sitcom *Friends*), and news interviews.

Third, there is a need for more research that explores the languages, cultures, and literacies of Canadian multilingual immigrant students. According to Roessingh & Douglas, 2012), Canadian generation 1.5 students represent "an emergent profile of learner long recognized in Canada, but not adequately addressed in the research in the Canadian context" p. i). Although much has been written on Generation 1.5 students in US Writing and ESL contexts in higher education, in Canada "issues of migration, socio-economic class, multilingualism, and schooling are often interwoven differently" (Marshall & Lee, 2017) so additional studies that address the Canadian context are needed. Further research would also benefit from studies in Canadian contexts that build on Harklau's (2000) study of *identity in movement* (p. 41). Studies that focus on Generation 1.5 students as they transition from high school to university could help educators and administrators better understand the needs of incoming Generation 1.5 students, advocate for them, and promote the development of targeted strategies and policies to support them.

Finally, there is also a need for more research that problematizes the practice of naming and labelling EAL students. Thesen (1997) reminds us, however, that "naming is inevitable and useful: equitable educational policy cannot happen without it. But the categories have to be kept open and their role in creating a discourse needs to be understood" (p. 490). Upon reflection, although I attempted to justify my use of the label Generation 1.5 as a way to contribute to a discussion among researchers and educators about the complex identities of Generation 1.5 students, I found that the participants' identities, as complex constructions, could not be easily defined or neatly categorized. As a result, I may have inadvertently reduced the identities of the participants to essentialist reifications (Marshall & Lee, 2017) by insisting on using the Generation 1.5 moniker. This is an issue for further research and discussion. Thus, researchers need to exercise caution around the use of the labels, find ways to understand the complexity of immigrant students, avoid reifying and generalizing about them, and not see them as stuck-in-between or lacking. A shift is needed, then, in how research is conducted, published, and disseminated—in ways that take into account the complex cultural hybridity and multiple identities of immigrant students.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* New York and London: Verso.

Antaki, C. (2011). Six kinds of applied conversation analysis. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk* (pp. 1–14). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Identities in talk.* London: Sage.

Antaki, C., Billig, M., Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (2003). Discourse analysis means doing analysis: A critique of six analytic shortcomings. *Discourse analysis online 1*(1), 1-24.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Baker, C. (2000). Locating culture in action: Membership categorization in texts and talk. In A. Lee & C. Poynton (Eds.), *Culture & text: Discourse and methodology in social research and cultural studies* (pp. 99-113). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Baker, C. (2002). Ethnomethodological analyses of interviews. In J. F. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and methods* (pp. 777-795). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baker, C. (2004). Membership categorization and interview accounts. In D. Silverman, (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 140-161). London: Sage.

BC Immigration Trends (2010). Highlights. Policy and Decision Support Branch. Retrieved from http://time.welcomebc.ca/welcome_bc/media/Media-Gallery/docs/communities/immigration_trends_2010.pdf

Benesch, S. (2007). What about the students? English language learners in postsecondary settings. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*, Part Two (pp. 655-667). New York: Springer.

Benesch, S. (2008). Generation 1.5 and its discourses of partiality: A critical analysis. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education (7)*, 295-31.

Benesch, S. (2009). Interrogating in-between-ness: A postmodern perspective on immigrant students. In M. Roberge, M. Siegal, & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching writing to US educated learners of ESL* (pp. 65-72). New York: Routledge.

Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Blackledge, A. (2005). Discourse and power in a multilingual world. *Ch. 1: Language, ideology and power* (pp. 1-29). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Blanton, L. (1999). Classroom instruction and language minority students: On teaching to "smarter" readers and writers. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues of the teaching of writing to U.S.- educated learners of ESL* (pp. 119-142). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Blanton, L. (2005). Student, interrupted: A tale of two would be writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 105-121.

Block, D. (2002). Destabilized identities and cosmopolitanism across language and cultural borders: Two case studies. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(2), 1-19.

Block, D. (2013). Issues in language and identity research in applied linguistics. *ELIA*, (13), 11-46.

Bolden, G, (2009). Implementing incipient actions: The discourse marker 'so' in English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics 41*, 974–998.

Bolinger, D. (1978). Yes-no questions are not alternative questions. In Henry Hiz (Ed), *Questions.* Dordrecht, Reidel, 87–105.

Blumenthal, A. (2002). English as a second language at the community college: An exploration of context and concerns. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 117,* 45-53.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

British Columbia Teacher's Federation, 2012 BC Education Facts. Retrieved from http://www.bctf.ca/uploadedfiles/public/publications/2012edfacts.pdf

Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369-394). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction. A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies, 7*(4-5), 585-614.

Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2009). Locating identity in language. In C. Llamas & D. Watt (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Language and identities* (pp. 18-28). Edinburgh, Great Britain. Edinburgh University Press.

Byrd Clark, J. (2016). Transdisciplinary approaches to language learning and teaching in transnational times. *L2 Journal, 8*(2), 3-19. [Special issue].

Cameron, D. (2001). What is discourse and why analyze it? In *Working with spoken discourse*. London: Sage.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice.* New York: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2004). Subversive identities, pedagogical safe houses, and critical learning. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 116-137). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Central Statistical Office. (2000). *Housing and population census 2000.* Port-Louis: Government Press.

Cervatiuc, A. (2009). Identity, good language learning, and adult immigrants in Canada. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 8*(4), 254-271.

