

ACADEMIC DISCOURSE SOCIALIZATION

YUTAKA FUJIEDA

CASE STUDY ON MULTILINGUAL LEARNERS

Academic Discourse Socialization

Academic Discourse Socialization

Case Study on Multilingual Learners

Yutaka Fujieda

LEXINGTON BOOKS
Lanham • Boulder • New York • London

Published by Lexington Books
An imprint of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowman.com

86-90 Paul Street, London, EC2A 4NE


Copyright © 2022 The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

ISBN 978-1-7936-3964-6 (cloth)
ISBN 978-1-7936-3965-3 (e-book)

 The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
Introduction	1
PART I: THEORIES OF THE STUDY AND METHODS	
1 Academic Literacy Socialization	9
PART II: CASES OF ADS OF SEVEN MULTILINGUAL LEARNERS	
2 Case Descriptions of Academic Literacy Socialization	33
3 Cross-Case Analysis of ADS	69
PART III: DISUCSSION AND SUMMARY	
4 Discussion and Implications	95
5 Summary	109
Bibliography	115
Index	123
About the Author	127

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deep gratitude to the many people who supported the publication of my book. First of all, I would like to express my deep appreciation for the seven brilliant research participants. Their vivid voices in exploring the academic discourses and engaging in this research topic were powerful and meaningful. Their participation, contribution, and enthusiasm inspired me to nurture professional identities as a teacher-researcher.

I would like to appreciate all of my staff members in my institute, Kyoai Gakuen University. Thanks to the generous support of my institute, I was able to publish this monograph.

For the completion of this publication, I am deeply indebted to Alexandra Rallo, an associate acquisitions editor of Lexington Books, and Amelia Manasterli, an production editor of Lexington Books, for their dedication to helping and advising me. Without their generous support, I would never have been able to release this book.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my family members, my wife, Yoshiko, and my children, Eimi and Mirei, whose presence has been absolutely invaluable to my life. I dedicate this book to my family, parents, and parents-in-law.

Introduction

This book illustrates a case study of academic discourse socialization (hereafter, ADS) by multilingual learners at a Japanese university. This monograph emerges mainly from my experiences of teaching third-year students a specialized class, *Research Seminar* (課題演習), at my university in Japan. This book covers the topic of ADS, which illustrates the process of socialization and academic identity construction of the students in my research seminar course, the development of their knowledge of the material, and their understanding of academic written discourse by reading the specialized journal articles of the disciplinary field, second language (L2) writing.

MY JOURNEY OF ENGAGING IN DISCOURSE COMMUNITY

The reason why I started to conduct this study derived from my experiences of ADS in the United States. I started a journey entering the academic field, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), when I was twenty-four years old. My major during my undergraduate school in Japan was international economics. I had never examined academic journals and books of linguistics, applied linguistics, and L2 education before beginning my master's degree. Whenever I looked back on the early stage of my graduate school years, I remembered my negative emotions, such as concern, anxiety, and uneasiness about the graduate-level course that I took for the first time. I was the only international student who was immature. Then, I saw myself as an inactive, reticent, and self-marginalized graduate student because I could not interact with my classmates well. When speaking Japanese outside the classroom, I was very talkative. But in the classroom, I was a totally dif-

ferent person. I was tight-lipped even if my peers asked me, “What do you think about this point?” I felt so frustrated with myself because I did not know what to do, how to respond in English to my peers’ opinions, and how I should be involved in the classroom where all students were native speakers. To survive such a harsh condition, I remembered that if I focused on listening carefully and taking notes on what my peers argued, I could learn terms and expressions about the course material. Then, fortunately, I found a few Japanese doctoral students in the TESOL program. I used to talk a lot with them in Japanese about TESOL issues casually. By the end of my master’s program, I was much more talkative in the classroom. My attitude changed completely, and I began to explore issues of English language education in Japan critically.

Then, I had a great opportunity to pursue my PhD degree in 2010, when my exploratory journey as a professional teacher-researcher began. I had the opportunity to take a one-year sabbatical from my university. I applied to an English doctoral program at a university in the United States where I completed my master’s degree. Upon entering the PhD program, I tried to prepare for my dissertation along with my coursework. Even though I had already identified a research topic, L2 writing and ADS, before starting the program, I gradually began to consider how I should delve into the issues related to my dissertation topic using a specific qualitative research method while taking classes. The more I tackled the topic of discourse socialization by reading various scholarly references, the more I wanted to unveil my visions of a research approach for ADS and identity construction. I had constructed an identity as a teacher-researcher by learning the theoretical and practical skills needed in academic society by myself and with my cohorts. In addition to revealing the study results, I would like to offer some theoretical as well as pedagogical implications for ADS in Japan and different learning settings because I continue to investigate the possibility of identifying more appropriate pedagogical practices. I remain committed to finding alternative ways to engage in academic discourse and address several questions, such as how teachers should engage students in being socialized in the classroom, what activities teachers should provide in the class, and how teachers should have students negotiate students’ agency to legitimize their learning.

MY TEACHING IN A DISCOURSE COMMUNITY, RESEARCH SEMINAR

My teaching experiences of a research seminar course was also the reason to explore the issues of ADS. I have taught my research seminar course since I

began to teach at my university in 2005. To participate in the seminar course, students must decide during their second year which research seminar they will take (see chapter 1). The research seminar aims to construct knowledge in a specialized field such as L2 acquisition, sociolinguistics, cross-cultural communication, or theories of communication and to prepare to write a required bachelor's thesis when the students become seniors. My seminar course, which highlights L2 writing scholarship, deals with a wide range of topics of L2 writing (e.g., a brief history of L2 writing, intercultural rhetoric, teacher/peer feedback, and teaching writing in L2). In the early years of conducting this research seminar, I required students to read one chapter every two weeks from a professional book, *Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice* (Ferris and Hedgcock 2005). In 2009, I began using several professional peer-reviewed articles, which covered a wide range of topics of L2 writing scholarship. By engaging myself in this seminar class for more than a decade, I launched a research journey to explore the issues of ADS and academic identity.

