6-2016

GATEKEEPERS TO THE THIRD SPACE: AUTHORITY, AGENCY, AND LANGUAGE HIERARCHY IN FIRST-YEAR COMPOSITION

Guadalupe Rincon
California State University - San Bernardino, rincg300@coyote.csusb.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd

Part of the Anthropological Linguistics and Sociolinguistics Commons, Applied Linguistics Commons, and the Rhetoric and Composition Commons

Recommended Citation
GATEKEEPERS TO THE THIRD SPACE: AUTHORITY, AGENCY, AND LANGUAGE HIERARCHY IN FIRST-YEAR COMPOSITION

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
English Composition:
Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language
and
English Composition

by
Guadalupe Rincon
June 2016
GATEKEEPERS TO THE THIRD SPACE: AUTHORITY, AGENCY, AND LANGUAGE HIERARCHY IN FIRST-YEAR COMPOSITION

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Guadalupe Rincon
June 2016
Approved by:

Dr. Caroline Vickers, Committee Chair, English
Dr. Brenda Glascott, Committee Member
ABSTRACT

This thesis examines writing conference interactions between multilingual students and first-year composition instructors in order to understand the co-construction of instructor authority and student agency in discussions of academic writing. Multilingual approaches to first-year writing assert that inviting students’ home languages or dialects into the classroom allows multilingual students to use languages other than English to connect with the curriculum, develop rhetorical complexity as writers, and to be validated as language users; however, scholarship could benefit from examining social interactions. Because identities, ideologies, and stances are co-constructed between people and emerge in social interactions, a discourse analysis of interactions between first-year composition instructors and multilingual students could illustrate how multilingual students and instructors position themselves, the orientations they take and how this affects the validation of multilingualism, and hybrid identities.

Data consists of 18 audio recordings of writing conferences between instructors and multilingual students, five interviews with first-year writing instructors, and audio-recorded post-conference interviews, where instructors and students were separately asked open-ended questions about the content of the writing conference. Employing a Communities of Practice lens, a discourse analysis of the data revealed that that expert-novice identities were co-constructed in interaction, and that the emergence of this power differential inhibited the validation of multilingualism, and hybridity. Implications for mitigating
instructor authority and promoting student agency in interactions with multilingual students are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Introduction

Recent studies in Composition have called for multilingual approaches for first-year writing courses, in the hopes that by incorporating students’ languages—particularly in instances where students have languages other than English as their native languages—that students will connect to first-year writing curriculums (Canagarajah, 2013; Horner, 2001; Horner, Lu, Jones & Trimbur, 2011; Lovejoy, Fox & Willis, 2009; Smitherman, 2003). According to Lovejoy, Fox and Willis (2009) “For students learning to write, a pedagogy that validates their home and community language varieties taps into their personal resources for learning and enables them to connect with the curriculum” (p. 281). By embracing and incorporating other languages or dialects into the classroom, first-year instructors can acknowledge their students’ linguistic identities in the classroom (Horner, 2001), as well as help them work with and against the linguistic expectations that have been institutionalized by the university (Horner et. al, 2011, p. 305).

New multilingual approaches to teaching freshman composition encourage instructors to design curricula and to think of the value that other dialects and languages have for students. I am interested in how institutional and epistemic authority impact the value of multilingual students’ languages in interactions between students and instructors. FYC instructors confront varying and often times conflicting expectations from academic institutions.
and English departments from ensuring that students can do university-level writing free from error (Bartholomae, 2005; Lu, 1991; Shaughnessy, 1977) to being able to write across curriculums and genres (Anson, 1999); to validating multilingual and multidialectal students’ languages/language varieties that enter and shape the university (CCCC, 1974; Canagarajah, 2006, 2009, 2013, 2013b; Horner, Lu, Jones & Trimbur, 2011; Lovejoy, Fox & Willis, 2009).

Therefore, close examination of interactions could shed light on how expert-novice constructions could influence the orientations that instructors take in interaction, particularly in contexts where instructors work with multilingual writers and discuss language difference, writing, and academic writing practices.

For the purposes of this study, I audio recorded, transcribed and analyzed 18 one-on-one writing conferences between instructors of first-year composition and multilingual students from multilingual courses of FYC. In addition to the conference data, I also conducted 5 individual interviews with instructors about their approaches in working with multilingual students, as well as post-conference interviews where instructors and students were separately asked questions about the content in the recordings. My findings indicate that the linguistic negotiation between instructors and students leads to the co-construction of authoritative teacher identities and subordinate student identities, but that this power dynamic also hindered the validation of multilingualism and hybrid identities.

In order to illustrate how first-year writing instructor and students co-construct authoritative and subordinate identities as they emerge in social
interaction, I employed a discourse analytic framework influenced by Interactional Approaches to Sociolinguistics (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Du Bois, 2007; Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012) and Conversational Analysis (CA) in data analysis. Because speakers and listeners rely heavily on a system of linguistic signs, Bucholtz and Hall (2005) contend that it is important to think of the process of identity construction, “…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” (pp. 585-586). This means that it is important to consider the construction of identity, as a process that happens during interaction, and that does not exist as a fixed structure before the interaction ever takes place. Further, the construction of identity is not a fixed product that relies solely on language alone, but rather, that identity is constructed as a result of the social, cultural, institutional and political contexts, in which these interactions take place (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 586).

In order to determine how expert/novice identities were constituted in interaction, I analyzed the data under a communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) lens, by specifically examining the enactment of stances as they emerged in interaction (Du Bois, 2007; Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kärkkäinen, 2006, 2012; Kiesling, 2009, 2011; Kockelman, 2004). Because various positions are taken as people interact with one another (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005), it is important to investigate how they emerge in social interactions. According to Du Bois and Kärkkäinen (2012), positions emerge
in discourse as a result of object evaluations that are made as interactants take stances. By specifically examining the orientation that multilingual writers and first-year composition (FYC) instructors take in discussions about writing, multilingualism, and community, I wanted to determine how instructors of first-year composition and multilingual writers locally co-construct instructor and student identities. As a result, the co-construction of these disparate identities could not only articulate the asymmetrical social relationships between instructors and multilingual writers, but also how this asymmetry affected the validation of multilingualism and hybridity.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

In order to discover how instructors and students construct their own identities, how these identity constructions affect the orientations towards multilingualism and hybridity, and the larger pedagogical implications these identities have on multilingual sections of first-year writing instruction, it is important to investigate how language use in interactions between instructors of first-year composition and multilingual students.

This study then considers the following:

1). Identify how instructors and students index social, cultural, and institutional ideologies as they interact in office hours.

2). What kinds of stances do instructors and students enact in one-on-one writing conferences? What do these stances reveal about the greater sociocultural values that are embedded in interaction associated with instructors of first-year composition and multilingual students?
3). How can the analysis of stance, and particularly, the emergence of positions in interactions affects how instructor authority can affect the validation of hybridity and multilingualism in the university?

In exploring these questions, not only will this give us a different perspective that sheds light on interactions within institutional contexts, but it will also address a rich site of research that has not been empirically explored in Composition research. In addition, in identifying what kinds of stances and indexes permeate conversation, a discourse analysis of interactions between first-year composition instructors and multilinguals can illustrate how the power differential between instructors and multilingual students affects the positioning that interactants take, and ultimately shape views about multilingualism, hybridity, and academic writing practices.

1.2 Literature Review

1.2.1 Language Difference and First-Year Composition

Language difference and first-year writing instruction have long been a topic of scholarly research. In response to the influx of working class students into the university and the G.I. Bill of the 1960s and open access to universities, the CCCC passed the “Students’ Rights to Their Own Language” resolution in 1974, which was aimed at addressing other discourses that were entering academia and ideological efforts that deemed these “other” discourses as unfit or ungrammatical for the university; this proposal posited that students’ other language varieties and styles were legitimate and that instructors must be trained and willing to work with and respect language
difference (Smitherman, 2003, pp. 17-18; Horner, 2001). Instructors, as a result, were called on to face difference, particularly in the writing classroom. As a response to the increase in various languages entering the university and composition classrooms, as well as English-only policies, recent research in composition has called for instructors to incorporate students’ home languages in first-year composition to foster a better understanding of the relationship between language, audience, and writing (Canagarajah, 2013; Horner, Lu, Jones & Trimbur, 2011; Lovejoy, Fox & Willis, 2009). By inviting other languages or dialects into the classroom, first-year instructors acknowledge their students’ linguistic identities, and that language is a social practice (Horner, 2001), help them navigate the linguistic expectations that have been institutionalized by the university, and allow students to connect with the curriculum in ways that do not stigmatize their languages and dialects (Horner et. al, 2011, p. 305).

The goal, then, for instructors is to get first-year writers to not just write, and to steer away from the belief that language and writing are free of error, but to write in a way that considers and invites students to incorporate whatever linguistic resources they have, and for writers to recognize that languages can serve as rhetorical affordances instead of linguistic hindrances (Horner, 2001). This kind of language policy in first-year composition has paved the way for translingual/multi-lingual pedagogical approaches to teaching first-year writing. While this approach is still very much grounded in the conversations started by the STROL and the National Language Policy passed by the CCCC in 1988 (Smitherman, 2003), translingual approaches
stress the importance of teaching and legitimizing of other languages and dialects, and seeks to actually have students work with their native languages or dialects of English. In a study that looks at how students navigate language difference in their peers’ writing over the process of drafting, Canagarajah (2013) finds that it is not merely the act of having students to incorporate other languages, but the process of being able to navigate between languages in writing that helps writers. As a result, “Meanings are generated by the interplay of participants, objects, spatiotemporal contexts, and the ecology of semiotic resources, not words in isolation” that is beneficial to multilingual writers (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 62). What Canagarajah is calling for, then, is not the process of just merely incorporating language for the sake of upholding language policy, but it is looking at how language is negotiated to generate meaning, and how interlocutors in fact navigate through difference, even if they are not familiar with the language that their peers are using.

Canagarajah’s study certainly points out that the process of negotiation is instrumental to written communication and the development of rhetorical awareness in written contexts can be of great use to multilingual students. However, this scholarship could benefit from examining the interactional contexts where interlocutors have to navigate through linguistic difference on the ground. Lovejoy, Fox and Willis (2013), for instance, provide personal accounts that document how their linguistic experiences outside of first-year composition were plagued by linguistic discrimination that limited their opportunities to use linguistic resources that would have otherwise helped them to learn, and that even though this kind of discrimination proved hurtful,
incorporating other languages into composition classrooms has proven effective for their own students, because it creates a space where students can connect with the curriculum in ways that they might not have been able to in the past (p. 274).

While this research certainly points out that students should learn how to be able to shift across rhetorical contexts, and that languages other than English can definitely be a catalyst for that (Leonard, 2014), scholarly research should investigate how identities and language difference are negotiated in interactions between instructors and multilingual students, and how this could influence the employment of multilingual approaches to first-year writing. Although scholarship considers how students position themselves and their multilingual or monolingual peers in writing (Canagarajah, 2013), and the experiences of writing in and working with other languages that validate other voices that exist in academia (Leonard, 2014; Lovejoy et al., 2013; Horner, 2001; Horner et al. 2011) empirical research about how students and instructors position themselves based on power differentials between student and instructor, and language difference in social interactions has not been discussed. Although Multilingual approaches to FYC can help students connect to the curriculum, because it invites students to use their various linguistic resources in writing assignments, multilingual writers are not solely validated based on curriculum design alone. To make such a claim ignores what happens in interaction. Multilingual writing prompts can provide rich insight into how students can critically play with language (Canagarajah, 2013; Horner et al., 2011; Leonard, 2014; Lovejoy et al., 2013),
but interactional work can illustrate how multilingual writers are validated beyond an assignment prompt. When FYC instructors rely on prompt or curriculum design alone, it becomes problematic, because of the fact that multilingual writers are validated just as much—if not more or less—in interactions. A critical multilingual pedagogy should be informed not just by the project or unit sequences, but should also draw insight from what can happen in social interactions.

My objective, then, with the use of empirical data, is to examine how instructors of first-year composition and multilingual students orient towards various identities in the enactment of stances in social interactions. In doing so, my goal is to illustrate how these various orientations could readily affect interactions between instructors and multilingual students, and the approaches that instructors take in working with multilingual students.

1.2.2 Frames and Footing: Guides for Interactional Arrangement

To begin, it is important to understand the process of identity construction, because interlocutors constitute identities through changes in stance, alignment, and footing. Identity work is a collaborative and highly fluid intertextual and intersubjective process that depends on the knowledge of and experiences with various kinds of social interactions (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1986a; Jacoby & Ochs, 1995; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Ochs, 1992). Although Composition Studies has addressed the relationship between language and identity, and the possible affordances they could provide to multilingual composition students (Canagarajah, 2006, 2009, 2013, 2015; Horner, 2001; Horner et al., 2011; Leonard, 2014; Lovejoy et al., 2013;
Smitherman, 2003, Young, 2010), it would also be fruitful to address how languages and linguistic identities are validated in interaction. Linguistic research has demonstrated that identities are not solely co-constructed based on the kind of language or dialect that interlocutors use or affiliate with (Bucholtz & Hall, p. 588), but rather identity is a multi-faceted co-construction that occurs through the use of various linguistic variables that operate on multiple planes of discourse, which provide a field of different interpretations that are situated in the social context, and are made socially relevant in interaction (Eckert, 2008; Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008; Silverstein, 2001, 2003). In short, while linguistic variation might seem socially significant, its importance and social significance for interlocutors is determined in interaction, based on its interpretation at these various levels of discourse. Linguistic variation provides a variety of interpretations, and therefore various meanings in social interaction, such that linguistic manipulation can point to not just one, but multiple aspects of identity that permeate social interactions and are made salient for the purposes of constituting identity, membership to social groups, stance, and more (Bucholtz, 2009; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; DuBois, 2007; Eckert, 2008; Kiesling, 2001, 2009; Silverstein, 2001, 2003; Ochs, 1992). In talking about identity, language use is not the only aspect to be considered, because identities are not constituted by language varieties alone, instead they are intersubjectively created between people and emerge in social interactions, which are always subject to negotiation (Beck, 2006; Burke, 1941; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Foucault, 1977; Gumperz, 1982; Jacoby & Ochs, 1995; Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008;
Ochs, 1992; Podesva, 2007; Silverstein, 2001, 2003). For instance, in investigating what kind of social meaning is attributed to the use of falsetto by homosexual men, Podesva (2007) determined that falsetto was used “…to yell, to express excitement/surprise, to offer evaluative commentary, to enliven a direct quotation, and to engage his audience when telling a narrative” (p. 490). Because of this, Podesva (2007) asserted that, “…the social and linguistic contexts in which a variable is uttered color its social meaning, enabling the variable to participate in the construction of more specific, identity-based meanings” (p. 491). The use of falsetto, then, provided a layer of social meaning that was interpreted and used to point to sexuality and gender, not just one or the other. In this instance, the participant, Heath, used falsetto to articulate expressiveness, which although linked to non-normative behavior for men, enabled him to point to his sexual identity and distanced himself from heteronormative masculinity (p. 495). As such, this illuminates the fact that identity is multi-faceted, because people can point to both their sexuality and gender (Podesva, 2007), as well as other aspects of their identity, simultaneously.

To better understand what I mean by the intersubjective nature of identity work in social interactions, and how this could help illustrate how instructor authority and multilingual student subordinate identities, it is important to understand that identity is not constituted through one interlocutor alone. Much of this kind of interactive work begins with frames and our understanding of their purpose in interaction. According to Goffman (1974) frames are what he referred to as a “schemata for interpretation” (p. 21), or
assumptions about social situations that we expect as a result of our social experiences (Seilheimer, 2011, p. 678), which are used for the purposes of interpreting those given situations as we interact with others. As a result, as humans gather experiences with various social interactions, people are not only socialized into recognizing these practices from a very young age and or through their interactions with others across social contexts (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1989a; Ochs, 1992), but they come to use these experiences to make assumptions about interactional situations, in order to be able to interpret those utterances or specific interactional events. In other words, it is these framing devices (Schiffrin, 1994) or frames (Goffman, 1974) that gives interactants important information to interpret utterances as frames change and are produced in conversation (as cited in Seilheimer, 2011, p. 678).

For instance, in an investigation of a prank-call community of practice, Dornelles and Garcez (2001), found that pranksters had to have a greater understanding of the kinds of frames that helped to constitute business phone calls to local breweries in Brazil, that not only allowed for the prank caller to prank his victim, but to do so in such a way that the victim could not pick up on changes in frames. This meant that pranksters had to constantly reevaluate their utterances, and the utterances of the people they prank-called in order to accomplish the prank call without getting caught. According to Tannen and Wallat (1993), frames are "continuously transforming interpretive structures of individual frames," and in turn, clash with more generalized assumptions or expectations about situations, which are also referred to as knowledge schemas (as cited in Seilhamer, 2011, p. 678).
Participants use knowledge schemas throughout conversations up until the beginning of an interaction between interlocutors. This means that frames, such as the ones that pranksters used in Dornelles and Garcez’ (2001) study, are then used and revised for the interpretation of utterances, and draw from knowledge schemas about those events in order to help them with the successful revision process of frames in interaction.

In providing interlocutors with the means, in this case a set of assumptions that help participants constitute and understand the social context, interactants not only use frames to interpret events (Goffman, 1974), but the interpretation of frames and our responses to them are illustrated through succinct changes in footing. Footing refers to “the alignment we take up to ourselves and that others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (Goffman, 1981, p. 128). As mentioned previously, interlocutors articulate footing through close consideration of how a participant’s alignment (i.e. the relationship between the stances and the stance-taker), which is then projected in the way we respond to or produce utterances in interactions.

Footing is just one of the ways that linguistic research illuminates how and to what extent interlocutors manage interactions for the purposes of identity work. So far, it seems that identities emerge in interactions, because footing affects the organization of talk and the way speech events are organized and continuously shift over the process of interaction (Davies & Harré, 1990; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004; Goffman, 1981; Schegloff, 2007; Zimmerman, 1998). According to Pagliai (2012), “To change footing means to
change the basis for inference and action. Footing underlines the role of people as agents in choosing and changing the context” (p. 678). This suggests, then, that shifts in footing point to changes in the stances, roles, positions, etc. that we take as interlocutors, which also go a long way in demonstrating how participants interpret the schemas or frames, what is going on at the epistemic and interpersonal levels, and how they relate to others in order to understand the immediate social context. Footing is a reflection of those changes and how interlocutors begin to adapt to the social context. With this in mind, we cannot simply divide interlocutors into speakers and listeners, or recipients and non-recipients of social action, because that neglects and influences the constitution of a much more structurally complex and fluid participation framework (Goffman, 1981, pp. 136-137); instead, it is through shifts in footing that interactants can begin to determine, identify and project local identities and ideologies.

For instance, Zimmerman’s (1998) study of emergency call centers demonstrated that notions of institutional and social order affected how 911 phone calls were arranged, particularly at the beginning of emergency phone calls. In this instance, people attempted to ratify specific identities and positions based on pre-conceived notions about emergency phone calls and dispatchers. These notions gave callers a frame to interpret utterances as they were produced, but to also pre-define the organizational arrangement of 911 phone calls to pre-define the roles of emergency dispatchers—all of which were either ratified or contested in the opening sequences in phone calls to the center (p. 97). This means that dispatchers either went along with
the kind of interactional arrangements that were introduced at the beginning in
their displays of footing that confirmed those arrangements, or they contested
the positions and arrangements that callers tried to embed into the
conversation. As a result, Zimmerman (1998) determined that the social
structure did not define the way talk and interactions were managed, but
rather it was the social interactions themselves that illustrated these structures
(p. 105). Although social structures are tied to how interactions are arranged,
social structures do not define interactive activities. Instead, the interaction
itself illustrates how interactants interpret frames to manage their and their
interlocutor’s responses, and to produce utterances based on displays of
footing that interlocutors assert in conversation. Interactions themselves help
to illustrate social orders and values—footing is just the beginning of the
projection of those social orders.