Chiang, D. & Schmida, M. (1999). Language identity and language ownership: Linguistic conflicts of first-year university writing students. In L. Harklau, K. M. Mosley, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues of the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 81-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Syntactic structures.* The Hague: Mounton.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2013). Immigration overview: Permanent residents. Retrieved from http://time.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/statistics/facts2013/permanent/05.asp

Clift, R. (2001). Meaning in interaction: The case of actually. *Language, 77*(2), 245-291.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed). London: Routledge.

Connerty, M.C. (2009). Variation in academic writing among Generation 1.5 learners, native English-speaking learners, and ESL learners: UK. The discoursal self of G1.5 student writers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham.

Coulter, J. (1982). Remarks on the conceptualisation of social structure. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 12(1), 33-46.

Coste, D. & Simon, D. L. (2009). The plurilingual social actor: Language, citizenship and education. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 6*(2), 168-185.

Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 20-35.

Darvin, R. & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35,* 36-56.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2016). Investment and language learning in the 21st century. *Langage et Société, 157*, 19-38.

De Fina, A. & Perrino, S. (Eds.), (2013). Transnational identities. [Special issue]. *Applied Linguistics, 34*(5), 509-515.

di Gennaro, K. (2008). Assessment of generation 1.5 learners for placement into college writing courses. *Journal of Basic Writing, 27*(1), 61- 79.

Djité, P. G. (2006). Shifts in linguistic identities in a global world. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 30*(1), 1-20.

Douglas Fir Group (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal, 16,* 19-47.

Duff. P. (2012). Issues of identity. In S. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 410-426). London: Routledge.

Duff, P. (2015). Transnationalism, multilingualism, and identity. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 57-80.

Dwyer, S. & Buckle, J, (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 54-63.

Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and cognition*. London: Sage.

Eglin, P. & Hester, S. (1992). Category, predicate and task: The pragmatics of practical action. *Semiotic, 88*(3), 243-268.

Ferris, D., Kennedy, C., & Senna, M. (2004, April). *Generations 1.5 and 2.0 in college composition*. Paper presented at the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Annual Convention, Long Beach, California, U.S.A.

Finlay, L., & Gough, B. (Eds.). (2003). *Reflexivity: A practical guide for researchers in health and social sciences*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fitzgerald, R. & Housley, W. (2015). *Advances in membership categorization analysis*. London: Sage.

Fitzgerald, R., Housley, W., & Butler, C. (2009). Omnirelevance and interactional context. *Australian Journal of Communication, 36*(3), 45-64.

Fix, M. & Passel, J. (2003). *U.S. immigration: Trends and implications for schools.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Francis, D. & Hester, S. (2004). *An invitation to ethnomethodology: Language, society and interaction*. London, GB: SAGE Publications.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Garfinkel, H. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out Durkheim's aphorism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Garfinkel, H. & Sacks, H. (1970), 'On formal structures of practical actions', in J. C. McKinney and E. A. Tiryakian (Eds.), Theoretical sociology: Perspectives and developments (pp. 338-366). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Garnett, B. (2012). A critical review of the Canadian empirical literature: Documenting generation 1.5's K-16 trajectories. *TESL Canada Journal, 29*(6), 1-24 [Special issue].

Gee, J. (1996). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of culture*. New York: Basic Books.

Goen-Datler, S., Poter, P., & van Dommelen, D. (2009). Working with generation 1.5: Pedagogical principles and practices. In M. Roberge, M. Siegal, & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 235-259). New York: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 18*, 213-231.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of the self in everyday life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: J. Aronson.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interactional ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Anchor.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Press.

Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 1-17.

Goffman, E. (2001). Footing. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 93-110). London: Sage Publications and the Open University.

Griffin, C (2007). Being dead and being there: Research interviews, sharing hand cream and the preference for analyzing "naturally occurring data." *Discourse Studies*, *9*(2), 246-269.

Gubrium, J. F. & Holstein, J. (2002). From the individual interview to the interview society. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and methods* (pp. 3-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gunderson, L. D'Silva, R. A. & Odo, D. M. (2012). Immigrant students navigating Canadian schools: A longitudinal view. *TESL Canada Journal, 29*(6), *142-156* [Special issue].

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 222-237). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, S. (1992). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, & G. McLennan (Eds.). *Modernity and its futures.* (pp. 274-316). Cambridge: Polity Press

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs 'identity'? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage Publications

Hall, S. (1997). The spectacle of the 'other'. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S. Yates. (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice* (pp. 324-344). London: Sage.

Hammersley, M. (2013). *What is qualitative research*? London: Bloomsbury Academic. Retrieved July 20, 2015, from http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849666084

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1998). *Ethnography: Principles in practice.* London: Tavistock.

Harklau, L. (1999). Representations of immigrant language minorities in US higher education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 2*(2), 257-280.

Harklau, L. (2000). From the "good kids" to the "worst": Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(1), 35-67.

Harklau, L., Losey, K. M., & Siegal, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-Educated learners of ESL*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (Ed). *Bilingualism: A social approach.* (pp. 1-23). London: Palgrave MacMillan

Heller, M. & Martin-Jones, M. (2001). Introduction: Symbolic domination, education, and linguistic difference. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference* (pp. 381-402). Westport, Connecticut; London: Ablex Publishing.

Henwood, K. (2007). Beyond hypercritically: Taking forward methodological inquiry and debate in discursive and qualitative social psychology. *Discourse Studies, 9*(2), 270-275.

Hepburn, A. & Bolden, G. (2014). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 57-76). Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society, 27*(3), 291-334.