My research seminar students evolved in their unique ways to examine the assigned journals and understand their content like my process of committing to the academic discourse community in the United States. Every year, the students in my seminar course have difficulty constructing their expertise, since it is their first time interacting with written academic discourse through reading scholarly English texts. I know my students work very hard to read these articles in their own ways. Their attitude toward examining written academic discourse reminds me of my graduate school years at the master's level in the United States. I also found that the students went through various processes of socializing into academic discourse by interacting with their peers inside and outside the class as the seminar course progressed. I realized that being socialized into the academic communities and discourse effectively serves as scaffolding and fosters the learners' understandings of the subject matter even while they struggle to adjust to the patterns of academic written discourse. As a researcher and a teacher, my experiences in the seminar class have sparked my interest in exploring my students' process of negotiating academic discourse and in promoting their development and understanding of academic discourse.

This is the reason I want to explore the topic of ADS of my research seminar students and publish this monograph. I believe that my monograph will contribute greatly to critical discussions on ADS and construction of academic identity in various contexts, especially English as a Foreign Language (EFL).

PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

While most studies until recently that were framed explicitly as ADS have looked at oral discourse (M. Kobayashi 2003, 2006, 2016; Morita 2000, 2004), research on ADS through academic reading has not been paid attention. Nor is little known about the academic literacy of various types of learners in different learning settings. Although English is situated as a foreign language in Japanese educational contexts, learners with multicultural backgrounds and home languages other than Japanese or English attend in Japanese higher education. As the population of foreign residents in Japan increases, multilingualization and internationalization have progressed in higher education (Kitamura, Omomo, and Katsuno 2019; Y. Kobayashi 2019). The default notion that Japan is a homogeneous EFL context in which learners possess a nearly identical background in language learning experiences must be challenged. Rather, Japanese university settings entail complex and fluid contextual elements, including language background, educational history, prior knowledge, and ideology.

Supporting a relationship between academic literacy and discourse socialization (Duff 2010a, 2010b, 2012; Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, and Duff 2017; Leung and Lewkowicz 2017; Zappa-Hollman and Duff 2015), this study delved into the experiences and practices of ADS and academic identity formation by seven undergraduate multilinguals in a required research seminar class in a Japanese university. Specifically, the goal of this study was to understand how multilingual learners read professional articles in English and negotiated the meanings of them and to interpret how they went through the processes of becoming members of the discourse community. Its goal was also to examine the challenges encountered during their ADS in situated learning contexts. In addition, this study presents pedagogical approaches that should be incorporated into teaching. It emphasizes the development of expertise using scholarly reference works in undergraduate settings, and it suggests further studies of academic literacy socialization in various learning settings.

Previous investigations of ADS by L2 learners have demonstrated how these students engage in socializing into the discourse community and what aspects influence their ADS (Casanave 2002, 2003; Casanave and Li 2008; M. Kobayashi 2003, 2006; Leki 2007; Morita 2000, 2004; Riazantseva 2012; Seloni 2012). Grounded in perspectives of sociocultural theory and community of practice, the research indicates that ADS is connected with dynamic and in-depth interactions with community members, while L2 learners who have socially and culturally different backgrounds negotiate their formation of academic identity (Casanave 2002; Kanno 2003; Leki, 2007; Morita 2009). Such studies also identify meaningful results, showing that numerous

ideological, psychological, and behavioral processes are deeply involved in acquiring academic literacy to coexist with other members in discourse communities and classes.

Therefore, the importance of this study is to achieve an in-depth understanding of insiders' views of academic literacy and discourse socialization in the context of a local course and to highlight each case description of the research participants. All novices endeavor to gain membership in the discourse community by examining scholarly articles in English. They try to engage with the reading assignments, shuttling between their first language (L1) and the target or other languages, while examining the complex academic topics. This involves "the multiple languages (i.e., more than two) and varied sequences (e.g., L1→L2→L3→L1) involved in language learning" (Duff 2012, 565). The newcomers are involved in socializing into the discourse community, encountering challenges of understanding the scholarly texts, problems of interplay between peers, and conflicts with their prior learning experiences. Exploring the cases of academic literacy socialization of multilingual students in a unique curricular setting, like a research seminar course, brings a unique perspective to issues of academic literacy. This present effort, using a case study method, takes a close look at the participants' discursive and multidirectional ways of socialization and construction of academic identity in the community of practice.

In addition, exploring this line of inquiry in academic literacy socialization may provide useful insight into approaches for teaching academic literacy to students who come from mostly similar backgrounds. It may also contribute to applied research in L2 education in the realm of discourse socialization and academic literacy. Morita (2009) suggests several implications for teaching in a Canadian university context that demand an expectation of classroom approaches for language socialization in various contexts, offering valuable insight into classroom practices facilitating learners' socialization processes. For instance, teachers should offer students a wide range of attractive opportunities to exert a reciprocal influence on their academic literacy socialization, so that students can "see academic socialization as a dynamic and creative process" (Morita 2009, 457) in the classroom. Teachers should serve as intermediaries, helping students socialize into the class, even as teachers themselves participate in the socialization process. If teachers are confronted with complications regarding learning situations such as classroom size, institutional policy, or students' characteristics, they have the potential to incorporate online platforms for discussion, such as course blogging, Google Meet, Microsoft Teams, and Zoom, into activities that can take place outside of the classroom.