Changes in footing, then, reflect how alignment influences the way
utterances are managed and interpreted, which is then articulated in the
production and reception of utterances (Pagliai, 2012), because they are
directly related to people’s social and cultural understanding and knowledge
of interaction that help interlocutors to interpret different frames (Goffman,
1974, 1981; Gumperz, 1982); in turn, this process readily influences the way
participants arrange and understand their roles in interactions. According to
Goffman (1981), "we self-consciously transplant the participation arrangement
that is natural in one social situation into an interactional environment in which
it isn't... we not only embed utterances, we embed interaction arrangements"
(Goffman, 1981, p. 153). This means that interlocutors are given information,
in order to be able to decipher their role in the interaction itself for the purposes of organizing participation. Ultimately, changes in footing drive this kind of discursive organization and pushes communication in various directions, none of which can be done without the arranging or the successful interpretation of utterances.

In short, a change in footing reflects changes in communicative organization and interpretation of frames. Alternatively, when footing does not change, but the frame does, it might hinder the organization of participation frameworks (Schleghoff, 1984, 2007) and interactants’ understanding of their roles in interaction, all of which might be the result of the misinterpretation of or absence of knowledge schemata needed to interpret these frames. In other words, even though these shifts in footing may be constituted through the use of signals that allow participants to move into various roles to the point where they are recognizable in interactions, these are still highly context bound and rely on the way participants perceive others and themselves in interactions, because they are subject to variation. Shifts in footing demonstrate this kind of variation, which is why identity work in part is not entirely associated with language variation alone, but rather the way that interactions are arranged and the way positions are marked in conversation. These changes not only address the fluidity in roles, but they also articulate the kinds of social structures that are necessary to take up those roles.
1.2.3 Contextualization Cues: Moves for Interactional Interpretation of Frames for the Definition of Social Interactions

Scholarship on footing provides insight into identity work in interactions between instructors of first-year composition and multilinguals. Footing is essentially the frame with which to organize and navigate through interactions (Goffman, 1974, 1981; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004), allowing interactants to align with or diverge from social values in the process (Pagliai, 2012). Interactants understand the type of interaction that they are engaged in through their interpretation of contextualization cues.

According to Gumperz (1982), a contextualization cue is highly context bound, which can be, but is not limited to: codes; organizational sequences (Holtgraves, 2000; Pomeranz, 1984; Robinson & Holden, 2010); discourse markers (Schiffrin, 1987; Vickers & Goble, 2011); dialect and style switching processes in discourse that help to constitute the interactional context (Gumperz, 1983), and situate social knowledge relevant to the activity types or activities that are taking place. Since utterances can be interpreted in several ways, interactants need signals to be able to interpret and make meaning of what is going on around them, specifically when it comes to shifts in interactional frames (Gumperz, 1982). What this means, then, is that contextualization cues serve as "... linguistic form[s] that contribute[s] to the signalling of contextual presuppositions" (Gumperz, 1982, p. 131). Contextualization cues obviously contribute to the understanding and constitution of the immediate social context, as well as any values, roles, etc. associated with the context as well. Because contextualization cues are
highly-context bound, and may or may not be explicit in interaction, interpretation of contextualization cues is important so that interlocutors have enough information to situate themselves in the conversation.

Because contextualization cues provide the necessary information needed for interlocutors to constitute the immediate social context, among other things, this means that frames are necessary for this process, because they function as schemata for interpretation (Goffman, 1974) that provide interactants sets of assumptions or expectations with which to interpret utterances and interaction as it occurs. However, contextualization cues add a layer to the interpretation of frames in that they give participants the ability to "...constrain interpretations by channeling inferences so as to foreground or make relevant certain aspects of background knowledge and to underplay others" (Gumperz, 1982, p. 131). As a result, instead of having to sort out a handful of assumptions or social expectations in interaction, contextualization cues allow interlocutors to identify what is socially, culturally, and perhaps cognitively salient and necessary for interactions.

For example, Gumperz (1982) referred to an instance where an African American student going to interview an African American Woman met the husband, who said "So you gonna check out ma ol' lady, huh?" but because the student failed to recognize this as a cue that pointed not only to an attempt to build solidarity and camaraderie with the people he was about to interview, the environment and nature of his interview became "stiff" as result. This revealed a number of things, the first of which was that the purpose of the husband's question was to serve as contextualization cue to build
solidarity with the student; second because the student failed to recognize cue (e.g. the code-switch) as a shift in footing here, the researcher failed to pick up on discursive efforts to constitute a much more cordial, egalitarian relationship between the researcher and the interviewees. This kind of discursive system relied heavily on the successful interpretation of the cues provided by the man's question, and it resulted in miscommunication because the response from the researcher did not readily interpret and respond in such a way that reaffirmed the social/communal responses that the participant was looking for.

In addition, Gumperz’ (1982) study also revealed that interlocutors have to have an awareness of the social functions that contextualization cues have for the purpose of interpreting frames and displays in footing. This level of awareness is what ultimately signals to participants their meaning in social interaction, the kinds of information that they should consider, how they can be interpreted, and how they should not be interpreted. When interlocutors understand the purpose, relevance and meaning of contextualization cues, they can move forward in interactions. As mentioned earlier in the literature review, Seilhamer’s (2011) study about prank call communities of practice investigated the role that the use of contextualization cues had on the successful construction and maintenance of prank calls; he considered just how much these pranksters worked with implicit inferences that were built on assumptions about the social context, interactive goals, as well as interpersonal relationships, for the purposes of developing frames, with which
they can interpret utterances and what is going on in interaction (p. 678). After careful examination of the data, Seilhamer (2011) concluded that,

> Maintaining fabricated frames, however, not only requires that callers persevere with crank call intentions and refrain from explicitly informing call recipients that they are prank victims. Also discouraged are any contextualization cues that inadvertently disrupt the fabricated frame of the call, causing victims to realize the true nature of interaction (p. 682).

In other words, the interpretation of contextualization cues as they are used by interactants was important, but just as important was knowing what each of those signals do in discourse insofar that it allows interactants to recognize the signals that would otherwise give away their interactive goals, which in this case is to successfully carry out prank calls. As such, contextualization cues, and the way in which people use and interpret them, is not a static process, but rather it is one that is highly co-constructed, and is constantly in flux as people interact with one another, pick up on and work with those cues and signals as conversations continue to mutate.

As we have seen, contextualization cues not only help constitute contextual information for social interactions, but they can also be used to make social information salient in discourse. Because contextualization cues give participants information in order to be able to discern their positions and roles necessary for identity work to take place, these frames are ultimately important for interlocutors to be able to determine how they want to position themselves, as well as the stances that they want to take throughout the
length of the interaction. This scholarship ultimately has led to another important aspect of how we talk about identity work, one which as we will see, can readily impact the kinds of positions that people take, and while contextualization cues can be used to help constitute the situational context, they also undoubtedly point to and help interlocutors interpret and make aspects of identity salient in interactions.

1.2.4 Orders of Indexicality: From Frames, Footing and Contextualization Cues to the Indexical Field of Sociolinguistic Variation

As previously discussed, contextualization cues assist interactants as they determine the ways that they are positioning themselves and others in discourse. Examples of this of course do include variation in linguistic play, but this kind of signaling does more than just provide information about the kind of interactional context or the kinds of roles that interlocutors take up or abandon in discourse. Because language varies across social contexts, it is particularly important to note that, "such variation is part of the meaning indexed by linguistic structures" (Ochs, 1992, p. 338). This means that interlocutors are able to index various identities or ideologies, because of the fact that linguistic structures index various social meanings and structures simultaneously (Soukup, 2013)—what's key here, and what will be discussed below, is the fact that there is a multiplicity in meaning in linguistic variation. As mentioned earlier, social structure is not necessarily defined before the interaction itself, instead it manifests and takes shape through interaction and illustrates social structure as it is constructed in interaction (Zimmerman,
1998). So what is indexicality specifically? How are indexical orders related to identity work, as well as contextualization cues specifically?

An indexical order, first coined by Silverstein (2003) is the process of manipulating contextualization cues that operate in such a way that they occur in discourse on several connected dialectical “planes” (as cited in Soukup, 2013). In other words, the interpretation of contextualization cues and the way they function in discourse happens on various planes, which then points to various interpretations and, of course, different meanings. Eckert (2008) explains that, “participation in discourse involves a continual interpretation of forms in context, an in-the-moment assigning of indexical values to linguistic forms” (pp. 463-464). As a result, because utterances are continuously interpreted over the course of an interaction, they are interpreted based on the interactional context, and it is in this context-bound interpretation that utterances, or linguistic variance or form, can gain indexical values. In addition, this means that no indexical value can precede the interaction itself, but rather speakers index social and ideological values in the moment. However, the indexical linguistic forms take on their meaning form the larger socio-historical context within which the interaction takes place.

Indexicality, then, refers to linguistic variation that does not just point to membership in one specific group, because of a singular instance in language or dialect use, but rather the fact that interlocutors can point to larger and multiple sociocultural systems and ideologies through linguistic variation. As previously mentioned, language variation of any kind not only points to various identities—local and macro—but is also indicative of some kind social
meaning, and more importantly, indexical fields (Eckert, 2008). So when we talk about the indexical field, we are specifically referring to variables that point to “a field of potential meanings—an indexical field, or constellation of ideologically related meanings, any one of which can be activated in the situated use of one variable. The field is fluid, and each new activation has the potential to change the field by building on ideological connections” (Eckert, 2008, p. 454).

As mentioned earlier, we should not make the mistake of constituting or imposing identities or ideologies on interactants, and students or instructors in this case, based solely on the basis of linguistic variation that occurs naturally in social interaction, because variation does simultaneously point to multiple social meanings at once. In addition, the existence of an indexical field means that the use of one variable alone can point to multiple meanings, multiple identities, and multiple ideologies, because of the fact that “A form with an indexical value, what Silverstein calls an nth order usage, is always available for reinterpretation—for the acquisition of an n+1 value. Once established, this new value is available for further construal, and so on” (Eckert, 2008, p. 464). Ignoring the fact that various linguistic choices that already have an indexical value, implies that linguistic variation has a fixed meaning and points to only one kind of social identity or membership, when in reality these variables continue to add new values as they are used and manipulated in talk.

When talking about indexical orders, it is important to understand there are first, second, and third order indexes. According to Johnstone and
Kiesling (2008), first-order indexicals refer to links between linguistic variation and socio-demographic identity that can be socially meaningful and have the potential to be second-order indexes, but is not always the case. For instance, in a study of the use of the monophthongal /aw/, Johnstone and Kiesling (2008) found that although people attributed the use of the monophthongal /aw/ to the area of Pittsburgh, and working-class people or males, they did not necessarily possess this variant in their linguistic repertoires (p. 10), whereas participants who do not hear /aw/ as a local Pittsburgh feature, were more likely to use it in their speech. What this demonstrates is the fact that not all first-order indexicals are second-order indexicals, because in order for them to be second-order indexicals, these variables have to be socially meaningful and “imbued with meaning drawn from local ideology” (Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008, p. 7). In other words, their meaning can be locally constructed amongst members from a community, and as these interactants participate in social interaction, these variables then acquire meaning and social value in social interactions (Eckert, 2008). As a result, it is important to remember that just because a linguistic variable seems like it is socially meaningful to a specific community, that does not mean that that is always the case.

Third-order indexicals on the other hand are only a smaller set of features that are socially meaningful and “are represented by overt discourse” (Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008, p. 11). Kiesling and Wisnosky (2003) found that performances by DJ Krenn, who often used the monothongal /aw/ in performances as a local Pittsburgher, were linked to an “authentic” local identity that was not offensive to listeners (as cited in Johnstone & Kiesling,
Instead, “forms are available for performances of and allusions to localness that mock the stereotypical working-class Pittsburgher of the industrial era and… are heard by their peers as projecting local knowledge and post-industrial urban hipness” (Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008, pp. 28-29).

As a result, variables only acquire third-order indexical meanings when they become attributed with lists of local words (e.g. Yinzer), which are then incorporated into performances of local identities.

Because language users have the ability to refer to the past (recontextualization) and allude (precontextualization) to the future through the use and manipulation of linguistic features (Ochs, 1992, p. 345), this suggests that society establishes norms, preferences and expectations in interactions that are socialized in day to day interactions. Through this process of socialization (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a), interlocutors come to understand and recognize linguistic features as various social indexes in discourse. This process points to the fact that language variation itself constitutes an indexical system that not only carries with it ideologies, but also reveals that in recognition these indexes gain social meaning, that not only allow interlocutors to constitute ideologies, but also point to greater social structures, which are intertwined and very much a part of variation (Eckert, 2008, p. 454).

Because of the fact that people have to respond to these various indexes, in addition to contextualization cues that make social indexes, stances and shifts in footing salient, this suggests that identity work does not rely on one person alone or on a specific linguistic or semiotic resource,
instead it stems from an interactive process, that emerges between two or more actors in interaction and cannot exist before an interaction even takes place. In short, the ways in which identities are constituted in discourse is an intersubjective process that is completed with multiple interactants, because identity is "...not simply as a psychological mechanism of self-classification that is reflected in people's social behavior but rather as something that is constituted through social action, and especially through language" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 588).

What this means, then, is that identity work does not exist solely on the basis of variances of a specific language, nor that somehow linguistic and semiotic practices construct identities as a priori that enter and remain the same in social interactions (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Ochs, 1992), but that participants decide how they are going to participate and how they are going to arrange their participation and the participation of others, because in the process of shifts in their footing, participants project their local identities. As we will see, this kind of interactional phenomena is important and could contribute a lot to the scholarship about how first-year writing instructors and multilingual students interact with one another, but how this kind of positioning affects not just the interaction, but how students also begin to understand academic discourse, and their place in it. By investigating how identity is emergent in discourse, it can illustrate how these linguistic resources and indexes gain social meaning, and become more or less salient in discourse (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005).
1.2.5 Stance and Identity

As a result, it is these shifts in footing, use of contextualization cues, and their indexical use and interpretation that help us to see other complex processes in identity work, such as stance. Du Bois (2007) defined stance as "... a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the socio-cultural field" (Du Bois, 2007, p.163). In other words, when people take stances this means that interlocutors evaluate objects, and in evaluating those objects (e.g. essays, sources, etc.) interactants position others and themselves either into roles or in some instances into different gradients of expertise or knowledge (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2012; Heritage, 2012b; Heritage, 2013; Kiesling, 2011) to either converge and align with other people’s stances in the process. In addition, when we talk about stance, there are different types of stances that have been discussed in linguistic studies, such as epistemic stance (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2010, 2012, 2012b, 2013), affective stance (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kärkkäinen, 2006, 2012, 2013; Kiesling, 2011; Sakita, 2013; White, 2003), as well as interpersonal stance (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kiesling, 2011).

Stance taking requires a process of determining who is taking the stance, what the object of stance is, and what stance interactants are responding to (Du Bois, 2007), and ultimately it helps us understand how stances emerge naturally in interaction, and what that says about the
identities that are being constituted or indexed in the process. So arguably, stances themselves, and not just the language itself, reveal much more about our sociocultural values and the social structures that we are a part of than just linguistic variation alone (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Du Bois, 2007; Kiesling, 2011; Zimmerman, 1998). Stance not only reveals how people constitute their identities, but also sheds light on the ideologies and communities that surround their understanding of who they are and how they see the world around them because stances are ideologically entrenched in sociocultural values (Du Bois, 2007).

In linguistic analysis, there are stance acts that are often discussed: the object that is evaluated in conversation or is the target that speakers orient towards (i.e. evaluation); affective or epistemic positioning, which is the act of “…situating a social actor with respect to responsibility for stance for invoking sociocultural value,” (Du Bois, 2007, p. 143); alignment, or the process of measuring the relationship between stances and stancetakers (pp. 143-144). This means that stance is the way that interactants articulate how they perceive the relationship between stances and interactants (i.e. stancetakers), their evaluation of objects (which of course is revealed in the stance itself), and response to stances in relation to stances themselves (either epistemic, affective, or interpersonal in nature), either allow interlocutors to align or disaffiliate themselves and their social values with other interlocutors and their stances (Kiesling, 2009). This should demonstrate that stance taking does not happen in isolation, instead it is a co-constructed and intersubjective process
that occurs when a stancetaker responds to an object, as well as the stances that other people take towards that object as well.

Changes in footing indicate that interlocutors are changing the way they articulate or understand their relationships with other participants. As a result, stance illustrates how responses reflect how interactants see themselves and others, objects of stance in relation to the stances that others bring to interactions. In a study in the construction of white stances amongst fraternity brothers in Virginia, Kiesling (2001) found that whiteness or stances of whiteness were constituted in instances where speakers distanced themselves from definitions of whiteness and what it means to be white in the state of Virginia (pp.105-106); the use of verbal insults to construct out-group labels (pp. 108-109); and linguistic variables to talk about and index boastful basketball identities in the articulation of stance (p.111). This means that, in instances like the one in Kiesling’s study, where people have to assert and constitute their membership to a specific group, by taking stances about other out-groups—in other words, by evaluating out-groups, constituting relationships that align with or diverge from those out-groups—either with or without the use of linguistic or phonological variables, would require shifts in footing that meet the immediate context. In Kiesling’s work, participants to not only took stances about minorities, but stances that also simultaneously allowed participants to assert their membership by evaluating, positioning and aligning those minorities in relation to the fraternity and the participants’ notions of whiteness. It is also important to note that interactants also take stances, not for the purposes of being able to affiliate with others, but to
distance themselves from normative stereotypes, either about gender (Ochs, 1992), sexuality (Podesva, 2007), and in some instances to be able to contest, redefine themselves and those social norms (Ochs, 1992).

So stance is related to footing, in that stances help to illustrate shifts in footing by pointing to the ways that participants evaluate, position and align with stances that are projected in interaction. It is through these processes that shifts in footing indicate changes in stances, (Goffman, 1981). Such shifts are constantly evaluated by interlocutors as they interpret what is going on epistemically and interpersonally. As a result, identity work relies heavily on the ability to creatively and collaboratively constitute ways of being, and doing so requires social knowledge and experience, as well as socialization into understanding and practicing cues that help shape our ways of doing, being, and seeing, as well as their meaning in discourse (Jacoby & Ochs, 1995).

1.3 Conclusions

Ultimately, in looking at the way that speakers and listeners position themselves, we may be able to determine how social meanings and identities are constituted in academic contexts. As a result, it is important to investigate how first-year composition instructors and multilingual students co-construct identities.
CHAPTER TWO:

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Methodological Approach

In order to understand how FYC instructors and multilingual writers co-construct identities in interaction, I conducted a discourse analysis influenced by Conversational Analysis (CA) and Interactional Approaches to Sociolinguistics (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Du Bois, 2007; Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004; Gumperz, 1982; Kärkkäinen, 2006, 2012; Kiesling, 2009, 2011; Kockelman, 2004; Podesva, 2007; Schleghoff, 2007; White, 2003). By examining the use of varying discourse strategies, this project considers the ways that multilingual—or hybrid identities—emerge in discourse, and how they are invalidated or validated on the ground (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Du Bois, 2007; Eckert, 2008; Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008; Silverstein, 2003; Soukup, 2013).

For this study, I employed a community of practice lens (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Deckert & Vickers, 2011) in my analysis in order to determine how instructors and multilinguals orient towards and co-construct expert, novice, as well as authoritative and hybrid identities. By determining how these expert and novice identities emerge on the ground, this will highlight how notions of instructor expertise and student subordination could affect the validation of multilingual writers’ hybrid identities.

Given the fact that multilingual writers possess a rich linguistic repertoire that grants them access to an indexical field (Du Bois, 2007; Du
Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Eckert, 2008), careful examination of the various communities of practice that multilingual writers orient towards in interaction could illuminate how they attempt to construct their identities in an institutional context, even though they engage, live and constitute their identities in the Third Space (Bhabha, 1994; Bhatt, 2008; Goble, 2014). According to Bhatt (2008), the Third Space is defined as “a semiotic space between competing cultural collectives…where cultural identity across differences of class (English bilinguals-other bilinguals), gender roles (male-female), and cultural values (traditional/local-modern/global) is negotiated, setting up new structures of socio-linguistic authority and new socio-political initiatives” (p. 178). This means that the Third Space is where differences regarding class, gender roles, cultural values intersect in social interactions, and it is at this intersection that these multiple facets of identity are negotiated, and ultimately lead to the constitution of hybridity. As a result, because multilinguals are able to “negotiate and navigate between a global identity and local practices” (Bhatt, 2008, p. 182), and given the power differential between FYC instructors and multilingual writers, I argue that the power differential between instructors and multilingual writers allows for instructors to assert static notions about culture, community, and identity, which do not validate hybridity and its connection to the Third Space. In doing so, this further problematizes the validation of multilingual writers, and multilingualism in general, in first-year writing courses.
2.2 Setting

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board in Spring 2015 (see appendix). Data was collected at Paloma University, a four-year institution located in Southern California. As a result of the university’s location in Southern California, the university has a large population of students who are of Hispanic origin. It is estimated that out of the 20,000 enrolled students, 57% of the students identify as Hispanic (Census, 2010). More specifically, during the 2014-2015 academic year at Paloma University, there were approximately over 2,000+ first-year college students that enrolled, and it is estimated that over 1,000+ of those students were of Hispanic origin, whereas out of the 2,000+ that enrolled, approximately 40+ students identified as international students (Census, 2014). Typically, the university also hosts several students from Saudi Arabia, China, Japan, Thailand, Korea, as well as a host of other countries in Europe or Canada, but these students only make up about 7% of the first-year student population (Census, 2014).