Heritage, J. (2004). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analyzing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, methods and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 222-245). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K. L. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 103-147). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Heritage, J. & Atkinson, J. M. (1984*). A change-of-state-token and aspects of its sequential placement. In. J. Heritage & J. M. Atkinson (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. & Greatbatch, D. (1991). On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 93-137). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Herzog, H. (2012). Interview location and its social meaning. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti, & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (2nd ed., pp. 207-217). Thousand Oaks, CA.

Hester, S. (1992). Recognizing references to deviance in referral talk. In G. Watson & R. M. Sieler (Eds.), *Text in context: Contributions to ethnomethodology*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Hester, S. (1998). Describing 'deviance' in school. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 133-150). London: Sage.

Hester, S. & Eglin, P. (Eds.), (1997). *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology & Conversation Analysis and University Press of America.

Hester, S. & Francis, D. (1997). Reality analysis in a classroom storytelling. *The British Journal of Sociology, 48*(1), 95-112

Hinkle, K. (2006). On the inside/on the outside: Fragmented accountability and the academic readiness of some community college Generation 1.5 students (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York, United States.

Holstein, J. A, & Gubrium, J. F. (1997). Active interviewing. In D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 113-129). London: Sage.

Holstein, J. A, & Gubrium, J. F. (2004). The active interview. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, methods and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 140-161). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Horning, A. (2004). Digital critical literacy for generation 1.5 and everyone else. *The Reading Matrix, 4*(3), 134-144.

Hutchby, A., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hyman, C., Feldman, J., Hart, C., & Stember, C. (1975). *Interviewing in social science research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Jayyusi, L. (1984). *Categorization and the moral order*. London: Routledge.

Jayyusi, L. (1991). Values and moral judgment. In G. Button (Ed.) *Ethnomethodology and the human sciences* (pp. 227–51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity*. London: Routledge.

Johns, A. (1999). Opening our doors: Applying socioliterate approaches (SA) to language minority classrooms. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues of the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 159-190). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jones, A. (1991). *"At school I've got a chance": Culture/privilege: Pacific Islands and Pakeha girls at school.* Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Joseph. J. E. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious.* Houndmsill Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kasper, G. (2009). Categories, context, and comparison in conversation analysis. In T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 1–28). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaiʻi, National Foreign Language Resource Centre.

Kasper, G. & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 34*, 171–212.

Kim, J. (2008). Negotiating multiple investments in languages and identities: The language socialization of Generation 1.5 Korean-Canadian university students. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved April 12, 2011 from cIRcle.

Kim, J. & Duff, P. (2012). The language socialization and identity negotiations of Generation 1.5 Korean-Canadian university students. *TESL Canada Journal, 29*(6), *81-102.* [Special issue].

Kitzinger, C. (2000). Doing feminist conversation analysis. *Feminism & psychology*, *10*(2), 163-193.

Kramsch, C. (2013). Afterword. In B. Norton, *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation.* (pp. 192-201). Bristol: UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kvale, S. (Ed.). (2007). *Doing interviews.* London, England: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

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

Lee, E. (2008). The other (ing) costs of ESL. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communications*, *18*(1), 91-108.

Lepper, G. (2000). *Categories in text and talk.* London: Sage.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 543-560.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.

Levinson, B. & Holland, D. (1996). The cultural production of the educated person: An introduction. In B. A. Levinson, D. E. Foley, & D. C. Holland (Eds.), *The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice* (pp.1-56). Albany: University of New York Press.

Licoppe, C. (2015). Categorisation work in the courtroom. In R. Fitzgerald & W. Housley, *Advances in membership categorisation analysis.* (pp. 71-98) London: Sage.

Lo, A., & Reyes, A. (2004). Language, identity and relationality in Asian Pacific America: An introduction. *Pragmatics*, *14*(2-3), 115-125.

Marshall, S. (2009). Languages and national identities in contact: The case of Latinos in Barcelona. *International Journal of Iberian, 22*(2), 87-107.

Marshall, S. (2010). Re-becoming ESL: Multilingual university students and a deficit identity. *Language and Education*, *24*(1), 41-56.

Marshall, S. Hasashi, H. & Yeung, P. (2012). Negotiating the multi in multilingualism and multiliteracies: Undergraduate students in Vancouver. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 68*(1), 28–53.

Marshall, S. & Lee, E. (2017). Chinese students in Canadian higher education: A case for reining in our use of the term "Generation 1.5". *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 73*(2), 133-157.

Marshall, S., & Mossman, T. (2010). Changing identities in Japanese-English bicultural names: From parents to children. In D. Nunan & J. Choi (Eds.), Language and culture: Reflective narratives and the emergence of identity (pp. 147-154). New York: Routledge.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*. (2nd Edition). London: Sage.

Matsuda, P. & Matsuda, A. (2009). The erasure of resident ESL writers. In M. Roberge, M. Siegal, & L. Harklau, (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 50-64). New York: Routledge.

May, S. (2000). Uncommon languages: The challenges and possibilities of minority language rights. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *21*(5), 366-385.

May, S. (2011). *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. (2nd Edition). New York: Routledge.

Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative researchers: A philosophical and practical guide*. Washington, DC: Falmer.

McHoul, A. W. & Watson, D. R. (1984). Two axes for the analysis of 'common sense' and 'formal' geographical knowledge in classroom talk. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 5(*3), 281-302.

Miller, J. (2000). Language use, identity, and social interaction: Migrant students in Australia. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33*(1), 69-100.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative.* Harvard University Press.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, N. C: Duke University Press.

Mossman, T. (2012). "They're different from who I am": Making relevant identities in the middle through talk-in-interaction. *TESL Canada Journal, 29*, 103-123. [Special issue].