Thus, examining the disciplinary discourses of undergraduate multilinguals in different contexts offers new insights into the processes and practices of ADS and academic identity construction in L2 studies scholarship.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINING CHAPTERS

This book consists of five chapters. As the rationale for conducting my present study, chapter 1 discusses the gaps in the current empirical studies of academic literacy and academic identity construction. The chapter begins with a definition of academic literacy and ADS and briefly reviews these constructs. Then, as this study is grounded in sociocultural theory, I provide an outline of the theory as well as the concept of communities of practice. This chapter also illustrates the methodologies used to collect and analyze the data sources. First, I contextualize the research site, background of the research participants, and data sources. Next, I describe the use of case study as a methodological tool. Chapter 1 concludes with a discussion of trustworthiness and ethical considerations since I treat my students in a research seminar course as research participants.

Chapter 2 documents academic literacy socialization and identity construction as experienced by seven multilingual research participants. The narratives illustrate the participants' processes, experiences, and practices of ADS both inside and outside the classroom and academic identity construction of the research participants, demonstrating how each student came to construct an academic identity by committing to a community of practice in the research seminar course.

Chapter 3 offers my interpretation and analysis of the research findings as a cross-case analysis or case rendition, based on the emergent themes from each case, covering the previous studies of ADS and construction of academic identity.

Chapter 4 includes a summary of this book, and it proposes implications for further research, as well as the teaching of academic literacy, to gain further insight into the issues of academic literacy in university-level settings.

The final chapter, chapter 5, concludes with an epilogue that depicts future visions of academic literacy socialization in higher education based on the findings in this study with a narrative as a teacher-researcher.

Part I

**THEORIES OF
THE STUDY AND METHODS**

Chapter One

Academic Literacy Socialization

DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC LITERACY AND ACADEMIC IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION

The research focus on academic literacy among L2 learners has shifted from the development of linguistic ability toward socialization into the disciplinary community (Duff 2010a, 2010b, 2012, 2020b; Gee 2014; Seloni 2012; Zappa-Hollman and Duff 2015). Studies of academic literacy have examined how L2 learners participate in active interactions, share information, and collaborate with experienced members of specialized communities through socialization into their disciplinary discourses. This form of academic literacy is referred to as academic discourse socialization (ADS) or academic literacy socialization (Duff 2007, 2012, 2020b; Duff and Anderson 2015; Duff and Hornberger 2010; Duff and May 2017; Duranti, Ochs, and Schieffelin 2012; Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, and Duff 2017). The rationale for examining ADS is that academic literacy is inextricably linked to the interactions that make up the academic socialization process within a particular community. Thus, the possibility of more dynamic contact with competent members of the disciplinary community ensures the development of academic literacy.

Although ADS has received much attention in English-speaking countries, few studies have examined the socialization process of undergraduate students in different contexts, especially university-level English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Many universities in EFL countries offer specialized courses aimed at developing specific expertise. Individual EFL students come from a variety of contextual backgrounds and bring with them various types of knowledge, educational or otherwise. Thus, exploring ADS in the context of EFL is critical for understanding the process of individual learners' apprenticeship and enculturation into a given culture (Fujieda 2016, 2019). In this

study, I examine the ADS of seven multilingual learners enrolled in a research seminar course, with a particular emphasis on how they were socialized into the disciplinary community to understand academic discourses while reading scholarly articles written in English.

Academic literacy encompasses more than general language abilities such as reading and writing. Rather, it involves discursive processes, discussions, and experiences within the target discourse community, fostering collaborative knowledge construction and dynamic interactions (Blue 2010; Duff 2012; Lave and Wenger 1991; Zappa-Hollman and Duff 2015). To become competent members of discourse communities, novice learners must undergo “socialization *through* [italic in original] language and socialization *into* [italics in original] language” (Ochs and Schieffelin 2010, 5). While newcomers to a discourse community initially participate minimally, they gradually gain acceptance through interactions with more knowledgeable peers. By doing so, individuals may enhance their specific expertise and undergo a transition from peripheral members to experts (Wenger 1998). Thus, academic literacy can be defined as understanding of and capacity to engage in oral and written disciplinary discourses gained through socialization into a certain community, which mediates reciprocal interactions with experienced members. Peers in the community play a critical role in the development of newcomers’ academic literacy skills by serving as mediators or literacy brokers (Lillis and Curry 2006), offering explicit and implicit mentorship or evidence regarding normative, proper usage of the language, as well as worldviews, ideologies, beliefs, and identities of community members (Duff 2010b). More research on academic literacy is required to widen the scope of study, particularly emphasizing discourse socialization of individual learners across diverse learning settings. Furthermore, in the domain of academic literacy, there is a need to pay particular attention to learners’ engagement outside of class, since it involves understanding the social and discursive processes that occur among diverse actors in other learning environments as they act and respond to one another (Seloni 2012).

Research on academic literacy reveals that it is necessary to investigate the negotiation of academic identity through academic identity construction, since learners are socialized into generic and specialized courses related to academic writing. Within their academic fields, learners negotiate their position and sense of self. Academic literacy investigations should focus on the process of acquiring academic literacy while demonstrating the trajectory of academic identity construction (Casanave 2002).