The First-Year Composition program at Paloma University provides students with the option to take one to three quarters of first-year writing to complete their writing requirement in lieu of remedial coursework. The one quarter course, Writing 105, is an accelerated and fast-paced ten week course. Writing 101 is the first sequence in the twenty-week quarter writing course. Writing 100 is the first course in the thirty-week writing course. Students are allowed to choose the class they want to take after taking a Self-Directed Placement Survey that recommends a one of the three options to them, based on their answers to a series of questions. In addition to providing
a stretch-composition program, Paloma University’s First-Year Writing Program also provides A and B sections. B sections are specifically designed for international and multilingual students.

For this study, I recruited five instructors of First-Year Composition, in addition to the 18 multilingual students from B sections of Writing 102 (the last sequences of the two-quarter stretch composition course) and Writing 103 (the last sequence in the three-quarter writing course). Out of the 18 students that participated, only two of them, Riley and Sam, were international students, whereas Lana and Alex are Generation 1.5 students who were born and raised in Mexico before moving to the United States at a later date. The remaining 16 participants grew up learning another language in addition to English at home or at schools in Southern California. Only 2 students out of the 18 spoke fluently Arabic (e.g. Sam and Bennie). Bennie is a bilingual Arabic and English speaking student, who grew up with both languages at home in Southern California. Two other students, Riley and Tommy, spoke Mandarin Chinese. Riley was an international exchange student from China. Tommy grew up speaking Chinese and English in Southern California. The remaining 12 students who participated all spoke Spanish either as a first-language, grew up around Spanish, or had some Spanish but did not completely identify as completely fluent.

It was important to recruit as many multilingual students as possible, in order to provide a well rounded analytical account of how instructors interacted with multilingual writers, regardless of whether or not they were resident or international students who spoke a variety of different languages.
In addition, in having 18 participants who spoke various languages, it would also provide a highly diverse context to investigate how instructors and multilingual writers use various conversational strategies in one-on-one conferences. As a result, in order to get a broader understanding of how different instructors of FYC interact with multilingual writers, it was important to collect data with five different sections of multilingual FYC, because not all multilingual students will speak Spanish, and nor will all multilinguals use the same conversational strategies. Conducting this kind of interactional analysis, where multilinguals had a variety of linguistic choices at their disposal, could provide more insight into how multilingual writers’ identities and multilingualism are or aren’t validated beyond the curriculum itself.

All participants will remain anonymous and will only be referred by pseudonyms in this study. All identifiable information about the university, instructors, and students in the data were trimmed and deleted to protect the anonymity of each participant.

Table 1. List of Instructor Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Languages Spoken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Japanese, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbeth</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mostly monolingual, some Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Languages Spoken Other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female monolingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female some Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female Tagolog, Ilonggo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjie</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>L1 Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>L1 Arabic, Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>L1 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>L1 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lana</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>L1 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>L1 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>L1 Mandarin Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Some Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mandarin Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3 Data Collection

Data consists of five 30-minute interviews with five instructors of first-year writing, as well as 18 one-on-one audio recordings of conferences between instructors and 18 multilingual students of first-year writing. Instructors vary in age, gender and years of teaching experience. Audio-recordings are between 15 and 20 minutes each. After the recordings of conferences were collected, I met with instructors and multilingual students separately and conducted 10-15 minute audio-recorded post-conference interviews, where I asked instructors and students to separately listen to the conference, and asked questions relating to the content in the conference data. Such data collection procedures are typical of an interactional sociolinguistic approach (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Du Bois, 2007; Goffman, 1981; Gumperz, 1982). All 18 conferences were coded and analyzed for the purposes of this study. Of the 18 one-on-one conferences that were collected, coded and analyzed for this study, 13 excerpts from 10 conferences were included in this study, in order to provide a diverse and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martina</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>L1 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Some Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Some Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
detailed analysis of the most frequent patterns that emerged in the analysis of the data.

Before collecting data in instructor-student conferences, I contacted instructors before one-on-one conferences were held to set up a time to ask questions about their pedagogies. I was able to meet with instructors during their office hours in their offices at the university, where I asked open-ended questions about their pedagogical approaches in working with multilingual students. The purpose for this pre-conference interview, was to come to a better understanding of how each instructor approached their multilingual sections of FYC, their curriculum design, interactions with multilingual writers, and how they believed that can affect their interactions with multilingual writers. As a result, I asked open-ended questions so that instructors could freely talk about the texts that they use, their views on multilingualism and its place in the university, and in First-Year Composition, without necessarily eliciting specific answers from them.

The existing data for this project were collected during instructor’s office hours in instructors’ offices at Paloma University in Spring 2015 and Fall 2015 respectively. Instructors cancelled class meeting times to set up one-on-one conferences so that students could all sign up and attend during their regular class-meeting times. Conferences occurred typically around weeks 5 or 6 of each quarter, when data was collected.

One-one-one conferences ranged from 15-20 minutes each. The digital audio recorder was placed on the instructor’s desk in front of the student and instructor. In addition, the recorder was placed close enough in front of the
instructor and student to record their conference, but not so close that it would distract both the instructor and the student during their conference. The audio tracks themselves were then recorded onto WAV files that were later stored onto an encrypted computer.

2.4 Transcription

Data was collected using a digital audio-voice recorder that records data into WAV files. Once all of the files were securely uploaded, I used ExpressScribe to transcribe all of the data onto Microsoft Word and applied Du Bois (2006) transcription conventions (see appendix C), which resulted in a corpus with about 59,837 words. Transcripts themselves, in addition to providing an illustration of interactional features as they were used in talk, also highlight what kinds of discourse strategies were used by instructors and multilingual writers as they were enacted in stances (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Du Bois, 2007; Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Jacoby & Ochs, 1995; Ochs, 1992). A table including the transcription symbols used, symbol description and meaning, as well as how they were used in the analysis are included in the appendix for reference.

2.5 Data Analysis

In order to determine how the power differential between instructors and multilinguals influences how multilingualism and hybridity are validated, it is important to analyze stance displays in interactions. According to Du Bois
and Kärkkäinen (2012), the interlocutor, “presents herself as taking a particular affective orientation toward a specific stance object” by displaying a stance within a stance field or “social force field constituted by the history of stances taken, then and now, yielding a sequential and dialogic layering of participants’ positions” (p. 440). By situating my analysis in the contexts where instructors and multilingual students evaluate talk about multilingual students’ writing, ideas or concepts, community, or language, it can illustrate how they co-construct expert/novice identities based on how they align with or diverge from stances about writing, multilingualism, culture, and identity. By carefully considering these expert/novice identities from a communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) perspective, we can determine how these stances not only articulate these expert/novice identities, but also how this process affects the validation of multilingualism and hybridity.


In looking at preferred-agreement in stance displays, we can identify how instructors and students were able to co-construct their positions based on how they index expert and novice identities, and how that power structure affects the validation of hybrid identities in the articulation of stances. Preferred organization is defined as, “not the subjective feelings or
psychological preferences of individual interactants, but rather public forms of conduct that are thoroughly institutionalized and largely normative, and that systematically promote certain interactional outcomes over others” (Robinson & Bolden, 2010, p. 502). This means that preferred organization is not so much about the feelings or preferences held by participants, but rather interactional behavior that leads to the production of specific responses over others in interaction. These forms of conduct include: dis-preferred sequences (e.g. delay devices such as silences, compliments in instances where an interactant is self-deprecating in evaluations, rejections) and preferred agreement sequences (e.g. encouraging same evaluations, upgrading evaluations). This kind of organization provides interlocutors with alternatives that are asymmetrical in nature, because they invite agreement instead of disagreement, acceptance instead of rejection (Robinson & Bolden, 2010, p. 502). In short, one interlocutor will have more power over how other co-participants respond in interaction. As a result, by looking at the ways that instructors undermine multilinguals in talk, and vise versa, we can determine the ways that preferred organization leads to the co-construction of expert, novice, authoritative, and subordinate identities, particularly in instances where instructors and multilingual writers enact stances.

In addition to preferred organization, the analysis of information requests and assertions in talk could provide a rich understanding into how expert/novice, more knowledgeable/less knowledgeable identities and positions are co-constructed, and how these positions could point to static notions about community, culture, and identity. According to Heritage (2012b),
interactants have their own “territories of information,” and that any piece of information can fall into varying gradients or degrees of knowledge (p. 32). In looking at how information is requested or asserted, either through the use of preferred organization, affective responses (e.g. voice quality), I illustrate how interactants are able to define and position themselves within these territories of knowledge based on the information they do or do not have in interaction, particularly in stance displays where identities are constructed or contested.

With this in mind, Heritage (2012b) posits that, “epistemic access to a domain as stratified between actors such that they occupy different positions on an epistemic gradient (e.g. K+ or K-)” (p. 32). Such positioning, either more knowledgeable (K+) or less knowledgeable (K-), is what Heritage refers to as an *epistemic status*, where interactants come to recognize their fellow interlocutors as either more or less knowledgeable with regards to a specific domain of knowledge (Heritage, 2012b).

By investigating how information is asserted or requested, as stances are enacted in talk, I not only highlight how talk is organized based on the emergence epistemic statuses in interactions between multilinguals and first-year composition instructors, but how that could also influence how multilinguals are validated in interaction. If FYC instructors enact stances, where notions about multilingualism and the communities that multilinguals belong to are asserted in interaction, the power differential could readily affect how value multilingualism and hybrid identities are valued as stances are enacted. As a result, I demonstrate that the power differential between instructors and multilingual writers points to notions about instructor authority
and student subordination, and that this power differential also has the potential to undermine multilingual writers’ access to full participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) to the sociocultural practices of the academic community. Most importantly, it is through these stances, where expert and novice identities are signaled and co-constructed, that multilingual writers’ hybrid identities are ultimately contested—not validated.

In addition to examining the power structures between instructors and multilinguals, it is important to investigate instances of socialization. In doing so, I illustrate how these expert—novice identities lead to the situated practice of academic writing processes, and the implications this has for FYC instructors and multilingual writers. Following Ochs (1991), socialization is the process of participating in sociocultural practices and social interaction that allow for novices to participate and situate themselves in contexts that call for specific, routinized practices that adhere to the community in question (p. 143). As a result, by considering at routines, practices, values, and ideologies that make up entire social groups (i.e. academic community and communities of practice), and how these practices are discussed or situated in interaction, I will illustrate how different routines or interactions grant or inhibit multilingual writers’ access to full participation to the academic community.

Although research in multilingual approaches to first-year writing has started to incorporate and look into the kinds of assignments and curricula in scholarly work, little empirical research has been done on actual interactions between instructors and multilingual students. This kind of empirical work can provide a first-hand account about what happens during interactions between
instructors and multilinguals that would consider, and document, how multilingualism and hybridity are validated or resisted in interaction, and doing so could provide a rich resource of information that would situate further discussion of why it is important to consider how interaction can shape policy. In addition, a communities of practice perspective (Lave & Wenger, 1991) that examines the power differentials as they are articulated in stances, can highlight just how the positions that FYC instructors writing and multilinguals take reflect sociocultural values about instructors and multilinguals to be reified or contested in interaction, and how this could inform multilingual approaches to first-year composition.
CHAPTER THREE:
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF STUDY

3.1 Discourse Analysis

This chapter will present a discourse analysis of the data, where I will highlight patterns in different excerpts. The first four excerpts will demonstrate how expert/novice identities are co-constructed in one-on-one writing conferences. The following six excerpts specifically continue to draw from these expert—novice constructions, in order to examine how power affects the validation of multilingualism and hybridity. The last three excerpts of the study consider power differentials between instructors and multilingual students, as they were articulated in stances, by carefully examining instances of socialization. The last section of this chapter includes a conclusion, as well as suggestions for further research.

3.1.1 Linguistic Constructions of Instructor Authority and Multilingual Student Subordination

The first excerpt comes from a set of conferences from Lisbeth’s two-quarter composition course. In her pre-conference interview, when asked about her pedagogy and approaches to working with multilingual students, Lisbeth mentioned that it was important for her to make sure that multilingual students did not feel ostracized, especially in instances where the student had a first language that was not English. In order to talk about language and identity, Lisbeth employed a discourse communities approach (Gee, 1989) in her classes to talk about writing in efforts to foster the belief that students
were experts at something in the various communities that they are a part of. As a result, Lisbeth mentioned that she did not spend a lot of time talking about language in her courses, because of the fact that, as far as she knew, multilingual students did not want to talk about their respective languages anymore—especially if language had been used against them in the past. Here Lisbeth (L) and Bennie (B) are discussing a few of the concepts that Bennie wants to talk about in his paper about the Marvel comic book character, the Hulk.

Excerpt 1. Instructor Authority Through Rejection

1. B; =and like i found a few websites they said that actually there’s levels
2. of like type of Hulk he is so grey is like #needy and like easy Hulk and
3. green is this and they said red bu::t...after reading mo::re into it i found
4. out that red was not actually Hulk it was another guy=
5. L; =mhmm=
6. B; =created by villains to fight Hulk=
7. L; =yeah
8. B; [H] so:: i like scratched that out but i will probably like add that for #
9. L; well:: because a lot of stuff you’re talking about kinda got added on
10. %later:: right?
11.B; yeah

In the first few lines of this excerpt, Bennie started this conversation in a K+ position, because he was the more knowledgeable interlocutor by providing information of his scholarly research on the Hulk, particularly when he described the fact that there were different “levels of like type of Hulk,” in that
different colors represented different types of Hulk. In lines 3-4, Bennie mentioned that as he was researching, he discovered that red was not another “level of Hulk,” but a different character. Lisbeth latched onto Bennie’s turn with a backchannel to indicate that she was an engaged listener and participant (Goffman, 1981; Pomeranz, 1984). Bennie also latched on to her back channels and continued his turn, and mentioned the fact that the red Hulk was a villain created to fight the Hulk, which Lisbeth latched onto again in her turn on line 7. Because the assignment required Bennie to examine how a specific character changed over time, in Bennie’s following turn in line 8, he admitted that he initially “scratched that out,” but that he could incorporate this information in his paper.

What was of particular interest in this case, though, was Lisbeth’s following turn in lines 9-10, where she stated, “well because a lot of stuff you’re talking about kinda got added on later right?” The use of well in this instance hedged or possibly even framed a potentially face-threatening stance display (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Sakita, 2013), and more specifically it also signaled that Lisbeth was not only about to evaluate the stance object, which in this case was Bennie’s use of sources, but that she was also about to challenge Bennie. Lisbeth’s use of the English DM (discourse marker) right at the end of her turn allowed her to elicit preferred agreement in her evaluation of Bennie’s ideas (Holtgraves, 2000; Pomerantz, 1984; Richardson & Bolden, 2010), which she ultimately got in Bennie’s turn in line 11.
As a result, in eliciting preferred agreement in the evaluation of the stance object, Lisbeth indexed her authority in response to Bennie’s initial claims about the Hulk (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Kiesling, 2011), and the presence of these markers, both before and after the evaluation, illustrated the construction of preferred agreement. Further, in this particular instance Bennie did agree, and in doing so both interactants were able to co-construct Lisbeth’s authority. If Bennie had challenged Lisbeth’s evaluation, and ultimately the articulation of this authoritative stance—it would have been face threatening to the instructor, because Bennie’s resistance would have been dis-preferred (Holtgraves, 2000; Pomerantz, 1984; Robinson & Bolden, 2010; Schegloff, 2007). In addition, the turn in line 9 was designed to elicit a preferred agreement in the assessment of the stance object—in other words, it provided Bennie with a frame to organize the talk that followed (Goffman, 1974, 1981; Gumperz, 1982; Pagliai, 2012; Zimmerman, 1998). As a result, Lisbeth signaled authority by providing this interactional information to Bennie, and in doing so, Bennie then agreed, and co-constructed her identity making her evaluation non-negotiable.

Because Lisbeth subordinated Bennie’s assertions, and signaled to Bennie that Lisbeth’s evaluation was correct, this indicated Lisbeth had the authority and knowledge to be able to talk about the Hulk. Instead of allowing Bennie to elaborate and continue his turn, where he explained what he wanted to do with the research he collected about the Hulk, Lisbeth not only indexed authority about Bennie’s research topic, but she also appropriated his work in seeking agreement in the evaluation of his work. Such an authoritative
stances and appropriation of student work were patterned in Lisbeth’s interactions with multilingual students.

In the data that was collected for this study, this kind of pattern was not strictly limited to Lisbeth’s conferences. Other instructors also employed similar strategies, where they sought preferred agreement as they evaluated multilingual writers’ essays, and in so doing, rejected multilingual writers’ ideas in discussions of their research topics. This could be particularly problematic in that in signaling expertise, not only were multilingual writers’ ideas or concepts rejected, but their projects were reshaped by instructors and the orientations instructors took in discussions of their research. Further, although instructors in this data set did not tend to ostracize multilinguals based on language difference, they were more likely to usurp discussion of content and concepts in multilingual student writing. In doing so, instructors like Lisbeth did not co-construct their multilingual writers as experts, instead they subjugated opportunities that multilingual writers had at asserting their expertise.

Another instance where instructors signaled their authority occurred in the ways they indexed ideologies about writing, particularly in discussions about the writing process. Here I examined how instructors point to these ideologies about the writing process, and the consequences this had in interactions with multilingual writers. In his pre-conference interview, Dylan, who had experience in teaching both first-year composition and English as a Second Language courses, explained that while he did not incorporate multilingual writers’ languages in multilingual sections of first-year
composition, it was important for him to ensure that multilinguals were exposed to academic writing genres, especially in instances where he strictly worked with international students. By exposing multilingual writers to academic genres and registers, his aim was to get students to transfer what they know about academic writing in their first language to the first-year composition class. To accomplish this, Dylan has taught Joseph Harris’ *Rewriting: How to do Things with Texts* in both his A and B sections of his writing courses. The emphasis of his course was the use of various strategies, such as forwarding, countering, or coming to terms with texts. In the past, Dylan has also used texts such as *The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down* as a way to foster a discussion about culture, particularly in his multilingual sections of first-year composition.

In this excerpt, Dylan (D) and Sam (S) were discussing the writing and revision process.

Excerpt 2. Instructor Ideologies About Academic Writing

1. S; so uh:: yeah— so yeah (TSK) so::: just initially start with Orwell
2. maybe get a brief explanation of what’s going on there
3. D; mhmm
4. S; and how the farm is actually related to real life
5. D; mhmm
6. S; and then maybe... use more sources and talk about other (0.7)
7. other terms from hooks book
8. D; right so::
9. S; (coughs)
10. D; to use the language of our prompt it says=

11. S; =yes=

12. D; =you’re going to come to terms with or forward ideas from sources
13. so like we said you can use ideas from hooks and make connections
14. to Orwell or maybe some other source information you haven’t found
15. yet
16. S; mhmm yes=

In lines 1-11, Sam and Dylan discussed what Sam intended on writing about for the first assignment of the quarter. For this specific assignment, he was asked to come to terms with or forward ideas from scholarly source material (cf. lines 12-14). And in lines 1-2, Sam stated that he planned on beginning his paper by addressing George Orwell’s work (e.g. Animal Farm). There were a few pauses in the first two lines, and what was prosodically lengthened were English DMs, such as um and uh, to hedge his utterances as he presented them to Dylan for further assessment (Kärkkäinen, 2006, 2012). This particular instance illustrated asymmetry in positions between Sam and Dylan, because Sam’s use of hedges indicated that he was not only trying to mitigate any potential face-threats in his utterances, but that he also wanted Dylan to possibly approve his plans (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kiesling, 2011). In short, Sam’s use of hedges signaled a subordinate position, which meant that he also positioned Dylan as the authority. In line 4, Sam then also addressed the fact that he wanted to do a comparative analysis of Orwell’s novel to the real world, and in lines 6-7, that he could also possibly then incorporate sources and terms from bell hook’s work. Dylan did not uptake
any of Sam’s utterances, which would have signaled that he accepted or acknowledged Sam’s orientation as the agent of his paper, and instead back channeled throughout in lines 1-7.