Mossman, T. (2013). Talking accounts of "in-between-ness" into relevance in and through qualitative interviews. *Studies in English Language and Literature, 31*, 39-54.

Muchinsky, D., & Tangren, N. (1999). Immigrant student performance in an academic intensive English program. In L. Harklau, K. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.) *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp.211—234). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Murie, R. & Fitzpatrick, R. (2009). Situating generation 1.5 in the academy: Models for building academic literacy and acculturation. In M. Roberge, M. Siegal, & L. Harklau, (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 153-169). New York: Routledge.

Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2007). Informed consent, anticipatory regulation and ethnographic practice. *Social Science & Medicine, 65*(11), 2223-2234.

Myers, G. & Macnaghten P. (1999). Can focus groups be analyzed as talk? In R. S. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.). *Developing focus group research: Politics, theory, and practice* (pp. 173-185). London: Sage.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 9-31.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 409-429.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change.* Harlow, England: Longman/Pearson Education.

Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation.* Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Norton, B. (2016). Identity and language learning: Back to the future. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(2), 475-479.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2002). Identity and language learning. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 115-123). New York: Oxford University Press.

Nikander, P. (2012). Interviews as discourse data. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti, & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (2nd ed., pp. 397-413). Thousand Oaks, CA.

Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. Stigler, R. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 287-308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (2014). Transcription as theory. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (2nd ed., pp. 166-178). London and New York: Routledge.

Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). "English may be my second language, but I'm not 'ESL.'" *College Composition and Communication, 59*(3), 389-419.

Oudenhoven, E. (2006). *Caught in the middle: Generation 1.5 Latino students and English language learning at a community college* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois, United States.

Owodally, A. M. A. (2011). Multilingual language and literacy practices and social identities in Sunni Madrassahs in Mauritius: A case study. *Reading Research Quarterly, 46 (2),* 134–155. doi: 10.1598/RRQ.46.2.3

Paoletti, I. (1998). Handling 'incoherence' according the speakers' on-sight categorization. In C. Antaki, & S. Widdicombe, (Eds.) *Identities in talk* (pp. 171-190). London: Sage.

Park, K. (1999). "I really do feel I'm 1.5!": The construction of self and community by young Korean Americans. *Amerasia Journal*, *25*(1), 139-163.

Paulsen, J. (2018). Membership categorization analysis as an important qualitative method in evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning 67*, 138–145.

Pavlenko, A. & Blackledge, A. (2004). Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of Identities in multilingual contexts. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 1-33). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pennycook, A. (2004). Performativity in language studies. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 1*(1), 1-19.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice.* London/New York: Routledge.

Phan, L. (2008). *Teaching English as an international language: Identity, resistance and negotiation.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pole, C. & Morrison, M. (2003). *Ethnography for education.* Berkshire, GB: Open University Press.

Pollner, M. & Emerson, R. (2001). Ethnomethodology and ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography.* (pp. 118-136). London: Sage.

Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies, (9), 219-229.*

Pomerantz, A. & Heritage, J. (2014). Preference. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook or conversation analysis* (pp. 210-228). Oxford: Blackwell.

Potter, J. (1996). Representing reality: *Discourse, rhetoric and social construction.*

Potter, J. (1997). Discourse analysis as a way of analyzing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 144-160). London: Sage.

Potter, J. (2002). Two kinds of natural. *Discourse Studies, 4*(4), 539-542.

Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: Problems and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, (2),* 281–307. London: Sage.

Prior, M. (2016). Emotion and discourse in L2 narrative research. Tonawanda, New York: Multilingual Matters.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Raymond, G. (2004). Prompting action: The stand-alone ''so'' in ordinary conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 37*, 185–218.

Reed, G. (2001). Fastening and unfastening: Negotiating identity in Hawai'i. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 22*(3), 327-339.

Reid, J. (1998) 'Eye' learners and 'ear' learners: Identifying the needs of international students and US resident writers. In J. Reid and P. Byrd (Eds). *Grammar in the composition classroom: Essays on teaching ESL for college-bound students.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Reynolds, E. & Fitzgerald, R. (2015). Challenging normativity: Re-appraising category bound, tied, and predicated features. In R. Fitzgerald & W. Housley (Eds.), *Advances in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 99-122). London: Sage.

Riessman, C. K. (2002). Analysis of personal narratives. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research* (pp. 695-710). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rintel, S. (2015). Omnirelevance in technological interaction: Couples coping with video calling distortions. In R. Fitzgerald, & W. Housley (Eds.), *Advances in membership categorization analysis.* (pp. 123-150). London: Sage.

Roberge, M. (2002). California's generation 1.5 immigrants: What experiences, characteristics, and needs bring to our English classes? *CATESOL Journal, 14*(1), 107-130.

Roberge, M. (2009). A teacher's perspective on generation 1.5. In M. Roberge, M. Siegal, & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 3-24). New York: Routledge.

Roberge, M. Siegal, M., & Harklau, L. (2009). *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL.* New York: Routledge.

Rosaldo, R. (1993). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis* (2nd ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Roessingh H. & Douglas, S. (2012). Editorial: Generation 1.5 in Canada: Multiple perspectives on a shifting demographic landscape. *TESL Canada Journal, 29*, i-iv. [Special issue].

Roulston, K. (2010). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice.* London: Sage.

Rumbaut, R. & Ima, K. (1988). "The adaptation of Southeast Asian refugee youth: A comparative study." Final report to the Office of Resettlement. San Diego: San Diego State University. [ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 299 372].