Professionals, researchers, and graduate students begin to construct their own academic identities. Academic identity identifies ways of being in places that are considered part of the academic community and varies according to the community of practice (CoP) because of the understanding of identity

as flexible (Clegg 2008; Darvin and Norton 2015; Norton 2000; Norton and McKinney 2011; Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). Academic identity is often formed through participating in intellectual communities that involve other members of the profession, particularly those with superior knowledge. Thus, academic identity is fluid and dynamic, and “affected by lived experiences and continuous developmental process” (Pifer and Baker 2016, 201).

The premise of academic identity construction is the value of shared experience in collaborative work and forging mutual relationships with community members (Darvin and Norton 2015; Lave and Wenger 1991). Academic identity, as Jacoby and Ochs (1995) point out, is regarded as a collaborative endeavor facilitated by dynamic relationships. Involvement with community members facilitates learners’ development of identity construction, while also fostering an understanding of academic expectations and academic personhood (Ohata and Fukao 2014).

From the general scholarship standpoint, academic identity is formed by the extent to which an individual participates in the community and interacts with its members. Therefore, learners’ academic identity construction is conceptualized as “embedded in the communities of primary importance to them” (Henkel 2000, 251). Academic identity is described in this study as a positioning that shifts from peripheral to expert through achieving access to discourse communities and engaging in dynamic interactions with peers.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Discussions on academic literacy and identity construction emphasize the significance of sociocultural paradigms and the connection between persons and the social world. It is essential to delve into the emerging issue of ADS and identity construction to provide a societal viewpoint (Duff 2010a, 2010b; Duff and May 2017; Duranti, Ochs, and Schieffelin 2012; Leki 2007; Morita 2004). In this section, I outline sociocultural theory and the conceptual framework of CoP. Then, I attempt to discern how CoP affects academic literacy and identity construction as well.

Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural theory significantly influences our understanding of language development (Johnson 2009; Lantolf 2000; Lantolf and Poehner 2008, 2014; Turuk 2008; Vygotsky 1978). Sociocultural theory has recently been used to address challenges in applied linguistics and L2 teaching. The framework for sociocultural theory is inextricably linked to Vygotsky’s ideas. According to

Vygotsky (1978), learners' cognitive development is contingent upon their participation in social activities. As the model of zone of proximal development implies, the more interactions learners have with competent peers, the greater their development. Thus, language acquisition and socialization involve "a process of gaining competence and membership in a discourse community" (Morita 2004, 576).

The socialization process of CoP is key to sociocultural theory (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). In the CoP framework, learners gain significantly from engagement in social practices and dynamic interactions with knowledgeable community members. Through active involvement, learners strive to socialize themselves into a specific community, shaping their academic identities while they navigate multiple psychological complexities. Among newcomers' various experiences during such a process of note is a sense of tension while serving their apprenticeship in the specific community (Casanave 2002, 2003). Thus, by emphasizing individuals' frames of reference, the CoP model helps significantly increase our knowledge of the complex processes and realities of academic literacy and identity construction.

Legitimate Peripheral Participation and CoP

Lave and Wenger (1991) characterize a participatory form of CoP as "legitimate peripheral participation" (LPP). Through varied roles and interactions with other community members, learners contribute significantly to the maintenance of engagement in this format. Learners, particularly novices, engage at the edges of a CoP, fulfilling simple activities and gradually becoming more integrated into the community. Consequently, people develop more community-specific abilities and move from being peripheral members to gaining experience and possibly becoming experts.

As LPP supports cognitive apprenticeship, the notion of CoP transcends the confines of traditional learning systems, in which learning was primarily envisioned as a means of acquiring new knowledge from sources such as books and journals. Sfard (1998) compares this form of learning to an "acquisition metaphor," saying that learning is a knowledge-capturing activity. Meanwhile, the process of learning evokes social connections with other community members, as "agent, activity, and the world mutually constitute each other" (Lave and Wenger 1991, 33). This concept of learning encapsulates the core of human action in the process of knowledge construction, which Sfard refers to as a "participation metaphor." Thus, CoP contributes significantly to our understanding of how learning is facilitated by knowledge sharing and how knowledge is co-constructed within a particular community.

The CoP framework is critical for examining how learners develop their language in a particular context. Language socialization research has generated an epistemological framework for examining the relationship between development and involvement within a particular sociohistorical setting (Duff 2012, 2020a; Leki 2007; Watson-Gegeo 2004). CoP offers a strong foundation for ADS by serving as a framework for the socialization process. Moreover, such a conceptual framework helps explain academic literacy practices, since CoP serves as a vehicle for intellectual inquiry in contextual learning. Participating dynamically in a community enables further development of knowledge while also boosting individuals' levels of self-awareness (Lave and Wenger 1991). Given the social perspective on practices in a specific community, learning in a CoP does not always imply that an individual develops specialized knowledge and abilities consistently or quickly. Rather, learning is an experience gained through membership and engagement in the conventional practices of specific communities.

When learners interact with more competent community members, the concept of CoP fosters an environment conducive to the development of academic literacy. To demonstrate this point, using an example from this study, students enrolled in a required research seminar course have opportunities to collaborate with peers in the classroom. Through this joint enterprise, learners can garner further knowledge while interacting with a more competent peer in a mentor-mentee relationship. Additionally, research seminar students acquire a significant amount of disciplinary knowledge through the mediation of their first or main language in specialized courses (e.g., Introduction to Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition [SLA]). The use of the main language enables learners to expedite their efforts to develop beneficial relationships both within and outside the classroom. All participants in the research seminar are novices to the community of disciplinary discourse. As Watson-Gegeo (2004) notes, LPP is a kind of CoP social activity that evolves from “beginning as a legitimate (recognized) participation on the edges (periphery) of the activity, and moving through a series of increasingly expert roles as learners' skills develop” (341). In this study, it is beneficial to illustrate the process of each seminar student as they transition from a peripheral learner to an expert through participation in numerous activities in the community. As a result, the sociocultural viewpoint of CoP serves as the foundation for this study.