However, in line 8, Dylan signaled the beginning of his assessment of Sam’s plans for his essay, when he stated “right so,” but did not ratify any of Sam’s previous utterances. Instead Dylan proffered his assessment in line 10, and by referring to the language used in the prompt, he oriented towards an authoritative stance, because Dylan challenged and did little to ratify Sam or his utterances, which would have indicated that Dylan understood, acknowledged or approved of Sam’s intentions for his paper (Philips, 1983). In examining lines 12-14, Dylan also referred to the purpose of the assignment, when he stated that Sam had to “come to terms with or forward” ideas from sources, but could use concepts from bell hook’s work in order to make connections to Orwell or other scholarly source material. In doing so, Dylan indexed authority in order to not just point to an “ideal text” (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Murphy, 2000; Severino, 2009; Sommers, 1982; Straub, 1996; Tardy, 2006), but he also pointed to concepts highlighted in Joseph Harris’ book *Rewriting*.

In short, by indexing authority Dylan also oriented towards a set of writing practices, and simultaneously challenged and constructed Sam as a subordinate, which Sam had previously signaled in the hedging of his utterances in lines 1-2 and 6-7. As a result of the indexing that occurred previously, Sam did not uptake or challenge Dylan’s assessment, instead he backchanneled and said yes. In doing so, he co-constructed Dylan’s authority,
and in turn his own subordinate position. Although Dylan wanted a very specific kind of assignment, he also oriented towards an authoritative identity by pointing to ideologies about writing as he enacted this authoritative stance, which propagated a specific set of writing practices that were grounded in Harris’ text. Dylan signaled authority and pointed to and valued a set of writing practices—in this case, the concepts from Harris’ *Rewriting*—and did so by rejecting Sam’s plan of action based on the *quality* of source knowledge (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Brooke & Hendricks, 1989; Gale, 1996; Heritage, 2010, 2012, 2012b; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Kiesling, 2011; Mortensen & Kirsch, 1993; Patron, 2014; Philips, 2004). In other words, Dylan assessed Sam on the basis of the concepts addressed in Harris’ *Rewriting*. In short, Sam needed to be able to demonstrate that his writing could reflect an understanding of the concepts in the texts used in the class. However, because Sam’s writing did not illustrate that source knowledge, Dylan rejected Sam’s contributions, even though Dylan did not work with Sam’s actual writing in the conference.

By orienting towards his authority and to these values, Dylan did not validate what Sam planned on doing in the assignment, nor did this open any sort of space to validate him as a multilingual writer, because there was little reference to Sam’s writing, and instead the focus of the conference was on the kinds of concepts that he should have considered and enacted in his paper. As such, because the discussion solely focused on the specific practices that the student should engage in, even though there was little reference to the student’s writing, it was difficult to determine how Sam, and
the other participants of this study, used their linguistic resources innovatively in their writing—something that will be addressed later on in the analysis. So here, while Dylan clearly signaled his epistemic authority, he simultaneously pointed to ideologies connected to the writing practices that were under discussion here. In his post-conference interview, Dylan mentioned that he should have given Sam more time to respond to the claims he was making about writing, in order to understand what it was that Sam was attempting to say about how he intended on putting together his assignment. Sam, on the other hand, mentioned that he felt that the conference was very helpful, and that his instructor was very attentive, and just wanted to help. What was problematic about this interaction—and other instances in the data like it—was the fact instructors explicitly pointed to concepts that they wanted their writers to engage with in their writing, and in doing so reaffirmed notions about instructor authority and student subordination. And while the argument could be made that instructors should challenge their students, what was problematic in this instance, and in other patterned examples in the data, was that these concepts were referenced frequently, but instructors seldom examined and discussed students’ choices to further scaffold these kinds of practices in their writing. In short, discussions of academic writing genres between instructors of FYC and multilingual writers would benefit from situating those discussions by using the student’s writing.

Ignoring multilingual writers’ written projects could keep multilingual writers on the periphery, because instructors solely addressed academic writing conventions at the conceptual level, without examining the moves that
multilingual writers made, which could move them away from peripheral participation and novice positions (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As a result, by only addressing academic writing practices at the conceptual level in social interaction, instructors limited the access that multilingual writers could have that would otherwise allow them to potentially engage, and be socialized into these kinds of practices (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1994). Because the interaction did not focus on the student’s essay, but rather academic writing practices that the student should have engaged with, these kinds of conferences were counterproductive because instructors only stressed what genres of writing were important. By ignoring the actual writing itself, instructors missed opportunities of socialization that could have moved the student away from a peripheral understanding of academic writing practices, and perhaps even construct a kind of meta-language to discuss academic writing genres.

Although instructors frequently indexed a preference toward academic writing genres or practices, by way of their authority, instructors also made frequent assertions of epistemic authority over multilingual students’ topics in instances where instructors positioned multilingual writers as less knowing interactants of their research. By asserting expertise over multilingual students’ research topics, instructors could potentially constitute the power differential between multilingual students and FYC instructors, and in doing so, ultimately reproduce notions about instructor expertise. This next analysis focused on another excerpt from Lisbeth’s course, where she and her student, John (J), discussed research on his paper about Rapunzel.
In lines 1-2, Lisbeth discussed the origins of the fairy-tale character, Rapunzel, and at the end of Lisbeth’s utterance in line 2, she began to construct her expertise by providing—rather than eliciting information about Rapunzel—when she stated “the fact that Rapunzel is an actual thing.” As a result, Lisbeth oriented towards an expert position by eliciting preferred agreement through the use of the English DM right at the end of line 2, which meant that by eliciting agreement that was preferred, the background information about Rapunzel was non-negotiable. In addition, Lisbeth also solidified her position as the more knowledgeable interactant K+ in the interaction, which meant that, she constructed John as the interactant with less knowledge K- about the character (Heritage, 2012, 2012b).

In other words, by eliciting agreement in her assessment, Lisbeth assumed a more knowing position as a result of her evaluation (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kärkkäinen, 2006, 2012; Kiesling, 2011). Lisbeth then
directly asked for John in lines 2-3 to either confirm or deny whether or not the information that was provided was new to him or not. In doing so, this strategy not only allowed for Lisbeth and John to take on different positions on an epistemological scale (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2012, 2012b), where Lisbeth clearly indexed her expertise about the character, but she also positioned John as the novice. As addressed in the analysis of excerpt 1, these expert/novice identities were co-constructed because the use of preferred agreement in interaction not only provided John with an interactional frame in order to formulate a response (Pomeranz, 1984; Robinson & Holden 2010; Schegloff, 2007), but these strategies ultimately forced students, like John, to produce a specific kind of response that would allow him to avoid face threats—even if that meant he had to take on a less-knowing position in the interaction.

In their discussion of the fairytale, Lisbeth oriented towards expertise, and in doing so, epistemically divergent positions emerged and were maintained over the course of the interaction (Patron, 2014) through use of preferred agreement, which hindered student resistance. This meant that multilingual writers like John were constructed as novices, because it would have been face threatening for John to resist the identity constructions that took place in lines 1-5. This meant that it was safer for John to maintain a K-position, rather than contest it. This asymmetrical relationship between Lisbeth and John was particularly emphasized in lines 4-6, where Lisbeth requested confirmation about John’s epistemic status (i.e., in this case did John know this information), and in doing so she again indexed her own
epistemic authority in their discussion of fairytales (Pomerantz, 1984; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2012). This expert identity was then co-constructed by John when he reiterated in line 7 that he was unaware of that information. As a result, John not only co-constructed Lisbeth’s epistemic authority, but he also co-constructed his K-position, novice identity. In line 8, Lisbeth reaffirmed his less knowing position by stating that Rapunzel was the name for an actual plant, and that that was part of the information that he did not have in his writing, even though Lisbeth did not refer to John’s writing in the conference.

In her post-conference interview, Lisbeth revealed that a former student wrote about Rapunzel for a similar research project, which was why she knew all of this information. As a result, Lisbeth was unsure as to why John had not incorporated this research. However, because the instructor never referred to the actual words in John’s paper, it was difficult to determine whether John incorporated this research, because the two did not discuss nor work with John’s draft in the conference. Instead, the conference became a discussion where the instructor indexed her expertise. Such expert—novice constructions, particularly in instances where interactants sought to determine the epistemic statuses of their co-participants, were patterned in the data. This meant that not only did instructors orient towards expertise about writing, but they also constructed themselves as experts about students’ research interests. In short, students were not allowed to be experts about their own topics. During his post-conference interview, John mentioned that he hesitated to ask questions about his own work, because he didn’t think that
his questions would align with what his instructor wanted to address, and that ultimately he let her take over because she was the one that was going to be grading his work, and knew what she wanted to see in his essay.

What was problematic about this instance, and other instances like it in the data, was that the instructor constituted her own expertise in interactions with multilingual students about their research topics. In instances like excerpt 3 and other similar examples in the collected data, it could be exceedingly difficult for multilingual students to attempt to assert any sort of expertise, because resistance could be face threatening, or their contributions would be automatically rejected by instructors. But, even more troublesome yet, was the fact that the instructor would not work with the actual writing itself, which meant that there was little to no chance for the student to enact an epistemic stance, where he was the expert about his research project, nor were his intentions ever elicited by his instructor (Murphy, 2000; Severino, 2009; Straub, 1996).

Although the previous analysis demonstrated how problematic it can be to assert epistemic authority in discussions of multilingual writers' ideas or research topics, another frequent pattern that emerged in the analysis of the data was the overt appropriation of multilingual students' work, particularly in instances where instructors indexed their authority through the use of phonological strategies. In Excerpt 4, I examined another instance in the conference between Lisbeth and Bennie, continued to discuss the rhetorical progression of the comic book character, the Hulk.

Excerpt 4. Instructor Authority and Voice Quality
In lines 1-2, Lisbeth began her turn by referring back to a set of guiding questions she provided for her students, which indexed not only Lisbeth’s authority, but the fact that she had a very specific text in mind (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Murphy, 2000; Severino, 2009; Straub, 1996; Tardy, 2006). Bennie acknowledged the set of questions in his turn in line 3. From there, in lines 4-6 Lisbeth addressed the rhetorical context, and suggested that Bennie consider the comic book genre itself, particularly the use of words and pictures. What was interesting here, though, was Lisbeth’s emphasis on rhetorical context, as illustrated by the prosodic lengthening in context. The prosodic lengthening of context emphasized information (Gumperz,
1982, 1992), which Bennie acknowledged in line 3 in his response. Because rhetorical context, books and genre were emphasized, this could suggest that Lisbeth wanted to draw attention to concepts that she wanted Bennie to address in the paper, and in examining Bennie’s turn in line 7, what was interesting was that he not only latched onto Lisbeth’s turn, but he also did not challenge her.

Further on in the transcript, Bennie latched onto Lisbeth’s turn in line 7, before Lisbeth suggested that he should also consider the storytelling aspect of comic books in lines 4-6. In lines 11-13, Lisbeth brought up the rhetorical constraints of comic books (e.g. color), but what was interesting was the fact that Lisbeth only briefly mentioned Bennie’s research, and not in a way where his previous contributions were ratified, which in itself could be interpreted as dismissive. Reference to Bennie’s research was quickly dropped when Lisbeth discussed the rhetorical constraints that comic publishers faced in the publication of the Hulk manuscript, which she had stressed previously in line 4, and again in line 11. As such, this was a clear indication that Lisbeth wanted Bennie to consider and write about the rhetorical constraint. Because this was stressed time and time again, this indicated that Lisbeth was indexing her authority, and that that authority was co-constructed by Bennie because there was little resistance on his behalf. Further, in acquiescing to Lisbeth’s evaluation, but also co-constructing her authority, it led to the instructor’s overt appropriation of his research project. In the latter of line 13, Lisbeth emphasized the words color through glottalization, followed by a short 0.8
second pause, before stating “so talk about that right?” and emphasizing that through the glottalization of the word.

In examining the first spectrographic data on PRAAT, when Lisbeth stated “so talk about that right?” the spectrogram illustrated a clear drop in pitch, and an increase in pitch at the end of the utterance for right. More specifically, data analysis on PRAAT revealed that the minimum pitch of the entire utterance measured approximately 52.4 Hz, and that the token that was the word that had the lowest pitch in the entire utterance, whereas the maximum pitch measured at approximately 407.4 Hz, with a variation of 355 Hz. This meant that this segment was the most prominent because the token had the lowest pitch and was glottalized.
In order to confirm the voice quality type, pitch settings were modified from 35 Hz to 500 Hz in order to get an accurate illustration of creaky voice on PRAAT (Esling & Edmondson, 2011). Creaky voice quality (VQ) has a value of about 1.9 dB, in addition to pulses either at the beginning or ends of prosodic domains when the pitch was at about 50 Hz or lower (Esling & Edmondson, 2011). In this instance, we can see that the pulses occurred towards the beginning of the prosodic domain. To determine the vocal quality, then, I calculated the Harmonicity to Noise Ratio (HNR) and Q1 (Bandwidth) values. Calculations revealed that the Q1 value was approximately 7.90 Hz, whereas the HNR measured approximately 1.20 dB (i.e. decibels), which meant that Lisbeth did use creaky voice (Esling & Edmonson, 2011, p. 142).

Figure 2. Glottalization of that
The glottalization of tokens such as *that, story, genre,* and *books,* then, served to both emphasize concepts that Lisbeth and her students addressed in class, but also simultaneously functioned to signal her authority as an instructor. Because these tokens were salient, this could suggest that the overemphasis of these concepts meant that students had to address them in their projects.

Lisbeth, and the majority of female instructors that participated in the study, used creaky voice, and in doing so indexed authority (Esling & Edmonson, 2011; Lee, 2013; Yuasa, 2010). Instructors overemphasized concepts or ideas, and in doing so asserted their authority, but also appropriated multilingual writers’ texts. According to Severino (2009), “teachers appropriate or take over the texts of their students when they respond to their students’ papers with their own ideal texts in mind instead of negotiating with the students about what the students’ intentions are and how best to fulfill them” (p. 54). The same kind of textual appropriation described by Severino (2009) occurred here, in that by responding to Bennie’s text, Lisbeth articulated her own “Ideal Text,” instead of attempting to negotiate the purpose of Bennie’s paper, which would have granted him responsibility, agency, and authorship over his own work (Anson, 1999; Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Greenhalgh, 1992; Murphy, 2000; Severino, 2009; Sommers, 1982; Straub, 1996; Tardy, 2006). So even if multilingual writers presented their own ideas, if in the process of interaction, specific concepts or ideas were stressed, then multilingual writers’ original ideas and intentions
were trumped by instructors’ wants, even if it was not what the student originally intended or wanted to write about in their paper.

Lisbeth mentioned in her post-conference interview that her session with Bennie was particularly difficult because he did not readily engage with her, and that she definitely felt that he was positioning her as an authority. Given what transpired in the interaction itself, and the fact that Lisbeth asserted her expertise on numerous occasions, Bennie’s positioning of his instructor was no surprise. According to Bennie’s interview, he mentioned that he valued her expertise and experience, which was why it was important for him to hear her opinion about where he should take his paper. In short, the construction of Lisbeth’s authority, coupled with Bennie’s positioning of her as an expert, led to a highly asymmetrical social relationship.

What was particularly troubling here was the fact that Bennie was given little chance to talk, much less maintain his own expertise or authority of his own work (something he attempted to assert at the beginning of excerpt 1), but the overemphasis of ideas and concepts made it nearly impossible to escape Lisbeth’s phonetic constructions of expertise. While Bennie and other students generally valued their instructors’ input, too much input was problematic in instances where multilingual writers’ texts were appropriated, because instructors did not give multilingual writers the opportunity to articulate their intentions as authors and agents of their own work (Beck, 2006; Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Greenhalgh, 1992; Murphy, 2000; Severino, 2009; Sommers, 1982; Straub, 1996; Tardy, 2006). As a result, instructors missed opportunities where they could have validated multilingual
students’ writing, because of the fact that their work—as demonstrated above—was ultimately dictated by instructors and their visions of ideal texts. Following Anson (1999), it would have been productive for instructors to have had a better understanding of their students’ needs and intentions in their research papers. As demonstrated in the analysis above, without this information, instructors could and did easily appropriate their students’ texts by not asking multilinguals to clarify the purpose of their texts, nor the choices they made, which was of course exacerbated by the fact that students’ texts were not part of the writing conferences.

As a result of these expert/authority and novice/subordinate identity constructions, notions about students having to “write for instructors” could and were reproduced, because instructors stressed “ideal texts” instead of focusing on the drafts that their students brought to these conferences (Anson, 1999; Beck, 2006; Brooks & Hendricks, 1989; Broad, 2003; Gale, 1996, Mortensen & Kirsch, 1993; Murphy, 2000), which left multilingual writers in subordinate positions about their own writing, and the interaction as a whole. As a result, multilingual writers had to produce texts that were approved or molded by FYC instructors, and because of the fact that these instructors had the power to either pass or fail students based on whether or not students met those expectations. Such a revelation could have dire consequences for the discussion of hybridity and multilingualism. If instructors had that much of a say over multilingual writers’ projects, then there was the possibility that they could have dictated how multilinguals write, talk, and
possibly think about multilingualism, hybridity, and even language use in the university.

3.1.2 Multilingualism, Hybridity, and The Third Space

Although excerpts 1 through 4 highlighted the co-construction of instructor authority in interaction, it was also important to consider how multilingual writers faired in attempts to constitute hybridity as they interacted with people with institutional authority. In the analysis of the following excerpt, I was interested in how multilingual writers often constructed subordinate identities, as they also positioned their instructors as authorities in interaction.

This excerpt was collected from Diana’s three quarter FYC composition course. In her pre-conference interview, Diana stated that while the field of Composition was making strides in attempting to validate students’ languages, she stated that in talking about multilingual students, the field often used students’ languages to “mark them.” In addition, Diana also mentioned that scholarly conversations about multilinguals were patronizing because the field addressed multilinguals as if they were “special,” and that their language use was a marked difference, that was often pitted against multilinguals, particularly in instances when their language use clashed with dominant forms of academic discourse and other academic writing practices. Based on her interview, the struggle for FYC instructors was how to validate multilingual writers without ostracizing them.

Instructors should consider how to take small steps in validating their writers in interaction, and this could arguably begin through careful examination of multilingual writers’ positioning in relation to their instructors.
The following analysis focused on what happens when multilingual writers indexed and maintained uncertainty. The following excerpt includes Diana (D) and Mariana (M).

Excerpt 5. Multilingual Student Indexes Uncertainty

1. D; okay…good I have a set of questions to ask you and I'll write stuff down so I won't forget (RUSTLING PAPER) so can you tell me what parts of the assignment you found.. confusing?
2. M; um:: exactly what we're what are we supposed to like.. because I know it has to do with like the main goal is to like say what role
3. D; does food play in people's lives right?
4. M; could we like.. contribute from like our past essays? Or?
5. Like...##=
6. D; =wh— what do you mean by that?
7. M; like=
8. D; =get ideas from your past essay?
9. M; like in the last one I #kinda remember right now but u:m (1.9) I basically… because I felt like in this one I put my thoughts down and it repeated a lot from like the past essays oh it #depends on survival um:: as culture and stuff like that I think put something like that in the other one
10. D; mhmm
11. M; so I dunno if we're allowed to do that
At the beginning of her turn in line 1, Diana mentioned that she had several questions she wanted to ask Mariana, and that she would be taking notes during their conference. In line 3, she then asked Mariana to explain what was confusing about the prompt. Mariana’s use of the DM *um* hedged and signaled the beginning of an evaluative activity in their interaction (Kärkkäinen, 2006; Pomerantz, 1984; Robinson & Bolden, 2010; Sakita, 2013), in order to construct a less face threatening utterance, and to frame her understanding of the prompt. The delay before the utterance indicated that Mariana indexed uncertainty. In addition, in lines 4-6 Mariana sought preferred agreement in her assessment of the assignment prompt (Holtgraves, 2000; Pomerantz, 1984; Robinson & Bolden, 2010). In short, Mariana was uncertain about the assignment, and so she appealed to her instructor’s authority to clarify what she needed to accomplish in this assignment.