Rumbaut, R.D. & Rumbaut, R.G. (1976). Self and circumstance: Journeys and visions of exile. In Rose, P. I. (Ed.), The Dispossessed: An anatomy of exile (pp.331-343). U.S.: Louise W. & Edmund J. Kahn Institute.

Sacks, H. (1972a). An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 31-74). New York: Free Press.

Sacks, H. (1972b). On the analysability of stories by children. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 325-345). New York: Rinehart and Winston.

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation (*54-69). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation: Volumes 1 & 2*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696-735.

Saussure, F. (1959). *Course in general linguistics*. (Baskin, Trans.)*.* Glasgow: Collins.

Schegloff, E. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Eds.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75-119). New York Press.

Schegloff, E. (1992). *Lectures on conversation: Volume 1: An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Schegloff, E. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (1998). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society, 8*, 413-416.

Schegloff, E. (2007a). Introduction to sequence organization. In *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (2007b). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39* (3), 462-482.

Schegloff, E. Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). *The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language, 53*(2), pp. 361-383.

Schecter, S. R. (2012). The predicament of Generation 1.5 English language learners: Three disjunctures and a possible way forward. *Canadian Journal of Education, 35*(4), 308-340.

Schenkein, J. (1978). Sketch of an analytic mentality for the study of conversational interaction. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 1-6). New York: Academic Press.

Scheurich, J. J. (1995). A postmodernist critique of research interviewing. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 8*, 239–252.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schütz, A. (1953). Commonsense and scientific interpretation of human action. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 14(*1), 1-38.

Schütz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Schwartz, G. (2004). Coming to terms: Generation 1.5 students in mainstream composition. *The Reading Matrix, 4*(3), 40-57.

Sharrock, W. (1974). On owning knowledge. In R. Turner (Eds.), *Ethnomethodology: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Sharrock, W. (2011). Fundamentals of ethnomethodology. In G. Ritzer & B. Smart (Eds.), *Handbook of social theory* (pp. 249-259). London & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Silverman, D. (1998). *Harvey Sacks: Social science and conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage.

Silverman, D. (2006). Interpreting qualitative data" Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction. (3rd ed.), London: Sage.

Spack, R. (1997). The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(4), 765-744.

Speer, S. (2008). Natural and contrived data. In P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman, & J. Brannen (Eds.), *The sage handbook of social science research methods* (pp. 290-312). London: Sage.

Spivak, G. (1995). Subaltern studies: Deconstructing historiography. In D. Landry & G. MacLean (Eds.), *The Spivak reader*. New York: Routledge.

Statistics Canada. (2011). 2011 census of population: Linguistic characteristics of Canadians. Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/121024/dq121024a-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2012). Visual Census. 2011 Census. Ottawa. Released October 24, 2012. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/dp-pd/vc-rv/index.cfm?Lang=ENG&TOPIC_ID=4&GEOCODE=59 (accessed August 2, 2016).

Statistics Canada. (2016). 2016 census of population. Linguistic characteristics of Canadians. Retrieved from http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-314-x/98-314-x2011001-eng.cfm

Stille, S. (2015) Identity as a site of difference: Toward a complex understanding of identity in multilingual, multicultural classrooms, *Intercultural Education, 26*(6), 483-496, DOI: 10.1080/14675986.2015.1109777

Stokoe E., & Attenborough, F. (2015). In R. Fitzgerald & W. Housley (Eds.), *Advances in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 51-70). London: Sage.

Stokoe, E., & Smithson, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: Conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse and Society, 12*, 217-244.

Stokoe, E., & Smithson, J. (2002). Gender and sexuality in talk-in-interaction: Considering conversation analytic perspectives. In P. Mcllevenny (Ed.), *Talking gender and sexuality* (pp. 79-109). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stokoe, E. (2010). 'I'm not gonna hit a lady': Conversation analysis, membership categorization and men's denials of violence towards women. *Discourse and Society*, *21*(1), 1-24.

Stokoe, E. (2011). Simulated interaction and communication skills training: The 'conversation-analytic role play method'. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk* (pp. 119-139). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stroud, C., & Wee, L. (2007). A pedagogical application of liminalites in social positioning: Identity and literacy in Singapore. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(1), 33-54.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in social psychology*. London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.C. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Talmy, S. (2001). *Reading between the decimal point: Naming, identity, and the 1.5 generation.* Department of Second Language Studies, University of Hawaiʻi at Manoa, Unpublished manuscript.

Talmy, S. (2004). Forever FOB: The cultural production of ESL in a high school. *Pragmatics, 14*(2/3), 149-172. [Special double issue]

Talmy, S. (2005). *Lifers and FOBs, rocks and resistance: Generation 1.5, identity, and the cultural productions of ESL in a high school.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaiʻi at Manoa, Hawaiʻi.

Talmy, S. (2006). The other Other: Micronesians in a Hawaiʻi high school. In C. C. Park, A. L. Goodwin & S. J. Lee (Eds.), *Asian and Pacific American education: Learning, socialization, and identity* (pp. 19-49). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Talmy, S. (2008). The cultural productions of the ESL student at Tradewinds High: Contingency, multidirectionality, and identity in L2 socialization. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(4), 619-644.

Talmy, S. (2009). Resisting ESL: Categories and sequence in a critically "motivated" analysis of classroom interaction. In G. Kasper & H. T. Nguyen (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaiʻi, National Foreign Language Resource Centre.

Talmy, S. (2010a). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30,* 128-148.

Talmy, S. (2010b). Critical research in applied linguistics. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 127-142). London: Continuum.

Talmy, S. (2010c). Becoming "Local" in ESL: Racism as resource in a Hawaiʻi public high school. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 36*, 36-57.