Previous Studies of Academic Literacy

Recent research on academic literacy and ADS has emphasized the relevance of language socialization, academic community enculturation, and

socialization into oral/written discourses (Duff 2020b; Duff and May 2017; Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, and Duff 2017; Muramatsu 2018; Wang 2020). The reasons for this include a paucity of research on the complex negotiation processes of academic discourse from the perspective of learners. Namely, such inquiries need a naturalistic approach (case study or ethnography) driven by environments (e.g., curriculum, policies) and learners' attitudes, tensions, and conflicts (Duff 2007, 2010b; Kouritzin, Piquemal, and Norman 2009). Watson-Gegeo (2004), for example, adopts an explanatory analysis to contextualize learners' backgrounds as thick explanation, which perceives all relevant and theoretically significant micro- and macro-contextual influences that are in a systematic relationship with the concerned behavior or events. Moreover, Duff (2012) highlights the significance of considering the interaction between academic socialization and learners' sociocultural characteristics in studies on academic literacy as a micro-level examination of academic socialization. Hence, the focus in research on ADS has shifted from academic language development to a more in-depth examination of socialization in academic discourses.

According to Braine (2002), previous studies of academic literacy were undertaken in English-medium contexts and focused on writing activities, examining the influence of contextual elements such as the institution, course policies, assignments, instructors, and learners (Swales and Freak 2012). Braine advocates the significance of an in-depth examination of academic literacy that covers more vivid accounts of how non-native English learners are initiated into the discourse community in diverse learning environments. Owing to the scarcity of research on academic literacy that emphasizes case studies of language learners, it is critical to capture their experiences of socialization into specific communities: knowledge construction from academic texts and negotiation of meaning with other members. Research on academic literacy that illustrates individual cases can elucidate the individual's explicit processes of discourse socialization within the target community.

Morita and Kobayashi (2010) explore the emerging issues of ADS in English language higher education across a range of disciplines. They discuss three areas of current research on L2 ADS from a theoretical and pedagogical perspective: academic language knowledge and abilities, learners' socialization, and critical perspectives on discourse and literacy. As the authors suggest, how research findings regarding ADS should be described is a challenge. To address this difficulty, ADS research must include students' perspectives, offering clear descriptions of learners' discourse socialization to establish the framework for future academic literacy studies in the area of L2 studies.

Studies within the domain of academic literacy underscore the various and complicated inner dimensions of language learners (Canagarajah 2006; Casanave 2008; Casanave and Li 2008; Ferez 2005; Leki 2007; Seloni 2012). Leki's (2007) set of longitudinal studies demonstrates the difficulties associated with academic writing experienced by four L2 learners in a variety of academic areas. In their L1 work, the L2 writers struggled to navigate academic discourses while resolving cultural issues. Leki demonstrates how L2 learners came to be initiated into their target communities through their writing processes and CoP. Additionally, Leki asserts that students obtained membership through dynamic interactions with community members, a process she refers to as "socioacademic."

Another approach is to consider how the development of students' academic literacy has an impact on relationships with academic members (i.e., a social network). Ferez (2005), for example, examines the effect of social networks on the progress of academic literacy among EFL graduate students. Ferez indicates learners created to enrich their understanding of academic literacy practices and how these constructed relationships had an impact on their acquisition of academic literacy. The findings show that engaging with peers in the disciplinary area was one of the social networks that promoted learners' academic literacy proficiency.

Likewise, Casanave and Li (2008) discuss the academic community socialization and interactions of L2 graduate students in English-speaking countries and their relationships with faculty members. Casanave and Li's collection presents the difficulties, practices, and experiences of L2 graduate students being socialized into academic communities, with a particular emphasis on the meaning of academic involvement. Casanave and Li emphasize the need to examine the process of enculturation into such communities from the lens of the students' cultural backgrounds. Moreover, Casanave (2008) discusses the difficulties she faced when adjusting to the unique communities and diverse cultures of her graduate school. Her reflective analysis of her academic reading and writing reveals that participation in communities was the biggest obstacle owing to her difficulties in comprehending the jargon, although she was a graduate student and native English speaker. Casanave claims that the purpose of community engagement is to become socialized into the specialized community, to form a rapport with other students and faculty members (e.g., mentor-mentee relationships), and to acquire the literacy skills necessary for the field. Casanave also stresses that reflective study of both L1 and L2 is essential to foster a shared understanding of the academic socialization process.

Several researchers have offered various implications for exploring academic discourses (Duff 2010a, 2010b, 2012, 2020b; Kobayashi, Zappa-

Hollman, and Duff 2017; Kouritzin, Piquemal, and Norman 2009; Zappa-Hollman and Duff 2015). While academic literacy research has been undertaken, the area of L2 studies employing qualitative methodologies focusing on written and oral ADS has only started to flourish in the last decade.

Studies of Academic Identity Construction

Inquiries into the notions of academic identity have shown which factors impact its development. According to several studies, the educational discipline has a significant effect on the development of academic identity (Becher and Trowler 2001; Henkel 2000; Jawitz 2009; Kogan 2000; Neumann 2001; Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004; Reveles and Brown 2008). The discipline is perceived as a part of a specialized community, which fosters student participation and a sense of belonging in the higher education setting. The discipline lays the groundwork for academic identity formation by establishing a foundation of knowledge and values, eventually leading to a stronger sense of academic identity.