As a result, by articulating uncertainty and confusion, Mariana’s response to the prompt constituted an interpersonal stance display, because of the fact that she signaled uncertainty and was appealing to Diana’s epistemic authority (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Kiesling, 2011), which meant that by signaling her uncertainty she oriented towards a more subordinate position. This kind of identity work highlighted that Mariana positioned Diana as the interlocutor with epistemic authority to confirm or reject Mariana’s understanding of the assignment, but at the same time, Mariana also positioned herself as the subordinate in the interaction.
However, in order to make these authority/subordinate positions salient, Mariana had to signal uncertainty. This pattern continued throughout.

For example, in line 8, Mariana followed up her previous question and asked, “could we like contribute from our past essays?” In this instance, Mariana indexed uncertainty again, by framing her utterance as a collective understanding between her and her peers through the use of “we.” In other words, by framing her evaluation of the prompt from the standpoint of her and her classmates, she distanced herself from complete ownership of the evaluation, which further illustrated her own sense of uncertainty. In lines 10-12, Diana asked her to explain what she meant by “past essays,” and Mariana then explained that she did not know if she could incorporate her previous assignments to put together her final project. By seeking confirmation in her assessment of the prompt previously, and appealing to Diana’s authority, Mariana indexed a subordinate role in her interaction with Diana, whereas Diana was the one who had more authority over what Mariana could and could not do.

As a result of Mariana’s positioning, Diana was constructed as the interactant with the power to dictate the final written product. This indicated that not only did Mariana take a subordinate position, but it also gave Diana the opportunity to possibly appropriate her final paper. So not only did Mariana see herself as a subordinate, but it seemed that her ideas needed to be approved beforehand by the instructor. Mariana maintained this subordinate identity when she explained that her draft “felt” repetitive, in that she had already addressed similar ideas in previous essays. The use of *I felt*
framed the evaluation of her previous projects which came in the subsequent utterance, as indicated in the use of the intensifier *a lot* to indicate that all of her projects were repetitive (Kärkkäinen, 2006; Sakita, 2013). Diana responded with a backchannel shortly thereafter in line 18, but she did not reject or uptake what Mariana had stated, which would have signaled to Mariana that what was said was actually understood by her instructor. Mariana added that she wasn’t sure if, “we we’re allowed to do that.” Here, not only did Mariana re-contextualize her uncertainty, but she also co-constructed and maintained the authoritative and subordinate identities that emerged in the process. And even though Diana asked Mariana to elaborate on her assessment in several instances throughout the excerpt, she did little to resist these authoritative positions, which allowed Diana to co-construct her authority. As a result, this would explain why instances of preferred agreement and confirmation continued to come up again and again in their conversation, because the sequences initiated by Mariana pointed to the fact that what she planned on doing for her paper had to be approved by the instructor. As a result, these subtle nuances in interactions led to the frequent constitution of asymmetrical relationships between multilingual writers and FYC instructors.

While Mariana did not necessarily construct a multilingual identity in this instance, as a multilingual writer in the conference, she did position herself as a subordinate. The issue here, and in other similar instances in the data, was that FYC instructors did little to challenge this kind of identity work. By taking on authoritative roles in conversations with multilinguals, instructors
not only co-constructed their own authority, but they also co-constructed multilinguals’ novice or subordinate identities, instead of challenging those constructions, and positioning students as experts about their own research topics. The expectation that multilingual writers somehow would have positioned themselves as experts fell short, because they had little to no social experience where they asserted agency and authorship over their own work, because they did not have access to interactional frames that would have signaled that kind of positioning (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Davies & Harré, 1990; Du Bois, 2007; Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Goffman, 1974, 1981; Gumperz, 1982; Silverstein, 2003).

In her post-conference interview, I asked Mariana specifically about why she sought approval over what she wanted to do for her project. She admitted that she wanted to make sure that she met the instructors’ needs. In addition, Mariana added that her instructor came up with the prompt, and given Diana’s teaching experience, her “instructor knows what she wants,” which was why her instructor’s opinion was prioritized. In her post-conference interview, Diana mentioned that she tried to have a more “conversational” conference with all of her students, so that her students could articulate what they needed to say or voice their interpretation of the assignment, without necessarily being too intimidating, and that she would only try to step in when what the student was saying was unclear. Although Diana did not willfully assert authority to ostracize Mariana, the analysis did demonstrate why it was important to consider how multilingual writers’ contributions, both in interaction and writing, in order to illustrate the validation of their contributions. This kind
of meta-awareness could allow instructors of FYC to make strides in interactionally valuing their students—multilingual or not.

Although multilingual writers frequently indexed subordination, and to maintain those positions throughout their conferences, it was also important to consider how multilingual writers attempted to index hybridity. Examining interactions, where multilingual writers attempted to index hybridity (Bhatt, 2008) particularly as they oriented towards memberships to local Communities of Practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), could illustrate how this indexing and validation—or lack thereof—could be related to the power differential between instructors and multilingual writers. This excerpt featured Diana (D) and her student Josue (J), where they discussed Josue’s research paper about college students and food.

Excerpt 6. Instructor Contests Hybridity

1. D; if you think about what role does food play in students' %lives? Will that give you answers? Or can you think of right now as a student how much::... wh—I mean wh— how much do you think about food?
2. a::nd=
3. J; =oh okay=
4. D; =does your b— does the amount of work that you have to do for your classes affect the choices that you make in food? Does that make sense? (H)... so let’s reframe it what role y— uh it’s not quite off but its not quite together
5. J; [###]
6. D; [what role] does food play in
In lines 1-4, Diana asked Josue to contemplate the role that food plays in college students’ lives in order to develop cohesive answers about his topic. She also added that he could express his opinion about food. Josue latched onto her suggestions in line 5, even though he did not uptake the suggestions and questions that Diana provided in the discussion of his topic. Diana also latched in line 6, and suggested that he consider the relationship between college students’ work load and their dietary choices. In lines 6-9, Diana also asked if any of her suggestions made sense. However, her pause was short, and she continued her turn in line 8, where she stated that the questions in his paper needed to be reframed for cohesion and focus, which indicated that Diana valued writing that was interconnected or cohesive.

Diana and Josue overlapped in lines 10 and 11, and although Josue’s utterance was unintelligible, she wrote down and reframed the questions she
presented earlier out loud. However, in lines 13-14, Josue attempted to the importance of health with his parents, but also addressed freshmen fifteen. So in lines 13-14, Josue oriented towards his home and his college lives, because he continued to stress the importance of both. This illustrated that Josue was attempting to index membership to two communities he belonged to—his immediate family and college. Diana did not uptake the construction here, and instead just backchanneled in line 15. In line 16, Josue stated that freshmen fifteen was related to alcohol, and not to food. In line 17, Diana exhaled briefly, before evaluating his previous statement and stated that what he just brought up was off topic. In the last turn of the excerpt in line 20, Josue agreed with Diana, and stated that he did not know if the two could be connected.

What was interesting here, was that Diana continued to point to ideological values about writing, where the expectation was that the ideas in the project had to be cohesive. However, those expectations continuously clashed with the interactive work that Josue was attempting here, because Josue was orienting towards two communities in order to define his understanding of food and culture, and how it related to college students. In line 10, Josue oriented toward his family and college identities to demonstrate how they were related to his food consumption. In other words, for Josue, the choices he made about what he consumed was related to both his family identity and his college student identity, which was why he continued to orient towards these two aspects of his life in this instance, and elsewhere in the conference. In her post-conference interviews, Diana stressed time and time
again that she took notes during her conferences with her students and then read them out loud, so that they could get a sense of what they were saying, and that ultimately she only tried to intervene when something needed clarification.

Despite Diana’s efforts to help her student reach a point of clarity, the source of Josue’s struggle with this assignment, and Diana’s suggestions, were linked to the fact that he was asked to consider just one aspect of his college student life, even though he clearly oriented towards various aspects of his identity. Josue stated in his own post-interview that he appreciated his instructors’ feedback because he did not necessarily understand how he could reconcile his home and college life in his work. In instances where writers like Josue attempted to weave in these multiple facets of their identity in discussions of their writing, these attempts were often rejected because of the fact that their work was “unfocused,” when in reality, these aspects were interconnected. Articulating hybridity within this context was at the heart of the struggle.

Validating hybrid identities was a big problem in these one-on-one conferences, because the writer was never truly validated. Invalidation was tied to the fact that their contributions were not ratified in interaction. This was extremely problematic in instances where multilingual students attempted to signal their hybridity, particularly in instances where they attempted to constitute their membership to communities of practice, because instead of validating their membership to these smaller communities, they were often lumped with generalizations about an entire culture.
In the analysis of the next excerpt, I considered the possible implications associated with instructors’ authoritative indexing in instances where multilinguals indexed membership to local communities. Here, Diana worked with her student Ezra (E), who was also working on a research assignment on the relationship between food and culture.

Excerpt 7. Multilingual Student Indexes Membership to a CoP

1. E; like where they got it from maybe it’s important to them because
2. they first learned it from someone or maybe their parent or ancestor…
3. and they’ve #from their childhood brought it to them and so they
4. brought it to… their..u:m can I say like…to their family? And showed it
5. u:m to them?
6. D; [H] ah okay let me see if I can remem—because I think in your
7. project two you talk about how your mom brought=
8. E; =um shrimp cakes=
9. D; =shrimp cakes it’s imp— is it—I’m not maybe mistaking it but you
10. talk about it came from her::
11. E; her u::m
12. D; … she was taught by someone
13. E; yeah yeah I think from her mom
14. D; okay
15. E; but that.. but her mom my mom’s mom learned from her mom
16. D; okay
17. E; so they all learned from
18. D; okay
19. E; each other

20. D; so maybe and i— it— g— it’s important because:.. um can you

21. finish that?

22. E; um it’s important because:.. it comes—it came from… uh.. how can I

23. say? from like family system it came from

24. D; so it’s been passed down from generation?

25. E; yeah

26. D; so [H] uh:.... uh: @ @ generation a:nd why is this important?

27. E; u::m because it's— it's like a family thing

In lines 1-5, Ezra attempted to explain how recipes were passed down from family members, and that these recipes were important because people learned how to prepare these meals from parents, relatives or perhaps even ancestors, and that people were exposed to these recipes from infancy at family gatherings, and that these were then taken to other families. Here, Ezra indicated that these culinary practices were associated to a more localized community of practice, and because of this, Ezra oriented towards a more localized, micro-identity, which meant that these culinary practices were not reflective of the entire Mexican populous, nor did he identify himself with a more macro-scale identity. Instead, these practices were situated in a very small, local community, which in this case was his family. Diana asked him to talk about his mother’s recipe in her turn in lines 6-7. Ezra responded, and mentioned a shrimp cake recipe. In lines 9-19, Diana and Ezra attempted to narrow down how he found out about the recipe, and discussed his mother’s preparation of the dish, and its importance.
What was interesting here, though, was that Ezra did not orient towards a macro, Mexican community or solely to Mexican culture in his discussion of the recipe, instead he reiterated that this culinary dish—and its preparation—was part of a local community of practice—in this case his family, who was from Mexico—where knowledge about the recipe was passed on from one member to the next, through participation and practice in these activities (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Diana, however, did not recognize the fact that Ezra was orienting towards a local community of practice, but attributed these indexes with a macro-scale Mexican identity. Diana instead asserted that it was a generational tradition in lines 24 and 26, despite the fact that in lines in 22-23, Ezra clearly oriented towards a more localized, micro-identity and community membership, when Ezra stated that the recipe came from a “family system,” and again in line 27, when he stated that the recipe was a “family thing.” As stated earlier in the analysis of this excerpt, Ezra oriented towards his membership to a local community of practice, his immediate family, which would explain why he constructed these culinary practices as a situated practice within this small community in lines 1-5, 15, 16-18, 23, and 27. His orientations indicated that these practices were associated with his family, and not Mexican culture as a whole. In doing so, it allowed Ezra to use these practices to orient towards a micro community, and localized identity. As a result, Ezra was not indexing a macro-scale Mexican identity, but rather a much more localized Mexican identity, where children or younger members in this community watched and participated in instances of legitimate peripheral participation and full participation in situated learning activities.
(Lave & Wegner, 1991), and specifically to learn how to prepare this dish. Even though Diana did position Ezra as the more knowledgeable interactant (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2012, 2012b), in that she elicited information about the significance of the recipe, and in doing so positioned him as a K+ more knowledgeable interactant (cf. lines 9-10,12,15, 20-21), she did not uptake Ezra’s indexing. Instead of recognizing his orientation as an index to a localized community, Diana attributed this kind of signaling to a macro-level, generational Mexican identity, as illustrated in instances where she continued to assert the importance of this recipe to Mexican culture (cf. lines 24 and 26), even though Ezra oriented towards his immediate family. In doing so, this hybrid, local micro-scale identity was not ratified by the instructor, and instead Diana associated it with a much more macro-level identity than the one that Ezra indexed throughout. Because Diana was the instructor, and authority in the interaction, these macro-scale associations of identity were the ones that were reinforced.

Diana criticized the static nuances associated with Gee’s discourse community theory in her pre-conference interview. In addition to her remarks about the issues with the scholarship on multilinguals in Composition, Diana also mentioned that like some of the instructors that participated, she had also taught Gee in the past, and found that she did not want her students to “assume that everything will apply with this little bubble,” specifically in discussions about how language could be used or how multilinguals identified with various groups. However, in excerpt 7, Diana did not recognize Ezra’s attempts to orient towards this localized membership and identity, but rather
(as noted in her post-conference interview) she attributed his struggle with clarity, not hybridity, even though Ezra indexed hybridity throughout his writing conference. Ezra stated in his interview that he also agreed that his ideas were not focused, and that he should have addressed how his discussion applied to Mexican culture. Again, this was problematic, because of the fact that that multilingual students could possibly internalize these static notions of identity and culture, particularly in instances when their orientations in social interactions go unratified.

Neglecting to ratify or co-construct multilingual or hybrid identities, seemed to point to a monolingual world view that reinforced static notions about identity, where the link was strictly limited to language use and the geographical location, or in this instance a sociocultural practice and a geographical location or ethnic group, where multi-aspected attributes of identity performance were not considered (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; DuBois, 2007; Eckert, 2008; Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008; Kiesling, 2001, 2009; Ochs, 1992; Silverstein, 2001, 2003). As demonstrated in the analysis, multilinguals’ intentions to index hybridity were not validated, which led to macro-level associations of identity, that had the potential to reproduce notions that language variety and identity were mutually exclusive, even though this was not what emerged in the discourse (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008).

These static notions about community, culture, language, and identity could possibly be linked to Gee’s (1989) discourse community framework, or more specifically the use of this framework in writing prompts, which
articulated monolingual and static notions of identity that did not account for linguistic variation, nor multi-aspected notions of identity. The absence of this affordance could be important in dealing with multilingual writers. Without such an opportunity, multilinguals would then have to define their communities at large, and by default, their identities, in a vacuum.

The following analysis included an excerpt from the data set collected from Catherine’s course. Catherine, along with the other 4 instructors that participated in the study, employed Gee’s theoretical framework of discourse communities in FYC. In her pre-conference interview, Catherine revealed that she devoted part of her first units in the two-quarter sequence to talk about language with her students. In addition, she has also used of Sapir-Whorf Theory as well as texts by Lakoff in her class in order to foster a conversation about conceptual metaphors, how language could shape worldviews, and how such an understanding could affect their writing.

This analysis studied how the use of Gee’s discourse community theory affected the validation of hybridity, and how this validation was affected by the power dynamics that emerged in interaction. In the excerpt below, Catherine (C) and Lana (L) discussed the full draft of a literacy narrative.

Excerpt 8. Hybridity and Discourse Communities

1. C; yes exactly um:: you wanna define this—those terms those primary
2. and secondary discourse and you wanna do it early on and you also
3. it’s a good idea in the first I would say page you wanna define the
4. discourse community of... what you’re writing about.. mexican
5. american?
In lines 1-5, Catherine stressed the importance of clearly defining Lana’s first and primary discourses earlier in her assignment. What was particularly interesting about the beginning of the excerpt was that, while Catherine did not assert or impose her interpretation and understanding of Lana’s literacy narrative, she indexed her authority in response to and in her evaluation of Lana’s assignment, by stating that it was important to define concepts, such as primary and secondary discourses. Similar to the findings in excerpt 4, where the instructor made a clear distinction between the purpose of the assignment and what students were doing, here Catherine indexed her authority in that she asserted where these concepts had to be defined and why (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kärkkäinen, 2006, 2012; Kiesling, 2011). And while these were indicators that Catherine was positioning herself as the authority in the evaluation of Lana’s paper, what happened towards the second half of the excerpt seemed to point to
instances where the multilingual writer had problems in articulating a hybrid identity.

In lines 3-5, Catherine asked Lana if her narrative was about a Mexican American discourse community. Lana did not uptake her assessment, and instead of giving her more time to respond, Catherine started a new turn in lines 7-8, and began to provide her reading of Lana’s assignment, but the turn itself was truncated, and Catherine proffered different assessment than the one she started with, where she explained that Lana’s literacy narrative was about bilingualism. There was a three second pause, before Lana back channeled, but again, she did not uptake Catherine’s assessment. Catherine also backchanneled, followed by a 2.0 second pause where Lana attempted to formulate a response. Catherine then stated that the final paper did not have to be about bilingualism, but that that was what stood out in the paper. Lana then responded in lines 14-16, and stated that she at first wrote about being bilingual, but that that discussion became about her race, and that ultimately she did not know which one to explore in her assignment.

Because of the fact that Lana admitted that she did not know what to write about, this was an indication that Lana did not just orient towards bilingualism or her own race. Instead she oriented towards both. In other words, Lana was indexing both her race and her bilingualism in this instance, and she attempted to illustrate those orientations in her writing, but she was unable to do so. As such, because there was little uptake at the beginning of the excerpt, particularly after Catherine proffered evaluations, the lack of uptake could indicate that Lana did not just ascribe to her bilingualism or race,
nor did one facet of her identity hold a hierarchal position over the other, but that both were facets of her identity, and that neither of them constituted membership to just one single social group, ethnicity, or language. Given the discourse community framework, Lana was unable to take just one orientation, where she clearly defined one aspect of her identity as her primary discourse, because she did not identify just as strictly bilingual or strictly Mexican. As a result, these were indicators that Lana belonged to multiple social groups or communities of practice (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Bhabha, 1994; Bhatt, 2008; Deckert & Vickers, 2011; Eckert, 2008; Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008).

This finding was particularly important because of the fact that it revealed that while assignments could be fruitful in that they ask multilingual writers to reflect on the kinds of communities they belong to, they also presented difficulties for multilingual writers. These difficulties were related to the theoretical underpinnings of these assignments, which did not account for hybrid identities, and more specifically the Third Space, where multilinguals could negotiate and articulate facets of their identity (Bhatt, 2008). Following Bhatt (2008), multilinguals in this study required a space where they could have negotiated various aspects of their identity (e.g. race, gender, class, sexuality, etc.), but they needed those affordances necessary to allow for that intersection and negotiation of identity (something that Lana also alluded to at the end of line 16). Instead, the use of this framework was grounded on static and highly ideological notions that people somehow only belonged to one social group, even though, as demonstrated in this analysis, that was far from
the case. By asking multilingual writers to define their membership to one discourse community, instructors that participated in this study were able to reject, rather than invite hybrid multilingual identities, because the assignment prompts inhibited access to the Third Space, and instead perpetuated monolingual worldview that did not consider or validate variation.