Talmy, S. (2010d). Achieving distinction through Mock ESL: A critical pragmatics analysis of classroom talk in a high school. In G. Kasper, H. T. Nguyen, D. Yoshimi, & J. Yoshioka (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (pp. 215-254). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaiʻi, National Foreign Language Resource Centre.

Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics, 32*, 25-42. [Special issue].

Talmy, S. (2015). A language socialization perspective on identity work of ESL youth in a superdiverse high school classroom. In N. Markee (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 353-368). New York: Wiley Blackwell.

Taylor, S. (2001). Locating and conducting discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 5-48). London: Sage.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd Ed.). London: Sage.

Thesen, L. (1997). Voices, discourse, and transition: In search of new categories in EAP. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 487-511.

Toerien, M. (2014). Conversations and conversation analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 327-341). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Tolmie, P., & Rouncefield, M. (2013). *Ethnomethodology at play: Directions in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis.* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Turner, J. Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, J., Stephen, D., & Wetherell, M.S. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

van Dijk, T. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage.

van Dijk, T. (2013). *CDA is NOT a method of critical discourse analysis.* Association for the Study on Discourse and Society. Retrieved January 24, 2014 from http://edisoportal.org/debate/115-cda-not-method-critical-discourse-analysis

Watson, D. R. (1978). Categorization, authorisation and blame-negotiation in conversation. *Sociology 12*(1), 105-113.

Watson, R. (1997). Some general reflections on 'Categorization' and 'Sequence' in the analysis of conversation'. In S. Hester, & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis.* Washington, D.C.: University Press of America: 49-76.

Watt, D., & Roessingh, H. (2001). The dynamics of ESL drop-out: Plus ça change…*The Canadian Modern Language Review, 58,* 203-222.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory.* Cambridge: Blackwell.

Wei, L. & Hua, Z. (2013). Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics, 34*(5), 516-535).

Wenger, E., (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning meaning and identity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an analysts' and a participants' resource In C. Antaki, & S. Widdicombe, (Eds.) *Identities in talk* (pp. 191-206). London: Sage.

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2008). Using conversation analysis in feminist and critical research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*(2), 555-573.

Wood, L., & Kroger, R. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. London: Sage.

Wooffitt, R. (2001). Researching psychic practitioners: Conversation analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 49-92). London: Sage Publications and the Open University.

Wooffitt, R. & Widdicombe, S. (2006). Interaction in interviews. In P. Drew, G. Raymond, & D. Weinberg (Eds.), *Talk in interaction in social research methods* (pp. 28-49). London: Sage.

Young, I. M. (1997). Asymmetrical reciprocity: On moral respect, wonder, and enlarged thought. *Intersecting voices: Dilemmas of gender, political philosophy, and policy* (pp. 38-59). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zimmerman, D. (1998). Discoursal identities and social identities. In C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 87–106). London: Sage.

Appendix A.

Informed Consent

Faculty of Education

Informed Consent by Participants in a Research Study

       The University and those conducting this research study subscribe to the ethical conduct of research and to the protection at all times of the interests, comfort, and safety of participants. This research is being conducted under permission of the Simon Fraser Research Ethics Board. The chief concern of the Board is for the health, safety, and psychological wellbeing of research participants. Should you wish to obtain information about your rights as a participant in research, or about the responsibilities of researchers, or if you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the manner in which you were treated in this study, please contact the Director, Office of Research Ethics.

       Your signature on this form will signify that you understand the procedures, possible risks, and benefits of this research study; that you have received an adequate opportunity to consider the information in the informed consent form document; and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the study.

       Project Title: Generation 1.5 and the discursive construction of in-between-ness

       Duration: April 1, 2012-March 1, 2015

       Principle Investigator: Tim: Mossman

       Supervisor: Dr. Steve Marshall

       I**nvestigator Department:** Faculty of Education

Project Description

       This study is about identity and multilingual students. I am interested in understanding the lived experiences of multilingual students at CPU whose formal K-12

schooling has been interrupted as a result of coming to Canada to study/live. In particular, I am interested in how you make and maintain your life in a new culture and language.

Interviews

I will ask you to participate in a one-to-one, in-person 45-minute interview with me. I will audio-record our conversation and later transcribe it for analysis. I will ask you to participate in one focus group discussion. I will also ask if you are willing to show me samples of your writing, such as formals essays and informal writing on social networks. Upon completion of the study, I may conduct an open-ended follow-up interview with you if you are interested. This follow up will depend upon our time and whether or not you are available for an interview.

Focus Groups

I will invite you and three-four other students to participate in one group discussion to talk about your experiences. I will moderate this discussion and will audio and video-record these sessions and later transcribe the conversation for analysis. Only I will analyze these video and audio recordings. I will provide drinks and snacks at these sessions.

Benefits of the Study

As a participant in this study, you have an opportunity to reflect on how you make and maintain your life in Canada and clarify your views through interaction with other bi/multilingual CPU students.

Risks

I foresee no risks to you and will ensure your privacy and confidentiality at all stages of research—collection, coding, analyzing, and using of data. All data resulting from this study will be kept for a period of 7 years and then destroyed.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

In the focus group discussions, your contributions will be shared with the others in the group as well as with me. You are encouraged to keep confidential what you hear during these discussions. I will keep all data from these group discussions anonymous.

Interview and focus group data will be securely stored on an external hard drive and kept in my office (3022) on campus, which will be locked whenever vacated. Interview and focus group transcripts and samples of your writing will be securely locked in a filing cabinet in my office. Only I will have access to this information, and it will not be shared with anyone else. I will use a pseudonym for your actual name and the location of the study will be identified in the study as "a university in Western Canada." Any other information linking you to CPU will not be disclosed (see next section below for the only exception). Data will be kept for 7 years, after which time it will be destroyed.