Other researchers argue that the literature on identity should reflect social contexts from a poststructuralist perspective, which considers numerous layers of contextual elements (Block 2006; Mendoza-Denton 2008; Norton and McKinney 2011). As an emerging approach, Block (2006) analyzes the poststructuralist analysis of identity, which posits that identity is self-conscious and socially constructed. Block argues that the poststructuralist approach to identity construction requires new viewpoints that stress fluidity and fragmentation of identity. According to Block, the formation of identity encompasses a variety of social components as well as complicated psychological processes such as self-management, anxiety, adaption to the environment, and self-realization. Since identity is discursive, the frameworks for its analysis identity are varied.

Norton and McKinney (2011) discuss broader aspects of identity (such as motivation and investment, imagined communities, and imagined identity) and many theoretical perspectives (poststructuralist and sociocultural theory) that are significant for relevant identity construction. According to Norton and McKinney, language acquisition involves the creation of identity through numerous complicated social processes. The poststructuralist tenets provide an effective means to investigate how learners construct their identities and gain literacy within their academic communities. To investigate the link between identity building and CoP, Norton and McKinney emphasize the importance of investigations of general concepts of identity.

Academic Identity Construction of L2 Learners

Most studies of academic identity construction focus primarily on learners' practices in a specific field and emphasize disciplinary discourse (Casanave and Li 2008; Jawitz 2009; Reveles and Brown 2008). Researchers have explored how new members in the discourse community build their identities and negotiate their academic literacy (Hirvela and Belcher 2001; Leki 2003; Morita 2009; Pavlenko 2001). Some scholars argue that learners' ambivalent identities or identity conflicts resulting from their diverse backgrounds should be explored (Block 2006; Cox et al. 2010; Norton 2000; Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). According to Cox et al. (2010), owing to the bias that they are fixed or stable, issues of L2 writers' identities have been undervalued. Exploring academic identity construction of L2 learners is crucial, as writers they have to negotiate target discourses to meet the demands of specific communities while struggling with the mismatch of written structures in their first language. These complexities are part of the process of constructing and negotiating identity as L2 writers. Thus, further discussions of L2 writers' (learners') identities are required as a reinvention of critical viewpoints in L2 research scholarship. The notion of academic identity defines how language learners develop their positioning in the disciplinary community.

Liu and You (2008) investigated how Taiwanese and American college students were initiated into their specialized discourses. The findings revealed that the learners' typical rhetorical tendencies significantly influence their efforts to acquire the discourses of their respective disciplines. The participants achieved varied degrees of progress in academic literacy, as well as engaging in dynamic interactions with their teachers and the discourses in the particular field. Similarly, Barnawi's (2009) year-long investigation of two Saudi Arabian newcomers enrolled in a master of arts for TESOL program in the United States examined the students' negotiation and construction of academic identities through classroom community practices. The study revealed that they had trouble in negotiating their academic competence and identities, which limited their capacity to fully participate in their disciplinary communities.

Morita (2009) examined a Japanese doctoral student's sense of agency achieved via negotiating the process of disciplinary discourse socialization and identity construction, drawing on the perspectives of social constructivism. The participant, Kota, demonstrated discursive processes of ADS both inside and outside the classroom. Despite the challenges Kota experienced while trying to become socialized into his academic community, he was able to manage using his chosen strategies (e.g., more interactions inside and outside the classrooms).

Even though the participants in Barnawi's (2009) study invested their energies into immersing themselves in academic communities, Barnawi (2009),

Liu and You (2008), and Morita (2009) show that initiations into academic discourse communities lead to an increase in academic literacy and progress in identity construction. Furthermore, the students recognized how to overcome difficulties in blending into their academic surroundings and interacting with peers in their particular fields. Similarly, in Ferenz's (2005) study, EFL graduates were able to form a social network that generated more opportunities for achieving academic literacy development and identity construction. According to Liu and You (2008), Taiwanese students had considerable difficulty embracing the new written discourse patterns. They found that negotiating disciplinary discourse with academic members (i.e., peers and professors) is important for identity formation and entrance into the specialized discourse. Learners are encouraged to (re)shape their identities in the particular field through dynamic collaboration with others in CoP and their negotiations of meaning in specialized discourse patterns.

To fit into the discourse patterns, L2 learners strive to negotiate their identities through numerous processes of community participation. It is obvious that learners face several challenges when it comes to building academic identity. L2 learners' identity formation is influenced by their cultural contexts (e.g., their values and preconceptions). Furthermore, the way academic identity is constructed depends mainly on the acquisition of academic literacy as well as enriching learners' understandings of discourse patterns in their specialized field. The process of negotiating the complicated identity of L2 learners involves building and reinventing their identities (Cox et al. 2010). There exists the possibility of constructing new identities as academic learners via the active interactions of discourses with members in their particular community.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Studies of academic literacy socialization and identity construction of L2 and EFL learners are essential to develop the related literature. Thus, I raise the following research question:

- How do undergraduate multilinguals enrolled in a required research seminar course negotiate and socialize themselves into their academic discourse and construct their academic identities by reading various English scholarly texts and through mediation by their teacher?

This study focused primarily on the ADS and academic identity construction of seven multilinguals at the university level using English scholarly

texts in a required research seminar course. The primary purpose was to explore how each participant attempted to (1) engage in ADS and (2) construct their academic identity through and outside of the activities, taking into account the multimodal natures of the learning context.