In her post-conference interview, Lana admitted that she felt comfortable in talking to her instructor, because Catherine was approachable. In addition, Lana also stated that her positioning would have differed in an interaction with another instructor, because she would not have had the same confidence, especially if the instructors did not make an effort to be approachable. Catherine, on the other hand, mentioned that she tried not to talk over her students, which was why she tried to give Lana as much room as possible to talk, even though there were instances in the data where Lana did not uptake, and where the pauses themselves weren’t as long. As a result, it seemed that multilingual students encountered difficulties in constituting hybrid, multilingual identities in discussions about the content in their writing, particularly in instances where they wrote about discourse communities, because they took orientations to multiple communities, not just one. In the data that was collected, multilinguals frequently took multiple orientations to multiple communities—a phenomenon that was patterned in the data. Such patterns revealed that the difficulties multilinguals encountered were related to the fact that they were asked to take one orientation to one community. As demonstrated above, multilingual students did not ascribe to just one community, but rather, in seeking to constiute their identity, they attempted to
constitute their membership to multiple communities, in order to reveal these multi-faceted identities.

However, the difficulties that multilingual writers’ face as they attempted to construct hybrid identities were not just restricted to discussions about discourse communities, but this was also related to discussions about culture as well. In order to demonstrate this, I analyzed another conference from Diana’s three-quarter FYC course. Here, Diana is working with Riley (R) on trying to clarify Riley’s discussion about food and culture.

Excerpt 9. Multilingual Writer Indexes Membership to Localized Communities of Practice

1. R; li::ke (2.5) like my hometown
2. D; mhmm
3. R; uh:: the wea::ther the location u::m decide the food #should #be #is
4. sp— spicy↑
5. D; okay
6. R; a::nd... am— american the:: uh:: (3.0) uh:: (Hx) they have a lot of cows #right here
7. D; uh-huh
8. R; so people like to eat %beef.. %pork
9. D; ## okay..so lets talk about that for a second um.. i thi::nk hmm.. food connects culture food (H) because what im— from what im hea::ring
10. this↑ one um… (H) um (Hx) its almost like a separate:: kind of:: topic right? [when I think]
11. R; [mhmm]
In lines 1-7, Riley explained the differences between how food and her hometown in comparison to the United States. Diana backchanneled throughout, but did not uptake any of Riley’s turns. According to Riley, weather and location were factors that determined the spiciness of the food in her hometown. She also explained that Americans owned a lot of cows, so people consumed beef and pork. What was interesting in the first few turns, was that a lot of the ideas that Riley talked about were primarily hedged, either with the use of delays or the English DMs *um* and *uh*. A few tokens were also prosodically lengthened (e.g. weather, the, um, uh). The hedges were probably used to avoid any face threatening acts, especially because
she was addressing an authority figure (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Kärkkäinen, 2006). As a result, there were clear instances of 
a power differential, as signaled by Riley’s use of hedges that signaled her 
own subordinate position, as well as her instructor’s authority.

In this instance, given the fact that Riley had access and control to the 
floor to provide information about her paper and her research topic, she had 
some authority over her work, but in examining line 1, Riley clearly oriented 
towards her hometown, not China. So because her orientation was towards 
hometown, and how culinary practices were shaped by the weather and 
location, it seemed that she indexed membership to her hometown and 
community, and most importantly, that these culinary practices did not 
represent all of China’s culinary practices, which could be subject to variation 
based on the location, weather, and resources. In short, while she was 
Chinese, Riley’s perspective on food and culture was linked to her community, 
and more specifically, her community’s culinary practices. This meant that 
Riley was indexing membership to her local community, and more specifically, 
how that community had shaped her understanding of the relationship 
between food and culture. However, in lines 10-13 Diana read out what 
seemed to be a sentence of Riley’s paper, before proffering her assessment 
of it. The assessment itself included delays (e.g. pauses; English DMs um uh; 
prosodic lengthening) that signaled Diana’s evaluation (Kärkkäinen, 2006, 
2012). In lines 12-13, Diana’s assessment explained that it seemed that Riley 
was writing about two separate topics in her paper.
Riley did not uptake nor did she resist Diana’s evaluation in the overlap in lines 14. Diana continued in line 15, and asserted that Riley did a good job. However, the hedges in lines 15-17 (e.g. pauses, use of English DMs, prosodic lengthening of words) indicated that Diana was about to proffer further assessment, and did in lines 17-19, when she explained that Riley continued to address the relationship between food and culture, but not necessarily how. Diana then provided an example that Riley gave in her paper, where she talked about how Americans liked to work so they try to work during the day more, so they only have an hour or less for a lunch break, or they go to get fast food for lunch. Here, Diana sought preferred agreement when she was talking about what Riley had written, which as seen elsewhere, made the reading or evaluation of Riley’s essay non-negotiable because resistance would have been face threatening (Holtgraves, 2000; Pomerantz, 1984; Robinson & Holden, 2010).

And in the latter of her evaluation, Diana used the epistemic stance marker *I think* (Kärkkäinen, 2006; 2012), before asking Riley to consider about how she could use the example to make a claim about American culture or even China. In other words, Diana wanted Riley to write about America or China as a whole, and in articulating those expectations, she also indexed her authority. In doing so, she also reaffirmed Riley’s subordination, which was indexed earlier in the conversation in lines 1-7.

As mentioned earlier, Riley oriented towards her home community in her discussion of culinary practices, and how those practices were connected to the weather and location. In doing so, Riley did not enact a stance where
she attempted to illustrate a homogenous view of Chinese culinary practices, but instead her stance on culinary practices were embedded in the culinary practices of her hometown, and not China as a whole. Given this orientation, and her stance, in line 27, there was a 5 second pause before her response, where Riley did not uptake Diana’s last turn, which could have indicated that Riley struggled in orienting towards a macro-scale Chinese identity or perspective on Chinese culinary practices, because she had already previously oriented towards a more localized identity and membership to a smaller community. As a result, her understanding about the relationship between food and culture was shaped by her community, and not China or Chinese culture as a whole. Shortly thereafter, in line 28, Diana mentioned that she was perhaps not clear. I would argue here that what was the problem in this interaction was not so much the clarity of Diana’s evaluation, but rather the misunderstanding in the orientation that Riley had taken earlier on in the interaction. In other words, Riley was unable to define Chinese culture solely based on very localized culinary practices, because her orientation highlighted her membership to a local community, and perhaps even, a localized understanding of food and culture that was situated in the practices of her hometown.

While there was a chance that Diana was not being clear, what was clear was that Riley oriented towards her hometown, and not China as a whole. Because Riley was talking about her hometown, and her understanding of the value of food in the US was based on her experiences, it seemed that Diana’s insistence that Riley discussed China or America as
these collective groups in her paper, was problematic for Riley, because she could not define each group entirely without making generalizations about Chinese and American cultures. In short, by indexing her authority, Diana possibly reinforced this idea that Riley should have made a generalization about the two countries as a whole, even though it was not possible for Riley, given variations and differences in resources, weather, and practices that ultimately shaped the culinary practices and culture of her hometown. Moreover, this illustrated the fact that she was also attempting to constitute her identity, and membership to her local community, but because Diana brought up China as a whole, it instead invalidated Riley’s active membership in this local community, because Diana did not ratify Riley’s identity constructions or orientations in the writing conference.

What this demonstrated then, was that it was not just in the process of trying to identify with one group or community of practice that was a problematic for multilingual students, but the process of defining an entire group of people and its culture as a whole was problematic. Because the multilingual writers featured in this study all identified with hybrid identities and various communities of practice, it became exceedingly problematic to ask them to define cultures and communities in a vacuum, because it required them to make sweeping generalizations about culture and communities, even though multilinguals took multiple orientations, their view and understanding of the social world could be otherwise influenced by the various communities that they belonged to. Ignoring these communities and their importance to multilingual writers in lieu of one did little to validate these writers as
multilinguals. While these generalized discussions about culture, identity and community could make grading or discussing such topics with students easier for instructors, who might not just be teaching more than one class, it in no way made progress for working with multilingual writers, because not all facets of their identities were ratified.

The invalidation of multilingual writers’ hybrid identities seemed to be related to the instructors of this study, and more specifically how they used Gee’s (1989) discourse communities framework. Because of the fact that these students had to limit themselves to the confines of just one community in their assignments, and quite possibly to just one orientation towards one community, they were unable to index memberships to various communities in order to constitute hybrid identities. Because of this, it should come to no surprise that in the data collected, instructors did not address multilinguals’ language use, and they certainly did not talk about their first or second languages in the writing conferences themselves, let alone language use in general. The following analysis focused on another excerpt from Diana’s conference with Ezra, and it documented just how, even in discussions about his family, there was little reference to Ezra’s Spanish use, which could point to an existing language hierarchy in the institution.

Excerpt 10. Multilingualism in FYC—the big, hybrid elephant in the room

1. D; so it was passed down from.. you said
2. E; from my grandma’s grandma—grandma’s mom
3. D; okay… and then:. Think about now that when your mom is:. eating
4. uh:: shrimp cakes
In line 1, Diana asked Ezra to clarify who passed down the recipe to his mother. In his turn in line 2, Ezra explained that his mother got the recipe from his “grandma’s grandma—grandma’s mom.” Then in lines 3-4, Diana asked him to think about when his mom ate shrimp cakes, before asking for the name of the recipe in Spanish in line 6. Ezra explained in line 7 that the recipe was called torta de camarón. After discovering the name of the recipe, Diana then stated that he should explain “what you get from it.” Ezra did not uptake her assessment, and instead just backchanneled in line 9, which meant that there was no real indication that he understood Diana’s assessment of his Spanish use. In line 10, Diana asked him to consider how the recipe reflected his family, and why it was important. Again, Ezra did not uptake or challenge her assessment of his work, nor did he resist the questions that were proffered in Diana’s evaluation.

What was interesting here, was the fact that although Diana asked for the Spanish name for the recipe, Diana did not uptake Ezra’s use of Spanish, or the Spanish name for the recipe for the remainder of the excerpt and the conference itself, even though she asked Ezra to consider the importance of
the meal with respect to his family in line 10. The fact that the Spanish name was only brought up once in their discussion, and was never addressed again, even though the recipe seemed to have some familial and social significance for Ezra, could indicate that even the original Spanish name did not have a place in Ezra’s discussion of the recipe in his paper, and might be further indication of language hierarchy in institutionalized settings (Woolard & Schieffelin, 2014; Woolard, 2008). So in this instance, although Ezra was welcome to write about this recipe and its significance for his family, he had to do so in English because of the fact that that was and is the language of the institution. In addition, the use of Spanish—or lack thereof—clearly pointed to the fact that its use could not be reconciled with the social and ideological value of the English language in the university, even though Spanish was the most predominant language used by the students that participated in this study.

Linguistic research has documented how the use of multiple linguistic resources allowed multilinguals to be linguistically innovative in their language use (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Bucholtz, 2007, 2012; Podesva, 2007). However, in this context, it was difficult to illustrate how linguistically innovative multilingual writers were because the writing conferences themselves did not center around multilinguals’ use of their linguistic resources in their writing. Further, instructors did not uptake or actively engage with multilingual writers' languages, and they certainly pushed back against multilinguals’ orientations towards their memberships to micro-scale or localized communities of practice, hybridity, or in this case multilingualism.
As a result, these findings could suggest that there was a linguistic hierarchy in the university.

Because of the fact that language was seldom addressed in the 18 conferences that were collected for this study, this not only demonstrated that English was valued in First-Year Composition classrooms (especially in the five courses that were surveyed here), but also indicated the fact that the university is and was an English-only institution. As a result, if the expectation was to have multilingual writers succeed in the university, then what they did in their writing classrooms had to align with this English-only ideology. As a result, it was also important to consider to what extent these multilingual writers were being socialized into academic practices, and the possible implications this could have for working with multilingual writers, particularly in instances where multilingual writers were socialized into academic writing practices.

The following analysis considers what happens when multilinguals’ writing clashes with instructor’s expectations, and arguably, ideologies about academic writing practices. Here, Ashley (A) and Becky (B) discussed her paper about the discourse community of college students.

Excerpt 11. Socializing Multilingual Students

1. A: (H) so this is (Hx) reading like your— your %annotations... u::m (3.0)
2. so just from like generally looking %at what you have so fa::r you have
3. these s:ingle source kind of %reports u::m what you’re gonna need to
4. do and the feedback i’m going to give %is gonna you need to start
5. working into conversation (H) which means like you’re gonna need to
6. pull you have organize around um concepts so=

7. B; =mhmm=

8. A; =like if you have these sort of like (H) um multitude of roles hours

9. being spent working; like (H) do— do multiple sources talk about the

10. juggle between work and school? And the impact it has on the

11. students? Or the uh— the %people? Do you understand?

12. B; yeah

In this instance, Ashley indexed expertise in her assessment of how Becky should have incorporated her scholarly sources in lines 1-6, in that Ashley stated that Becky’s work should not have read like single source reports. Ashley’s assessment, then, indicated that there was a specific way that Becky should work with her sources in her paper (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Murphy, 2000; Severino, 2009) and that Ashley knew how to synthesize scholarly sources. Her expertise in this instance was further illustrated in lines 4-6, when Ashley began to advise Becky about what she had to do in her revision. Ashley additionally stated that Becky would to have to incorporate her sources “into conversation,” which meant that Becky had to go through her essay and synthesize her sources. However, Ashley did not explain how, nor did she specifically refer to places in the text where synthesis was needed. Becky did not uptake Ashley’s assessment to indicate that she understood what Ashley meant, or to even ask what she meant by working her sources into conversation.

Even though there was little uptake on Becky’s behalf, there were some clear expert-novice constructions. These expert-novice identities were
exceedingly clear, in instances of socialization (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1986a, 1994; Ochs, 1987, 1992, 1996; Vickers, 2007), where Becky was being socialized into distinct ways of working with other sources in her essay. In lines 5-6, Ashley mentioned that Becky needed to organize her sources “around concepts.” Ashley then asked Becky later in lines 8-11, to determine what her sources said about juggling work and school and the impact it had on students and to discuss those ideas in her synthesis. In doing so, Ashley attempted to situate the practice of synthesizing scholarly sources—albeit a bit vaguely, and decontextualized—into their conversation to provide Becky some context to understand this process.

In giving Becky advice, where she not only attempted to give her questions to frame her understanding of how to work with sources, Ashley positioned herself as an expert who knew how to synthesize scholarly sources, which was why she attempted to illustrate the synthesis process in lines 8-11. As a result of this kind of positioning, Becky took on a much more novice position. What this indicated, then, that Becky’s draft did not align with specific expectations related to the synthesis of scholarly articles, which was why Ashley attempted to demonstrate what to do with sources. In doing so, Ashley not only reaffirmed her position as an authority, but as an expert as well. In her post-conference interview, Becky mentioned that she noticed a similar instructor/student dynamic in her interaction with her instructor, where Ashley read through her paper and “gave her opinion” and feedback, which seemed to reaffirm the expert-novice constructions seen throughout the excerpt. Ashley, on the other hand, noted her frustration, and explained that it
was related to the fact that she never fully got an indication from her student that she understood some of the feedback she was giving her in her writing conference.

However, even though Ashley did attempt to provide some sort of guidance to get Becky to think about how to synthesize her sources, the manner in which she attempted to socialize Becky fell flat, because Ashley never referred to the work that Becky had already done, or specific places in the student’s writing. As a result, this might explain why there was so little uptake from Becky, because the socialization of this academic practice was so decontextualized that it was not enough for the socialization itself to be effective. Further, because the discussion was never situated in the work that Becky brought to the conference, there was never a true sense where the two interactants came to a moment of shared understanding or intersubjectivity (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Murphy, 2000). This was particularly significant because in the discussion of multilingual writing, some—not all—instructors took it upon themselves to situate concepts into conversations in such a way, that demonstrated their expertise, and pointed to ways of writing that were expected of students in the university. However, if multilingual—even monolingual students—are never exposed to this kind of situated practice, they run the risk of remaining in these novice positions (Lave & Wegner, 1991). In short, although multilingual writers—or writers in general—were aware that these practices take place in the university, they were not as certain as to how they could have engaged in these kind of practices.

In addition to the decontextualized nature of this socializing instance,
Becky also did not have access to legitimately participate in the act of synthesizing, and coupled with the decontextualized nature of socialization that occurred in this conference, probably made it difficult for Becky to move away from this novice position in the interaction and in her writing. Studies have demonstrated why it was important to contextualize material for learners, particularly in instances where they were situated and actively have to engage with the material that they have to learn, because instructors and students could then negotiate the author’s intension and purpose (Anson, 1999; Ackerley & Coccetta, 2007; Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Chun, 1998; Levis & Pickering, 2004; Murphy, 2000; Severino, 2009; Sommers, 1982; Tardy, 2006). In doing so, instructors could have arguably provided well-rounded feedback based and situated in what multilingual writers accomplished in drafts of their essays.

In her interview about her pedagogies, Ashley mentioned her curriculum centered on “multi discourses,” which was why she began every course with Gee (1989) and identifying discourses that students belong to, before moving into a discussion about discourse communities. Ashley also discussed the connection between discourse communities and academia, and specifically how multilingual writers did not have to lose themselves, which was also the driving force for the assignment that Ashley and Becky went over in excerpt 11. As mentioned earlier in this study, the majority of the multilingual writers who had writing assignments grounded in Gee’s discourse community framework struggled, because of the fact discourse framework theory presented a very monolingual worldview of communities, where they
had to pick one discourse community, even though that did not align with their hybrid lived experience. This could suggest that the lack of uptake was an indicator that—just as it occurred in excerpts 8, 9 and 10—Becky did not necessarily identify with the way that college students were constructed here, because it was not relevant to her experience.

Although this assignment did not ask students to write from their own perspective about their discourse communities, again, when dealing with multilingual writers, their memberships were not as easily defined, because of the fact that they—and even perhaps monolingual students as well—identify as members of multiple communities, and it was these assignments that prevented them from being able to carve out a Third Space, that would have allowed them to index hybridity (Bhabha, 1994; Bhatt, 2008; Goble, 2014).

What made a difference in this case, was just how multilingual writers moved away from the periphery to become full-fledged participants in academic communities of practice. In instances like excerpt 11, where the socialization was too vague in of itself, it was assumed that multilingual writers knew how to grapple and engage with these kinds of practices because they have been addressed in class. What was problematic about such a presupposition was the fact that it did not give multilingual writers the opportunity to truly situate this practice in their writing, because of how decontextualized these socialization attempts were, and how little access multilingual writers had to the actual activity itself, which would have helped in the socialization process (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1994; Ochs, 1987, 1992, 1996; Vickers, 2007). And in instances where multilingual writers participated
less in the understanding of these community-based practices, that they remained in the periphery, and in these novice positions.

3.1.3 Contextualized Practice into Revision Strategies

Based on the previous analysis, it was important to note how important situated, contextualized practices, particularly when social actors were being socialized into value-laden practices. As this analysis will demonstrate, in providing multilingual writers opportunities to legitimate participation, they not only obtained the contextualized, social experience necessary to be able to accomplish these activities on their own, but then they also exercised agency over their own work. In this analysis, I examine an excerpt from Catherine’s class, where she and Alex (A) are discussing his literacy narrative.

Excerpt 12. Situated Revision Practice

1. C; [H] um... <QUOTE> the drum major’s call— call to attention to the
2. band until we responded <QUOTE> but did you shout or scream? You
3. *just* responded?
4. A; @@@
5. C; <QUOTE> with the word hi::t in unison <QUOTE> and was how
6. was it like?
7. A; we #played out guess yeah [H] w— we shouted out
8. C; okay [@@@@@]
9. A;  [@@@@@]
10. C; all right that’s more like it I a::ssumed because its in capital letters
11. like that=
12. A; =mhmm=
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In lines 1-3, Catherine read through Alex’s work before requesting more information so that his paper reflected what he remembered on a much more stylistic and vivid level. In doing so, Catherine began to evaluate Alex’s word choice (i.e. responded), which was framed by her use of the word just (Kiesling, 2011) to prepare Alex for the rest of the utterance, where Catherine sought clarification.

Alex’s laughter in line 4 signaled camaraderie, which indicated that although Catherine read from his paper, he was engaged, and even more in that, his response indexed solidarity (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kärkkäinen 2006, 2012; Kiesling, 2011) or that he felt comfortable working with his instructor in what could otherwise be a potentially face-threatening situation. In the following turn in lines 5-6, Catherine continued to read from the paper, before asking Alex to elaborate on his experience, and in doing so assumed a less knowing position in the interaction, whereas Alex resumed a K+ position.
Alex maintained this K+ position in the following turn in line 7 where he elaborated, and explained that they shouted out instead of just merely responding to the one leading his marching band. In doing so, Alex was able to constitute a relationship to the epistemic domain, but also co-constructed and took on a more knowing position that had been initiated in a small sequence of request for information (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2012, 2012b). Most importantly, Alex was given the opportunity to negotiate his meaning with his instructor (Severino, 2009).