Conference Presentation / Publication

If you are interested, I may invite you to co-present with me at future conferences and co-author a research article with me. This will give you an opportunity to speak to and engage with the scholarly community directly about your experiences. However, if you choose to do so, this will mean that you will lose your anonymity.

You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, and that any complaints about the study may be brought to the Director, Office of Research Ethics. For any questions about this research and for obtaining copies of the results of this study upon its completion, please contact me, Tim Mossman, at […]@cpu.ca or by telephone […].

Participation in Research Study

I certify that I understand the procedures to be used in this study and that I have been able to receive clarification of any aspects of this study about which I have had questions. I have read, understand and agree with the above, and have been offered a copy of this consent form for my records.

First and last name of participant   Phone and email contact

Signature

_____

Date

_____

Optional: Participation in Conferences / Publications

I consent to my participation in conferences and / or publications with Tim Mossman and understand that in doing so, I will lose my anonymity.

Signature

_____

Date

_____

Language Used to Recruit Participants

I am conducting my Ph.D. dissertation research in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University. My study is about "Generation 1.5" university students." I would like to invite you to participate. In the literature about language and learning, there is a term, "Generation 1.5," which has been used to describe students who have immigrated to North America or other English-speaking countries in childhood or adolescence. There is a division in this field of theory. Some people focus on "generation 1.5" students as being kind of stuck or caught in-between two languages and cultures, and so they look at it as a kind of problem. Whereas others see "Generation 1.5" students more as being both, kind of like having a dual national identity, which allows them to seamlessly move between languages and cultures—not lost or stuck at all. In order to understand how you

217

feel about this division surrounding "Generation 1.5" and how real these understandings are to your lived experiences, I would like to invite you to participate in one Focus Group discussion (about one hour in length, which I will moderate), and one 45- minute interview with me. These sessions will take place on the CPU campus at a mutually convenient time.

I will audio record the Focus Group session and later transcribe it for analysis. In the Focus Group discussion, your contributions will be shared with the others in the group as well as with me. I will keep all data from these group discussions anonymous. I will arrange an interview with you individually after the Focus Group discussion. I will digitally record our conversation and later transcribe it for analysis. I will also ask you if you are willing to show me examples of your writing, such as formal essays and informal writing on social networks (e.g., blog posts, poetry, Facebook posts) and/or photographs that you have taken that represent multilingualism (To ensure privacy, please do not take photos of people's faces).

I will ensure your privacy and confidentiality during all stages of research – collection, coding, analyzing and using of data. The only exception is if you agree to participate in a conference with me and /or co-author a paper with me, in which case you will no longer be anonymous. Upon completion of the study, I may conduct an open-ended follow-up interview with interested participants. This will depend upon our time and whether or not you are available for an interview. If you need any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me, Tim Mossman, at […]@cpu.ca or by telephone […].

Thank you for your assistance.

Appendix B.

Scholarly Snapshots of Generation 1.5

1. They are in many ways marginal to both the new and old worlds, for they straddle both but are in a profound sense fully part of neither. They occupy the interstices of two societies and cultures, between the first and second generation (Rumbaut & Ima, 1988, p. 2).
2. The term 1.5 is fitting. It almost makes me think of a version of software, not quite version 2, but almost there, still in the process of being upgraded, stuck awkwardly in the middle (Ferris, et al. 2004, p. 2).
3. Generation 1.5 students, by definition, are situated "between cultures". They must juggle the simultaneous and sometimes contradictory demands and pressures of the multiple social worlds they inhabit, including family, community, workplace, and campus (Murie & Fitzpatrick, 2009, p. 164).
4. Generation 1.5 learners are often caught between languages and literacies (Crosby, 2007, p. 2).
5. These are students who are truly caught in the middle—between languages, cultures, and classrooms (Oudenhoven, 2006, p. 243)
6. Many language minority students speak English with fluency […]. Some may even sound native-like. Others […] may have gotten stuck in a sort of interlanguage. These latter students have difficulty being understood, their pronunciation is "flawed" and their grammar is nonstandard (Blanton, 1999, p. 124).
7. […] their spoken language, though smooth and effortless, often reflects fossilized language errors (Blumenthal, 2002, p. 49).
8. …students […] lived realties often waiver between cultural and linguistic borderlands (Chiang & Schmida, 1999, p. 94).
9. Generation 1.5 students may be in a kind of developmental limbo where they struggle with mastering elements of language and discourse (Connerty, 2009, p. 111).

10. Generation 1.5 learners, attend school for some time in their home countries, then come to the U.S. to finish it before going on to post-secondary education, resulting in a fractured type of education (Crosby, 2007, p. 2).

11. Generation 1.5 have traits and experiences that lie somewhere between those associated with the first or second generation, and so pose a significant challenge to the conventional categories and practices of ESL teachers/researchers (Harklau, Siegal, & Losey, 1999, p. vii).

12. These young people identify neither fully with the culture of their native countries nor with the US… [They thus] may face alienation from families…(Hinkle, 2006, p. 40).

13. Suppose, […] I described a person who was not just lacking critical literacy in a digital environment but who didn't even know the language. Or who did know the language well enough to understand and speak to the needs of daily life but had little or no written language ability or academic writing ability. This situation describes the position of members of the group now referred to as Generation 1.5 (Horning, 2004, p. 138)

14. Caught among different worlds, these students require pedagogies that will assist them in sorting out their languages as cultures… (Johns, 1999, p. 159).