METHODOLOGY

Background of the Research Site

This study was conducted at a four-year private university to the northwest of Tokyo, Japan. The institution enrolls around one-thousand students and provides a bachelor's degree in international social studies through the following programs of the department: English, International Studies, Information Technology, Business Management, Psychology, Humanity and Culture, and Childhood Education. Students are encouraged to enroll in a variety of classes, not just in their major to expand their interdisciplinary expertise. The institution provides seven hundred classes, including domestic internships, foreign languages, study abroad, and volunteer work, to promote cross-curriculum education.

Research Seminar Course for Third-Year Students

A required seminar class, "Research Seminar," is offered to third-year undergraduate students. Students have to undergo several processes to enroll in a research seminar course. First, students must attend a research seminar orientation for each program held in early November during their second year. At the orientation, all full-time professors talk about their field of specialization, their agenda for the seminar class, and their way of grading assignments. Following the orientation, students are required to complete a short survey to indicate their top three choices for seminar courses and submit their lists to the Student Office Center. Second, students are able to observe the research seminar course freely and ask the teacher and current students questions. Finally, students have to finalize their choice of research seminar. If accepted into their first-choice seminar course, students can enroll in the next academic year. However, owing to enrollment restrictions, some students are unable to participate in their first-choice research seminar course. Each class has an average of ten attendees each year. Students who have not been accepted into their first-choice seminar course have to speak with other teachers to see if they would be allowed to enroll in their seminar classes. Some professors conducted assessment of academic records, as well as requiring prospective students to compose a statement of purpose and conducting a brief interview.

This was also the screening process for my seminar. First, I had prospective students write a one-page statement of purpose in Japanese. Then I planned a twenty-minute interview with each student so that they could review the course objectives and assessments in detail. I wanted students to validate these crucial points since the purpose of my rather time-intensive seminar class is to stimulate the growth of professional knowledge, L2 writing studies, and the study of English academic papers.

My research seminar course highlighted several theoretical and pedagogical issues of L2 writing with English academic references. Students were required to read one English journal article every week to build a solid knowledge foundation. My chosen peer-reviewed articles were from the past ten years and they focused on various aspects of L2 writing, and were selected from journals such as the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *TESOL Quarterly*, *Written Communication*, *ELT Journal*, *Applied Linguistics*, and *Communication and College Composition*. The articles emphasized the history of L2 writing, intercultural rhetoric, teacher/peer feedback, the reading-writing connection, (multi)discourse analysis, World Englishes, and teaching writing in ESL/EFL contexts. In my seminar session, I divided students into groups or pairs to make presentations about the articles in Japanese. I had students discuss the issues and share their ideas and experiences of English writing via in-class conversations, since one of the key aims of my seminar class was to deepen learners' understanding of L2 writing. As part of the course, I also required my seminar students to maintain a weekly journal, in English or Japanese, wherein they could review the articles and freely express their opinions or discuss what they had learned.

PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUNDS

This study focused primarily on the ADS of seven undergraduate multilinguals, majoring in English and Childhood Education, who participated in my research seminar course in the academic year, 2012.

Most participants had studied English since junior high school, beginning around the age of thirteen. To pass the university entrance exams, their English classes in high school concentrated mostly on grammatical translation and rote memorization of vocabulary. The participants prioritized four skills (i.e., speaking, listening, reading, and writing) when they first arrived at university. In their second year of studies, some students took more specialized classes (Introduction to Linguistics, American Literature, and Cross-Cultural Understanding).

Participant 1: Akiko

Akiko (pseudonym), who majored in childhood education, enrolled at a four-year university in Germany and spent two years there after graduating from high school. She left the German university at the age of twenty-two and enrolled in the current university because she aspired to become an English teacher. Thus, Akiko decided to join my research seminar course to develop specialized knowledge in applied linguistics. She had been studying English for twelve years, beginning in the sixth year of elementary school (at age twelve). Akiko started her English education in a private English conversation school by engaging in interactive English games and conversation. Owing to very high English aptitude, Akiko attended upper-level English classes with English-major students.

Participant 2: Chiaki

Chiaki (pseudonym) entered the English program and joined the second-highest level of English classes (B1). Owing to her advanced English abilities, she could participate in the highest-level class during her third year. She began studying English when she was twelve years old. Throughout her junior and senior years of high school, her English education focused mainly on reading and writing for high school and university admission tests. Chiaki was interested in teaching English and took some specialized classes for English teaching certifications, including SLA and English Teaching Methodology. She enrolled in my research seminar course to broaden her academic knowledge through the use of English scholarly articles and to gain practical teaching skills related to English writing at the secondary school level.

Participant 3: Jonghyun

Jonghyun (pseudonym) was born in Korea and moved to Japan at the age of fifteen because of his father's job. He could not speak Japanese well at the time but attempted to acquire language proficiency by attending a local junior high school. Subsequently, although he became multicompetent in Korean, Japanese, and English, he mostly communicated in Japanese in his everyday life. When Jonghyun was ten years old, he started learning English through enjoyable activities (card games and speaking). He improved his grammar, reading, and writing skills throughout secondary school in preparation for entrance exams. As a result of his experiences of studying English in Korea and Japan, his English ability was very high. He joined the highest-level English classes during his freshman year. As Jonghyun had a strong desire

to study English, he attended specialized classes (Introduction to Linguistics and SLA) as well as classes for English teaching certification for high school.

Participant 4: Kenta

Kenta (pseudonym) was an English program student. He began to study English at the age of ten because his primary school offered weekly English activities with a native instructor. As a part of practicing the language, he engaged in a variety of activities, including pronunciation exercises, games, and speaking. In junior high school, his English lessons focused on textbook-based grammar practice. He graduated from high school with a strong emphasis on technology and industrial courses. As a result, Kenta's English learning was confined to vocabulary memorization and learning grammatical structures through reading and writing. He decided to immerse himself in my research seminar class to develop his knowledge of applied linguistics.