In the following turn, Catherine then ratified Alex’s elaboration, which was followed by an overlap in their laughter in lines 8 and 9, before Catherine admitted that she had assumed as much. Again, here we see instances where solidarity were indexed in the responses to assessments. What was specifically telling here, was the fact that Catherine mentioned that she had assumed that that was what Alex originally meant in his paper, but instead proposing that assumption to Alex, which could have altered the positioning, she positioned Alex as the one with the more knowledge in this interaction in her evaluation, and in doing so, she invited him to actively participate in the evaluation of his writing, but also returned responsibility, agency and authorship of the text to Alex (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Severino, 2009; Sommers, 1982; Tardy, 2006). In addition, by ratifying his elaboration, this also illustrated that she did not have rights to the epistemic domain in this instance (something that was primarily the case in the majority of the one-on-one conferences that were analyzed for this study), because this was Alex’s lived experience, which made him the interactant with more knowledge and
the only one in this instance with rights to access to the epistemic domain (Heritage, 2010; Heritage, 2012; Heritage, 2012b).

Catherine and Alex continued to negotiate the meaning that he was trying to convey to his readers—what he wanted his readers to get out of that particular sentence. And in examining lines 16-19, Catherine and Alex attempted to come up with a word that would better express what he wanted to say. In line 16, Alex asked Catherine what would have been a better choice in his paper, and in this instance it seemed that he was appealing to her own authority in this instance, but instead of taking up this role in the interaction, Catherine instead emphasized the word *shouted* slightly, as indicated through the slight prosodic lengthening marked in the transcription, and in doing so she also ratified the verb he had used earlier in line 7. At first, Alex repeated what Catherine had said in her turn, but then she explained that it was the exact word that he had used earlier on in their conversation in line 7. Because Catherine ratified Alex’s word choice that he had used earlier in their interaction, as a means to emphasize his agency in the interaction, she was able to distance herself from the utterance, and position Alex as the owner of it.

By eliciting and ratifying, then, it could be argued that Catherine then also helped to co-construct his K+ position, but most importantly, also opened up a space in their conversation for him to legitimately participate and negotiate meaning in the evaluation of his own writing. In doing so, Alex gained social experience, where he not only practiced assessing his own writing in a way that was contextualized and he was working with his own text,
but was also being socialized into recognizing his own agency as a writer because of the fact that his utterances in the evaluation of his own work was ratified by his instructor. In this instance, what made a difference was the fact that he not only had access to legitimate experience in revising his own work, but also the fact that the instructor ratified his contribution in the evaluation of his writing, and in doing so demonstrated that he had something worth saying, and ultimately legitimized the experience he was writing about. Following Anson (1999), what was successful about this particular instance was the fact that the instructor and the student were able to negotiate Alex’s intended meaning, and in doing so, Alex retained agency and authorship of his work (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Beck, 2006; Severino, 2009; Tardy, 2006).

The importance of this kind of legitimate experience, then, could arguably impact interactions between multilinguals and FYC instructors, in that these writers will have had the social experience, where their contributions were ratified by instructors, and could become more comfortable in resisting the constructions and evaluations proffered by their instructors. In other words, if multilinguals have had some experience, where they were asked by their instructors to openly contribute to the discussion about their writing, instructors could then provide more opportunities to socialize them into practices situated in their writing. And in doing so, multilinguals might feel courageous enough to respond, or even resist, their instructors’ assessments.

As demonstrated earlier in the analysis of excerpt 12, Alex was asked to provide information about the marching band festival he was writing about. In the analysis of this next excerpt, I further examined the impact of having
multilingual writers to actively participate in the evaluation of their own work. In doing so, not only did instructors have the opportunity to socialize multilingual writers—and monolingual writers as well—but this also provided students with the experiences necessary where they critically engaged with their work. In doing so, this not only invited multilinguals to be critical participants and evaluators of their own work, but also agents who could push back against instructors’ initial assessments of their own work.

Excerpt 13 Socializing Multilingual Writers as Experts and Agents

1. C; %uh I loved your imagery:: in this first sentence in the second paragraph <QUOTE> it was four thirty pm at Barstow high school’s annual competition (H) and not a cloud to be seen under the blistering hot sun (H) <QUOTE> so that’s like excellent imagery right %there
2. A; mhmm
3. C; because instantly i know... i can picture what you are %seeing i can picture the world as you are seeing it [H] more that of that is %needed in your paper because then i feel it just got rushed and carried away [H] and i understand that that’s how especially if it’s an emotional story for you and it should be: because it’s a time when you felt you %belonged so um just kind of re-see it now in terms of it has to have more imagery so:: what were you wearing?... @@=
4. A; =@@ so like um::=
5. C; =what color was it?
6. A; it was maroon... because our uniform was all complete maroon yeah
7. C; mhmm
17. A; the thing is *I wanted* it to make it seem the second paragraph you
18. said that it was rushed
19. C; mhmm
20. A; *I wanted* to make it seem that that's how competition is like
21. everything is rushed there’s no time to even breathe or anything and
22. that’s what I wanted to make it seem but *I guess::* I didn’t @@@=
23. C; *tha::t* that little transition of information would make this completely
24. different
25. A; mhmm
26. C; because then that’s a rhetorical device you’re *%using:: you’re trying*
27. *to be rushed*
28. A; yeah

From the beginning of this transcript, Catherine positively reinforced
Alex’s use of imagery in lines 1-4, where she not only emphasized her initial
response to the imagery in that particular paragraph by stating that she not
only loved it, but also by emphasizing the token *imagery* prosodically. At the
end of her turn on line 4, after reading the example that Catherine was
responding to in lines 1-3, she reiterated her response to the imagery at the
end and particularly emphasized her evaluation with the glottalization of the
word *there* to emphasize where the strength in Alex’s paper was. At the same
time, the positive reinforcement framed the unfolding evaluation that followed
in line 7 (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Kärkkäinen, 2006, 2012; Kiesling,
2011), when Catherine commented that more vivid imagery was needed in his
paper, which she of course also emphasized through the glottalization of the
verb needed. In line 8, she continued to hedge her evaluation with I feel, before going on to explain the importance of having that kind of imagery in his writing, in order to get a more vivid picture of his experience. Similar to what happened in excerpt 12, here Catherine asked a series of questions in lines 11-14, designed to request rather than assert information, about Alex's marching band experience. Here, because Catherine asked for more information about Alex's uniform, again, this reaffirmed his more knowing position just as she had done in excerpt 12.

What was particularly interesting was Alex's following turn. In lines 17-18 and 20-22, Alex responded to Catherine's evaluation by framing his own response with the utterance I wanted as an epistemic stance marker before the actual evaluation was proffered in the interaction, and to hedge his utterance (Kärkkäinen, 2006, p. 719). Alex later explained the rationale behind the choices he made in his paper, and indexed epistemic authority by explaining that he wanted to convey the feeling of being rushed in lines 20-22. Because Alex indexed epistemic authority, and provided additional information that Catherine did not have, this meant that he was not only taking on a more knowing position, but that he was positioning his instructor as the K-interactant, because he was explaining the choices he had made, and their intended purpose in his paper. Similar to excerpt 12, what was important and significant here was the fact that in eliciting information from her student, Catherine and Alex were able to negotiate his intentions as the author of this particular literacy narrative (Severino, 2009). In her following turn in line 23 after Alex's clarification, Catherine emphasized that providing that additional
information—in reference to Alex’s utterance “there's no time to breathe” in line 21—would have been rhetorically effective for his paper, and in doing so reaffirmed Alex’s K+ status, and her own K- status. As a result, both Catherine and Alex were able to co-construct Alex’s more knowing position in this instance, as well as Catherine’s less knowing one, and in doing so, validated Alex’s agency over his own writing.

In terms of socialization, because Catherine did not reject Alex’s explanation of his choices, but instead ratified them, Catherine signaled that she had understood what that he was trying to do, but also provided social experience, where his resistance was welcomed and not immediately shut down. This was particularly important, because of the fact that up until this point in the study, the majority instructors appropriated multilingual writers’ work, asserted their expertise, indexed ideologies about academic writing, communities of practice and cultures, because the multilingual writers in this study were not given the opportunity to clarify the purpose of their writing, nor were they given the opportunity to truly negotiate with their instructors (Anson, 1999; Beck, 2006; Murphy, 2000). The act of eliciting information, inviting multilingual writers to contribute, and resist, could have carved out a Third Space for them to index their expertise, and most importantly their hybridity. What was ultimately key here was the negotiation of power—or rather, instructors’ willingness to negotiate power (Anson, 1999; Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Beck, 2006; Gale, 1996; Severino, 2009; Sommers, 1982; Tardy, 2006) in such a way that multilinguals were able to assert their hybridity, their memberships to communities of practice, as well as expertise
about their own research topics and projects. When power shifted to FYC instructors, as it did elsewhere in this study, notions about what constituted academic writing, culture, community, and expertise were otherwise perpetuated under a monolingual, hegemonic lens that did not recognize local and macro-scales of identity in the case of multilingual writers.

During his post-conference interview, Alex mentioned that when Catherine took the time to explain her comments, it made him—and the rest of the participants from his class—feel like he was talking to “an actual human being,” instead of just taking comments from an “invisible instructor.” In addition, Alex also added that this kind of conversation created a safe space for them to participate. When I asked Alex about how he felt about being asked for more information about his paper, specifically in instances where he had to either to clarify or elaborate, he mentioned that he felt comfortable doing so, and that it also demonstrated that his instructor was genuinely interested in what he had to say. I also asked Alex whether or not he would have felt comfortable challenging the instructor, had he not been given the chance to elaborate or clarify. Alex said no. Again, here it would seem that giving multilingual writers the opportunity to contribute and not just listen to their instructors discuss their own writing, actually led to a rich, collaborative interaction that was designed based on the students’ expertise, in what could otherwise be an asymmetrical and power-driven interaction. More control was given to Alex, which allowed for him and Catherine to negotiate and co-construct meaning.
When asked about why turns were designed to elicit more information from her students, Catherine mentioned that it was important for her students to understand that they were experts, which was why she was conscious of not only just positively reinforcing what they did well, but also just acknowledging their ideas, and opening the floor for them to explain what they were trying to say, specifically in instances when she needed clarification. As a result, by eliciting information from her student, Catherine tried to position herself as more of a colleague than someone to take orders from, and that was the case the previous two excerpts and other conferences with her students, and in doing so also allowed her to come to an understanding of what her students wanted to accomplish in their literacy narratives.

3.2 Discussion and Implications of Findings

Based on this analysis, instructors and multilingual students of first-year composition co-constructed expert and novice identities. As a result of this kind of identity work and power differential, multilingual writers’ orientations towards multilingualism and hybridity were largely unacknowledged and invalidated. Data analysis revealed that use of preferred organization particularly in the enactment of authoritative or epistemic stances, where instructors proffered their own co-evaluation in discussions about concepts or ideas in multilingual writers’ work, allowed instructors to assert their expertise and authority not just about writing, but also about students’ research topics.
As demonstrated in the analysis of excerpt 1, instances where instructors used the English DM right, just after framing and openly challenging the evaluations made by students, resulted in the organization of preferred agreement, where multilingual writers were forced to agree with their instructor’s assessment of their work and ideas, because of the fact that the interactional frame called for interactants to agree (Goffman, 1974, 1981; Gumperz, 1982; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004; Pagliai, 2012; Schleghoff, 2007; Seilhamer, 2011; Zimmerman, 1998) in order to avoid being face threatening by challenging or resisting instructors’ evaluations (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Holtgraves, 2000; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Pomerantz, 1984; Robinson & Bolden, 2010). According to Gumperz (1982), “Any utterance can be understood in numerous ways, and that people make decisions about how to interpret a given utterance based on their definition of what is happening at the time of interaction… they define the interaction in terms of a frame or schema which is identifiable and familiar” (p. 130). The use and interpretation of this particular sequence (e.g. preferred organization) led to the co-construction and understanding of authority that instructors initially indexed in the evaluations themselves as illustrated in excerpt 1, whereas multilinguals were co-constructed as subordinates. In doing so, instructors like Lisbeth were able to reject multilingual writers’ by way of asserting their authority, and in doing so invalidated writers’ ideas as they came up in the discussion of concepts in one-on-one conferences.

Excerpt 2, on the other hand, also revealed that in instances, where FYC instructors indexed ideologies about the writing and drafting process,
were equally problematic in interactions with multilingual writers. As demonstrated in the analysis, Dylan’s turns were designed in such a way that it inhibited Sam from contributing or contesting any of the assertions that were made when Dylan proffered them. At the same time, instructors also stressed the importance of a specific set of writing practices in their evaluations of multilingual student writing. Such evaluations, however, were not situated in the choices that multilinguals made in their essays, even if multilingual writers attempted to make those processes clear in interaction. According to Patron (2014), interactants can signal “…the particular epistemic quality of some knowledge (within an epistemic domain) held by the speaker. Epistemic stances mark either how the speaker... knows something, in terms of certainty, or the source of such knowledge” (Patron, 2014, pp. 405-406). As a result, because Dylan pointed to the epistemic quality—either source knowledge or certainty—of his stance on the writing process, it pointed to “gradients” of knowledge and certainty—K+ or K- (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2010; Heritage, 2012; Heritage, 2012b), which in turn helped make ideologies about standard academic writing processes salient in the conference.

By referring to source knowledge (e.g. class readings, discussions, etc.), FYC instructors were able to question the validity of the choices that multilinguals students made, particularly in discussions about academic writing practices (e.g. drafting, incorporating ideas, revision), because of the fact that the choices voiced by multilingual writers clashed with ideologies about very specific writing practices, and often times also clashed with
instructors’ visions of ideal texts (Anson, 1999; Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Beck, 2006; Murphy, 2000; Severino, 2009; Straub, 1996; Tardy, 2006). In short, multilingual writing practices were invalidated on the basis of source knowledge (Heritage, 2010, 2012, 2012b; Kiesling, 2011; Patron, 2014).

Because instructor authority was derived from the instructor’s position in the university, as well as that which would typically be granted by knowledge—source knowledge (Bahktin, 1973; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Brooke & Hendricks, 1989; Broad, 2003; Gale, 1996; Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Heritage, 1984, 2012, 2012b; Kiesling, 2011; Mortensen & Kirsch, 1993; Philips, 2004), by indexing authority and pointing to ideologies about academic writing, in instances where instructors took stances about the writing process, not only illuminated the sociocultural values about writing, but also how multilingual writers failed to reflect those ideologies in their writing. As illustrated in the analyses, multilingual writers had little to no opportunities where they and their instructors for engaged with those practices by using the students’ writing, in such a way where they could familiarize, situate, and develop their own understanding of those practices. In short, because multilinguals were not given the opportunity to engage with their own work in these interactions, instructors and students never arrived to moments of intersubjectivity, where both instructor and student signaled a shared understanding of these concepts (Beck, 2006), because multilingual writers’ assignments were largely ignored.

This could suggest that writing practices discussed in these conferences were not inclusive of other kinds of writing practices, and that
multilinguals are indeed patronized for not adhering to these values, even though it was difficult to determine what students did accomplish in their writing. Following Gale (1996), instructors’ expertise was used to "exclude or punish, to domesticate or transform students," (p. 50) because of the fact that multilingual writers were positioned as “the one[s] who do[es] not know and ha[ve], therefore, to be worked on and changed” (p. 50), instead of creating moments in interaction where instructors and students could have intersubjectively constituted their own understandings of these kinds of practices.

What was also startlingly clear in these instances, then, was that because of multilingual writers’ work, or discussion of how they intended to approach a project, clashed with instructors' notions about the academic writing process, multilingual writers were kept in these novice positions, because instructors did very little with multilingual students’ writing in the interactions themselves. Following Lave and Wenger (1991), moving to full participation in communities of practice would have required multilingual writers in this instance to engage in various sociocultural practices, which would have helped them develop knowledge and skills necessary to move them from legitimate peripheral participation to full participation (p. 27). But to do so would have required instructors to work with and discuss with students what they accomplished in drafts of their papers. In doing so, instructors could have situated their discussion of these value-laden practices within the context of what the multilingual writers themselves accomplished, in order to get students to critically think about the choices they made, but to also
negotiate and come up with strategies that would help multilingual writers to more clearly articulate what they wanted to say (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Beck, 2006; Murphy, 2006; Severino, 2009; Straub, 1996; Tardy, 2006).

Instructors should continue to evaluate and challenge their students, but in a contextualized fashion that would require multilingual writers to grapple with their own work, and not de-contextualized concepts referenced in interaction. In other words, novices could have moved to full participation, where they actually engaged with value-laden and socially significant practices to the community, but doing so would have required a discussion of students’ writing. By discussing with multilingual writers what they did and how their choices affected their intentions as authors, they could begin to develop the knowledge and skills to be active members of the community of practice, and would then move away from mere peripheral participation. That was not the case here. Multilinguals were kept in these novice positions, because instructors never fully engaged with multilingual students’ writing, which could have granted them access to these sociocultural practices, but could have also provided instructors a better understanding of what their students’ rationale behind the choices they made in their writing (Severino, 2009). As a result, instructors were gatekeepers to opportunities that would have granted multilingual writers full participation, but this also inhibited instructors from fully understanding the purposes of multilingual students’ texts. In order to move away from peripheral participation, instructors would be best advised to actually work with students writing and to discuss it with them in interaction, without an understanding of the students’ needs and
intentions in their work, instructors could erringly provide uninformed responses (Anson, 1999; Straub, 1996).

This kind of gatekeeping was also illustrated not just in instances where instructors indexed ideologies about academic writing and appropriating multilingual writers’ essays are problematic, but also in the construction of instructors’ epistemic authority. In excerpts 3 and 4, what I found was that Lisbeth indexed authority particularly in instances where she provided information about the topic of her students’ papers to assert her expertise, or at the phonological level, when instructors used creaky voice to emphasize concepts that should be in multilingual writers’ projects. What excerpts 3 and 4 ultimately demonstrated was the fact that multilingual writers lost to their instructors’ expertise, because in indexing expertise, instructors constituted their authority in their interaction in terms of expertise, but at the same time never truly allowed for multilingual writers to fully participate in the practices that could have moved them away from legitimate peripheral participation, nor were they ever truly allowed to be epistemic authorities of their own topics, because instructors continuously asserted expertise not just about writing, but about students’ research topics themselves.

These situations were exacerbated because multilingual writers were then, in instances where their instructors asserted expertise, less likely to challenge their instructors’ expertise because it would have been extremely face-threatening for them to resist or challenge those constructions (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2012, 2012b; Holtgraves, 2000; Schegloff, 2007). As a result of these expert—novice
constructions, notions of instructor expertise, where the instructor was not just an expert about writing, but also about the subject matter in students’ texts, reaffirmed the hegemonic principles of the banking model of education (Freire, 1970, 1985), where the instructor was positioned and constructed as an all-knowing beacon of knowledge, which then had to be provided for the student, with little to no negotiation of meaning and knowledge in these writing conferences.

What was particularly problematic was that multilingual students lost to instructors expertise and authority when they were asserted in conversation. As a result, when instructors signaled their authority, positioned multilingual students as subordinates, they also took control over multilingual writers’ essays, even when students attempted to assert expert or knowledgeable positions in discussions about concepts or ideas they addressed in their writing. This was particularly problematic because demonstrates how “instructor expertise” could lead to the appropriation of multilingual students’ texts, because as instructors’ expertise was co-constructed, this also led to the constitution of subordinating, novice identities as a result. In doing so, multilingual writers had no opportunity to fully participate in the situated practices that would have otherwise helped them constitute a membership to the academic community, or the communities that they wrote about, because of the fact that instructors’ expertise was re-contextualized over and over again in interaction (Ochs, 1992). As a result of these expert-novice constructions, multilinguals never moved away from these novice identities because they were never given the chance to do so, nor were they ever given
the opportunity to negotiate what they wanted to write about with their instructors.