15. They seem to be very fluent orally, especially in social situations, but tend to have severe pronunciation problems, including, especially, a very "unacademic" vocabulary (Muchinsky & Tangren, 1999, p. 224).

16. [T]hose who immigrated to the US before age five are considered 2nd generation. Immigration between the ages of six and ten places one as 1.7 generation; between eleven or twelve, 1.5 generation; between thirteen and fourteen, 1.2 generation. After graduating high school, one is classified as the 1st generation (Park, 1999, p. 49).

17. "…the term "generation 1.5" may be problematic, for it implies that these students are somewhere "between" first and second generation immigrants when they may have experiences, characteristics, and educational needs which, in fact, differ markedly from both of these groups (Roberge, 2002, p. 108).

Appendix C.

Sample Student Interview Questions

1. Why did your family immigrate to Canada and how did you feel about it?
2. What were your expectations about your new life in Canada?
3. What were your expectations about learning English in Canada?
4. What were your English learning experiences prior to moving to Canada?
5. When did you first arrive in Canada? How old were you?
6. Tell me about your experiences as an English language learner.
7. What languages other than English do you speak? Write? In which languages do you feel most proficient and why?
8. What language do you usually speak at home or with your friends?
9. Do you keep in touch with your friends from X (e.g., through e-mail, Web
10. Messenger, phone, personal blogs)?
11. Have you ever visited X after moving to Canada? If so, what was that experience like? If not, do you plan to visit in the near future?
12. What are your future professional aspirations? Do you have plans to work outside Canada? If so, why?
13. If any, what are some of the challenges you might face in achieving your future professional goal?
14. If someone asked you "Where are you from?" how would you answer this question?
15. Have you heard of the term "Generation 1.5"?
16. What does "Generation 1.5" mean to you?

Appendix D.

Interview Protocol

Thesis Title: Generation 1.5 and the discursive construction of in-between-ness

Time of Interview:

Date:

Location:

Interviewer:

Interviewee:

Project Description: This Ph.D. study investigate the processes of identity construction of multilingual university students.

Questions:

1. Why did your family immigrate to Canada and how did you feel about it?
2. What were your expectations about your new life in Canada?
3. What were your expectations about learning English in Canada?
4. What were your English learning experiences prior to moving to Canada?
5. When did you first arrive in Canada? How old were you?
6. Tell me about your experiences as an English language learner.
7. What languages other than English do you speak? Write?
8. In which languages do you feel most proficient and why?
9. What language do you usually speak at home or with your friends?
10. Do you keep in touch with your friends from X (e.g., through e-mail, Web Messenger, phone, personal blogs)?
11. Have you ever visited X after moving to Canada? If so, what was that experience like? If not, do you plan to visit in the near future?
12. What are your future professional aspirations? Do you have plans to work outside Canada? If so, why?
13. If any, what are some of the challenges you might face in achieving your future professional goal?
14. If someone asked you, "Where are you from?" how would you answer this question?
15. Have you heard of the term "Generation 1.5"?
16. What does "Generation 1.5" mean to you?

Appendix E.

Focus Group Protocol

Thesis Title: Generation 1.5 and the discursive construction of in-between-ness

Time of focus group:

Date:

Location:

Moderator:

Participants:

Project Description: This Ph.D. study investigate the processes of identity construction of multilingual university students.

Prompt One: Generation 1.5 in Educational Literature

The following are quotes in educational literature about students who, as a result of moving between countries, have had their formal K-12 schooling interrupted. How real are these understandings to your own lived experiences?

> "These are students who are truly caught in the middle—between languages, cultures, and classrooms" (Oudenhoven, 2006, p. 243).

> Generation 1.5 students, by definition, are situated "between cultures". They must juggle the simultaneous and sometimes contradictory demands and pressures of the multiple social worlds they inhabit, including family, community, workplace, and campus" (Murie & Fitzpatrick, 2009, p. 164).

> "These students [are often positioned] somewhere "between" first and second generation immigrants when they may have experiences, characteristics, and educational needs which, in fact, differ markedly from both of these groups" (Roberge, 2002, p. 108).

> Please explore the questions below by:

- asking each other questions
- exchanging stories
- commenting on each other's experiences and points of view

Prompt Two: Introducing Yourself to Researchers

Imagine you are researchers writing a book for educators about yourselves. How would you describe and/or introduce yourselves to educators so that they might understand your experiences, characteristics, and needs?

Appendix F.

Focus Group Questions

Prompt One: Generation 1.5 in Educational Literature

The following are quotes in educational literature about students who, as a result of moving between countries, have had their formal K-12 schooling interrupted. How real are these understandings to your own lived experiences?

> "These are students who are truly caught in the middle—between languages, cultures, and classrooms" (Oudenhoven, 2006, p. 243).

> Generation 1.5 students, by definition, are situated "between cultures". They must juggle the simultaneous and sometimes contradictory demands and pressures of the multiple social worlds they inhabit, including family, community, workplace, and campus" (Murie & Fitzpatrick, 2009, p. 164).

> "These students [are often positioned] somewhere "between" first and second generation immigrants when they may have experiences, characteristics, and educational needs which, in fact, differ markedly from both of these groups" (Roberge, 2002, p. 108).

> Please explore the questions below by:
> - asking each other questions
> - exchanging stories
> - commenting on each other's experiences and points of view

Prompt Two: Introducing Yourself to Researchers

Imagine you are researchers writing a book for educators about yourselves. How would you describe and/or introduce yourselves to educators so that they might understand your experiences, characteristics, and needs?