As a result of these expert—novice identity constructions, it should come to no surprise that multilingual writers in this study did not contest the stances or identities that instructors constituted in interaction, because of the fact that instructors wielded more authority in their writing conferences. Multilinguals’ responses to instructors evaluations in these writing conferences were designed not only to avoid face threatening acts, but to reflect power differentials and the social structures that emerged as a result (Schegloff, 2007; Zimmerman, 1998). For example, excerpt 5 revealed how Mariana indexed uncertainty and subordination in her evaluation of the prompts, because of the fact that she was fully aware of the power differentials between her and the instructor, in that she sought preferred agreement that would either confirm or contest their K+ or K- positions in the articulation of epistemic stances. Careful examination of excerpt 5 and other similar instances in the data revealed that not only did multilingual students maintain K- positions throughout conferences with instructors, but that they asserted these subordinate positions, because of the fact that their conversation was about agency—or an absence of agency.

Because interactions were driven by social schemata (Goffman, 1974, 1981; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004; Gumperz, 1982; Pagliai, 2012; Seilhamer, 2011), in instances like those discussed in the analysis of excerpt 5, multilingual students made choices that pointed to the fact that they acknowledged their fellow interlocutor’s epistemic status as either more or
less knowledgeable with regards to specific domains of knowledge (Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Goodwin, 2007; Heritage, 2010, 2012, 2012b; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Kiesling, 2011; Patron, 2014), and if instructors’ epistemic statuses were co-constructed in conversation—as they were in excerpts 1-5—then this meant that multilingual writers’ positioned themselves accordingly, and in order to reflect epistemic and power differentials. This meant that when epistemic statuses were salient in discourse, the social relationships that emerged were always asymmetrical—someone would always know more than the other (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 1984, 2012, 2012b; Patron, 2014). According to Gumperz (1982), “The means of speaking are put into practice and related to cultural norms in the performance of particular speech events. Action in such events is seen governed by social norms specifying such things as who can take part, what the role of relationships are… and what speech etiquette applies” (p.155). In other words, because multilingual writers indexed their uncertainty in student initiated evaluative activities in talk, they were often positioned as K- interactant, and instructors as K+ interlocutors. This was especially true if instructors maintained or asserted more knowing positions in talk.

This was particularly relevant, because of the fact that their choices were in part dominated by their understanding and reference to social frames that govern their understanding of how to organize talk. Because first-year writing students have only been exposed to instances where their relationships with instructors were asymmetrical, this could possibly mean that they were socialized from a very young age or in their interactions with their
instructors, to come to recognize and use assumptions about notions of instructor epistemic authority (Ochs, 1992; Seilhamer, 2011). But what was even more so problematic was that instructors did not pick up on instances when multilingual writers indexed subordination, which could possibly be related to the fact that instructors were positioning themselves as authorities or experts. In doing so, these expert—novice identities were co-constructed yet again, even if they were initiated by multilingual writers. Ultimately, FYC instructors missed an opportunity to truly “de-center” their authority in favor of multilingual writers, where multilingual writers would have had the opportunity to actively engage and constitute an intersubjective understanding of the sociocultural practices associated with academic writing by proffering their own understanding of said practices (Murphy, 2000). As a result, multilingual writers needed access to full participation, which could have been granted by using multilingual students’ writing, because then, and only then, would they have had the chance to engage with their own work, and with instructors as members of the academic community.

These expert—novice constructions were important because of the fact that FYC instructors asserted their authority by indexing expertise, but they also led to problems in validating multilingual writers’ attempts to index hybridity. As demonstrated in the analysis of excerpts 6-9, what was problematic was the fact that in each of these cases, multilingual writers’ identities were often lumped together with macro-scale communities, cultures or identities, even though they made clear attempts to distance themselves
from macro-scale identities in their orientations towards memberships to local communities of practice to index hybridity and micro-scale identities.

Unsurprisingly, in the vast majority of these instances in the data collected, instructors did not ratify, elicit or co-construct students' hybrid identities, because FYC instructors asserted much more macro-scale associations of identity by way of their authority. This happened primarily because of the fact that, in asserting their authority, FYC instructors also asserted more static and homogenized notions about culture, community, and identity. In other words, because instructors indexed their authority, they stressed notions about culture, community, and identity, and given the authority that was co-constructed in many of these interactions, these notions became non-negotiable in the stances that were enacted. As a result, multilingual writers then had to define themselves within the confines of their assignments that included Gee’s discourse communities, where varying practices, communities, or aspects of identity had to be strictly defined under an umbrella term to represent an entire social group. As a result, FYC instructors in this study were more likely to constitute boundaries as to what constituted community, culture, cultural values, as well as multilingual students’ identities.

Because multilingual writers were forced to make generalizations about the above, they often experienced difficulties in doing so, due to the fact that their understanding of the social world, their communities, values, and identities are constituted in the Third Space where they could openly transgress against hegemonic notions about language, identity, community,
and culture (Bhabha, 1994; Bhatt, 2008). As a result, this meant that the writing spaces given to them did not provide affordances, where they could safely constitute a Third Space, because it was an oppressive space where they were limited by the boundaries set up by overwhelmingly hegemonic and monolingual worldviews. In short, the fight over the Third Space became a power struggle—one where multilinguals sought to index their hybridity, and where instructors indexed their authority by stressing the importance of “ideal texts” but in doing so, they also unintentionally asserted static notions about community, culture, and identity. Multilingual writers were unable to constitute hybrid identities, because their hybridity was contested, and repackaged as hegemonic representations of an entire culture and community. Because multilingual writers’ hybrid identities were invalidated in these one-on-one conferences, this could have also reified notions that multilingual writers’ identities did not have a place in academia. According to Young (2010), standard academic English was used to mark multilinguals and multidialectal students, and to promote language ideologies that propagated the belief that as long as minority students demonstrated their mastery of standard academic English, they would be readily accepted by academia (p. 113). Adding to this scholarship, my findings indicate that this kind of discrimination against multilinguals was not limited to language use alone, but rather that the educational institution itself did not accommodate these hybrid identities, and perhaps that full participation in academia requires multilinguals to both accommodate language hierarchy, and to ignore multi-faceted aspects of their identity.
Because students’ hybridity was not ratified, it should come to no surprise that FYC instructors did not discuss language use—English or otherwise—in the data collected, with the exception of excerpt 10. In this instance, the multilingual writer was asked to code-switch once (e.g. asked for the Spanish name of the recipe), which could be an indication that languages other than English did not have a place in the university, and that there were definite indications of the fact that English had a hierarchal position in institutionalized contexts (Vickers & Goble, 2011; Woolard, 1998, 2008). This could also explain why multilingual writers’ attempts to index hybridity were challenged in instances like excerpts 6-9, because the instructors’ pedagogies and assignments were not accommodating, which meant that members in this community needed to accommodate to the values and ideologies that shaped the institution.

This was problematic, in that multilingual writers did not have access to all of their linguistic resources in order to make meaning both in interactions and in writing, which is at the heart of multilingual approaches to composition (Canagarajah, 2002, 2013; Horner, 2001; Horner et al., 2011; Leonard, 2014; Lovejoy et al. 2009; Smitherman, 2003). Based on the findings of this study, it is not enough to have one or two assignments where multilingual students investigate what they can do with language that will validate who they are as multilinguals. It is what instructors do with multilinguals’ linguistic resources, particularly in instances when these resources are used in interaction. By acknowledging multilinguals’ attempts to signal hybridity, FYC instructors can take the first steps in validating who they are as human beings. Multilingual
writers, then, need approaches that open gateways for them to constitute their identities in the Third Space, because then and only then can they push back against monolingual ideals about writing, language use, and ultimately their own sense of identity in the university. By considering and analyzing social interactions, particularly with multilingual writers, multilingual approaches to composition could be improved.

Despite the fact that there were some clear issues in discussions of hybridity, and how it emerged in one-on-one writing conferences, there were some instances where instructors attempted to socialize multilingual writers into academic writing practices, which were clear moves to assist multilingual writers as they transitioned away from these novice positions in the community. Excerpt 11 demonstrated how even though Becky struggled in synthesizing her scholarly sources, Ashley attempted to socialize her into this kind of academic writing by providing her with some guiding questions to think about how to connect her sources. However, Ashley's attempts, and similar attempts made by instructors, were extremely decontextualized. As mentioned elsewhere in this discussion, I believe what could make a difference in multilingual approaches to composition, would be the full and situated participation of multilingual students. By granting multilingual writers contextualized access to full participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991), students then have to grapple with the practices that they are expected to be able to do as participants and writers in the university with their own writing. By scaffolding and providing this situated and contextualized activities, multilingual writers, and FYC students in general, can begin to move away
from these novice positions and mere peripheral observation (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1994; Ochs, 1991, 1992; Vickers, 2007). Writers need access to legitimate participation, where they can actively participate in the practices that constitute the academic community, but also consider the choices they made as authors and agents of their own work (Anson, 1999; Severino, 2009; Tardy, 2006). All writers should be able to critically think about the choices they made, and talk with their instructors about the rationale behind those choices, in order to better understand how they can articulate the purpose of their work. If discussions about the kinds of writing students should engage in is not situated in what they have done, then students will remain peripheral participants of the activities that are expected of them by the time they leave their composition courses (Anson, 1999; Ackerley & Coccetta, 2007; Chun, 1998; Levis & Pickering, 2004; Murphy, 2000; Severino, 2009; Straub, 1996; Tardy, 2006). What is key to the process of socialization, then, is that multilingual students actually participate in the activity itself (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a).

Other attempts to socialize multilingual writers were found in excerpts 12 and 13, where instructors asked multilingual writers to both critically assess their own work, but also gave multilingual writers social experience where the assessment of their writing was contextualized. Further, these instances also provided multilingual writers with social experiences, where they were positioned as experts of their writing—and in turn the experiences they wrote about—by their instructor. By asking for clarification, Catherine positioned Alex as the K+ interactant, which granted him access to the
epistemic domain to be able to articulate his rights to possess—and in this instance—talk about it (Heritage, 2012, 2012b).

At the same time, although Catherine asked Alex to clarify, what was more important in this instance was the fact that she also ratified the information once it was provided by Alex. Because teacher’s utterances in interactions could provide evidence to students that their utterances have been heard, understood, and deemed acceptable by the instructor (Philips, 1983, p. 85), the instructor’s response to what students said, signaled that what was evaluated was acceptable. This meant that what happened in Alex’s conference illustrated that although both interactants in this instance were able to co-evaluate Alex’s writing, what made the difference in terms of being able to promote Alex’s own agency as a writer, was the fact that many of Catherine’s turns were designed to both ratify Alex’s ideas—and in this instance experience—and Alex’s epistemic status.

So while this instance provided a very contextualized experience, where Alex had to think about how he could revise his assignment, he was also being socialized into being able to think about his work critically, and to take on a more knowing position in the interaction itself, instead of just relying on the instructor to tell him what to do. Furthermore, instances like excerpts 12 and 13, demonstrated why full participation was fruitful for multilingual writers, because of the fact that writers, like Alex, were positioned as the experts of their own experiences and their own writing. In providing multilingual writers these opportunities, FYC instructors gave them opportunities to be able to experience what it meant to be an expert about
their writing, but it also gave them the social experience necessary to engage with the social practices associated with academic writing, and moved them further away from these positions of noviceness that would have kept them on the periphery and outside of the community. Furthermore, it also provided instructors and multilingual writers with a wide-range of opportunities where multilinguals’ contributions, experiences, and ultimately their identities were validated in interactions. This also gave Catherine and her students the opportunity to negotiate the meaning in multilingual writers’ texts, without stripping these students of their authorship and agency. Or in the contrary, it could have given instructors insight as to how they were not validating their multilingual writers in interactions.

Ultimately what this study demonstrated was the fact that expert—novice identity constructions were extremely problematic in interactions with multilingual writers, because of the fact they reproduced notions about instructor authority and expertise (Bahktin, 1973; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Brooke & Hendricks, 1989; Gale, 1996; Du Bois & Kärkkäinen, 2012; Heritage, 1984, 2012, 2012b; Kiesling, 2011; Mortensen & Kirsch, 1993; Philips, 1983, 2004), which also ultimately affected the validation of hybrid identities as they emerged in interaction. Because of the fact that instructors had the power to acknowledge and accept these constructions, it would be erroneous to not consider the fact that instructors also often ignored and challenged constructions made by multilingual writers in interactions. At the heart of this dilemma was the fact that instructors, in asserting their expertise and authority, overwhelmingly invalidated multilingual writers in multiple ways.
3.3 Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Research

As this study revealed, a lot of weight was put on instructors’ contributions to social interaction, which again not only led to the constitution of instructor authority at large, but at the same time it also revealed how instructors could easily and unintentionally appropriate students’ writing (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Greenhalgh, 1996; Severino, 2009; Sommers, 1982; Straub, 1996; Tardy, 2006; VanderStaay, Faxon, Meischen, Kolesnikov & Ruppel, 2009). If multilinguals’ social experiences largely consisted of interactions where they were positioned into these subordinate roles, it would be unrealistic to expect that multilingual approaches to first-year writing did validate them, especially when they took on these subordinate roles in interactions where their contributions were rejected, or when they were not given opportunities to explain the rationale behind the decisions they made as writers. When the analysis of interactions revealed that interactions articulated social hierarchy (Zimmerman, 1998) and asymmetry often feared by first-year composition instructors, shouldn’t that be an indication that FYC instructors should be aware of what they do in social interactions?

According to Ochs (1986), interactants gained language competence by interacting with others, because linguistic practices were reinforced through performance. Socialization, then, or the “interactional display” that was implicit and explicit to novices and experts alike, and reflected expectations concerning
ways of thinking, feeling and acting (Ochs, 1986, p. 2). As a result, social interaction provided information that then allowed for participants to become acculturated into various linguistic practices, because of their function as signals at various levels of social interaction (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Du Bois, 2007; Eckert, 2008; Gumperz, 1982; Pagliai, 2012; Silverstein, 2003; Soukup, 2013) . Following (Ochs, 1986), I believe that if multilingual students—and students in general—are expected to push back and contribute in composition classrooms, we have to expose them to interactions that invite them to do just that, so they can justify the reasons behind the choices they make as writers.

As a result, multilinguals need interactional frames at their disposal that encourages their contribution—either by directly eliciting information that is within their domains of expertise, ratifying their utterances, and ultimately recognizing the fact that they constitute their identities in the Third Space. If multilingual writers are limited by assignments that ask them to define who they are, what community they belong to, instead of asking them to reflect on the communities they orient towards, we are restricting the ways in which their hybrid identities can truly be validated. Because identities are multi-aspected (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, 2008; Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008; Ochs, 1992; Silverstein, 2001, 2003), FYC instructors should consider ways in which they can access their students’ linguistic resources, both for the purposes of written, rhetorical complexity (Leonard, 2014), but also for the purposes of addressing and validating their hybridity, but doing so requires an understanding of just how important the Third
Space is, because it is in this space where multilinguals can push against normative ideologies about language use, identity, and culture (Bhatt, 2008).

If multilingual writers, even monolingual writers, are limited to the confines of a single discourse community, FYC instructors will have less to work with in their classrooms, because of the fact that it pushes a worldview, where language use and identity are mutually exclusive, and are exempt from language variation, and the kind of social significance—or lack thereof—it has for language users in general. Following Johnstone and Kiesling (2008) it is ultimately up to multilingual writers to determine what is socially significant about the communities they belong to, the language they use, and its value for them, which is why they need affordances that allow them to articulate what is socially meaningful for them. FYC instructors just have to find new, and non-normative ways to make sure that their curriculum accounts for the Third Space, because what emerges in the Third Space is what is socially significant to the students in their classrooms.

First-year composition programs should consider working with trained linguists to conduct video-audio recorded in-class observations biannually, that are then analyzed by linguists who have experience analyzing empirical data. The data can then be presented to First-Year writing faculty and First-Year Writing Programs, and discussed for the purposes of having instructors develop an awareness of the discourse strategies they use with multilingual and monolingual students in class, in order to provide an interactional perspective of how multilingualism and hybridity are validated in classrooms. FYC instructors
would be best advised to re-asses how they incorporate Gee’s (1989) discourse community framework, as it proved to be problematic for the majority of multilinguals in this study, particularly in instances where hybrid identities are not addressed. It is my firm belief that instructors stand gain from developing a meta-awareness of their language use that multilingual approaches to FYC have called for. One of the instructors that participated in my study put it nicely: it’s time to practice what we preach.
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5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393
FRESHMAN COMPOSITION STUDENT INFORMED CONSENT

I am asking you to participate in a study that looks at how instructors of multilingual first-year composition interact with bilingual students. This study will be conducted by Guadalupe Rincon, an MA student in English, under the supervision of Professor Caroline Vickers. This study has been approved by the California State University, San Bernardino Institutional Review Board.

In this study, I will video record your one-on-one conference with your instructor. This can be up to, but no longer than 30 minutes. After your session, I will ask you to watch and listen to the video recording of your session in UN 056, which I will record for a 15-minute interview, and ask you questions about content of the video.

There are no known personal benefits for participating in this study, but benefits may include new discoveries for the fields of Applied Linguistics and Composition. There are minimal risks in this study, and this may include feeling discomfort at being video recorded during your appointment with your professor. However, if you find that you are uncomfortable, you may choose not to participate in this study without any negative consequences to you.

If at any point in time, you become too uncomfortable, please let me know and I will stop recording. Any data collected will be destroyed immediately. No questions asked. In addition, I will not use any data that you are not comfortable with me using. Should you have any questions at any point in the study, please do not hesitate to ask me questions.

If you choose to participate in this study, I will remove any information that could identify you, or your teacher. I will use audio and video recordings to look at interactions between teachers and students for my Master’s Thesis. I also intend on presenting my findings at conferences and publishing them in journals and books. Your name, your professor’s name and the name of your school will be replaced with pseudonyms, which are fake names, and will not be revealed. All audio and video recordings will be uploaded stored in a password-protected computer, and will be permanently deleted from the recording device, and will be permanently destroyed 10 years after data collection.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Dr. Caroline Vickers at crvickers@csusb.edu or (909) 537-5824.

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of and I understand the purpose of this study, and that I choose to participate.

Signature of Participant: __________________________

Today’s date: __________________________

909.537.5824

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393
As part of this study, I will be collecting audio and video recordings of you during your participation. By initialing all or a few of the spaces below, you will tell me what uses of the audio and recording(s) you consent to. You are free to initial all or the spaces you are most comfortable with, and will in no way affect your participation in this study. I will only use the recordings in ways that you agree to. When these recordings are used, your name will not be made public. If you do not initial any of the spaces below, the audio recordings will be destroyed.

Please indicate the type of informed consent by initialing below:

(AS APPLICABLE)

- The audio recording can be studied by the researcher for the researcher's Master's Thesis.
  Please initial _______

- The audio recording can be shown/played for scientific publications.
  Please initial _______

- The audio recording can be shown/played at meetings with scientists.
  Please initial _______

- The audio recording can be shown/played in public presentations to non-scientists.
  Please initial _______

- The video recording can be studied by the researcher for the researcher's Master's Thesis.
  Please initial _______

- The video recording can be shown/played for scientific publications.
  Please initial _______

- The video recording can be shown/played at meetings with scientists.
  Please initial _______

- The video recording can be shown/played in public presentations to non-scientists.
  Please initial _______

I have read the description above and give my permission for the use of the audio and video recording(s) as indicated above. The extra copy of this consent form is for your own records.

SIGNATURE_________________________DATE_________________________

909.537.1824
5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393
APPENDIX C:

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker attribution, letter in all caps</td>
<td>A;</td>
<td>A; okay...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause, timed</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>(3.8) um so yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold/micropause</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>.. I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause, untimed</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>... well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosodic lengthening/lag</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Ho:::w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A; how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>J; how would [you say]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B; [well you]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligible</td>
<td>#</td>
<td># one per syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># why # would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation quality less than a true voice of</td>
<td>&lt;QUOTE&gt;</td>
<td>J; well then you go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>another</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;QUOTE&gt; okay let’s do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this &lt;QUOTE&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truncated/cut-off word</td>
<td>wor—</td>
<td>Wha—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhale</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhale</td>
<td>(Hx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laugh</td>
<td>@</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing word</td>
<td>@so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocalism</td>
<td>(COUGH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click</td>
<td>(TSK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in seconds in recording</td>
<td>&lt;T=00:00:0.0&gt;</td>
<td>J; hey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;T=0:05:24.1&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creak/glottalization</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in pitch</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>oh↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in pitch</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>oh↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcription Conventions (Du Bois, 2006).
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