Participant 5: Miho

Miho (pseudonym) was a student in the English program who relocated from her hometown in northern Japan to the university area. Miho has been studying English for almost nine years, beginning in junior high school. Miho received English lessons using the standard grammar translation technique, practiced oral communication, and cultivated cross-cultural understanding by reading the English textbooks in high school. Although she had some experience with speaking English in high school, her objective for learning the language at the secondary school level was to improve her advanced English abilities, mainly reading and grammar, in preparation for admission examinations.

Participant 6: Sayaka

Sayaka (pseudonym) was majoring in English. She had been studying English for almost eleven years, starting with enjoyable English activities in elementary school, such as singing songs, reading the alphabet, and memorizing words. As her high school had a unique curriculum that included liberal arts, she spent three years taking different practical English lessons (speaking, listening, writing, and English expressions). Desirous of developing her speaking abilities, she emphasized the development of speaking proficiency. Her English level as a first-year student at university was intermediate, but she worked very hard and joined the top-level class in her junior year. Additionally, Sayaka took part in an eight-month study abroad program in the

United States. Consequently, her enthusiasm to study English increased significantly, and Sayaka participated in my research seminar course to expand her disciplinary knowledge through reading of English academic papers.

Participant 7: Taisei

Taisei (pseudonym) was enrolled in the English program and a transferred student. He majored in commerce at his former institution. However, he desired to explore the professional issues of applied linguistics. Thus, he started his higher education from the third year and joined the English department. Taisei has been learning English for nine years, beginning at the age of thirteen. He remembered that he acquired English in junior high school with the assistance of his father's friend, who was a native speaker, and with the use of a computer (reading newspapers) in high school. His English proficiency was very high owing to his self-learning, which included taking the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and scoring over 550 (paper-based) in his second year of university.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

To gain a better understanding of my research seminar, students' real practices of academic literacy, socializing both within and outside the classroom, I gathered data from each participant after the start of the second semester. The reason was that if I had explained my research issues and accordingly collected data from my seminar students, it was quite likely that they would have attempted to satisfy me with their weekly journals and interviews. To avoid these problems, I obtained permission from my institution to conduct my study by clarifying my research objectives and rationale for obtaining data from my research seminar students in the informed consent form. Owing to the nature of my study, which used my own seminar students as participants, I took steps to conceal their identities. After the first-semester grades were distributed, I requested each student to sign a permission form. This was the case in collecting data as well. When students agreed to participate on a voluntary basis, I asked them to complete a survey about their prior experience with English learning.

In what follows, I present six data sources as an integral part of the course curriculum, the rationale for their inclusion in the study, and the significance of each source in this investigation: (a) participants' literacy autobiographies, (b) weekly reflective journals, (c) a positionality narrative, (d) comments on blog posts, (e) in-depth individual interviews, and (f) a focus group interview.

Literacy Autobiography

The purpose of gathering participants' literacy autobiographies was to contextualize their backgrounds through thick descriptions of their language histories and educational experiences. An autobiographical narrative is a valuable approach because it enables learners to demonstrate a critical interpretation of their hidden truth obtained from their learning episodes and to become aware of their meta-language development (Belcher and Connor 2001; Clandinin and Connelly 2000; Pavlenko 2007). In the literacy autobiographies of the students' experiences of studying English at the secondary school level and in their first and second years of university, students reported their experiences of English language learning in detail, illustrating what literacy events they had experienced and providing details about them.

Weekly Research Seminar Journal

Each week, I asked students to reflect on the class and review the topics discussed in the reading assignment by writing a brief reflective entry in Japanese. The purpose was to help students develop a better knowledge of the topics by reflecting on class activities (Cisero 2010). Such reflective journal writing enables critical self-examination (Gebhard 2017; McGarr and Moody 2010; Pavlovich 2007; Pavlovich, Collins, and Jones 2009). I gave the participants permission to write a weekly reflection in Japanese because some of them felt it was difficult to express their thoughts clearly in English. Providing students with a platform to express their opinions allows them "to stand outside the experience, to see it more objectively, and to become detached from the emotional outcomes" (Pavlovich 2007, 284). Students were required to submit their journals on Moodle, an open-source learning platform, before the deadline. After students submitted their reflective journals, I provided written feedback on the content and asked a few questions.

Positionality Narrative

At the end of the semester, I encouraged students to revise and resubmit all weekly journals through Moodle to promote their understanding of the issues of L2 writing. This revision served as a positionality narrative, allowing students to reflect on their involvement in the research seminar course and their sense of agency in the process of academic socialization. It also prompted students to examine their identities as academic learners in the specialized field within their situated learning setting.

Blog Entries on Moodle

Blog posting is an important tool for students to exchange ideas. I gathered my students' voices via their Moodle posts. A course requirement was that members of the presenting teams had to post their thoughts, ideas, questions, and involvement on the course blog to facilitate discussions. Duff (2010b) underscores the relevance of investigating students' academic socialization through virtual/digital communication since it is critical to understand how students create knowledge through informal language interactions. The textual identity shown on the course blog can contribute significantly to the subsequent analysis of students' trajectories of academic identity as supplementary material (Kirkup 2010; Seloni 2008). Thus, as an integral part of the course curriculum, I asked each member of the presentation team to submit some remarks in either Japanese or English on the blog after the presentation.

Individual Interviews

In qualitative research, a common data collection technique is the interviewing (Chase 2011; Denzin and Lincoln 2017; Merriam 1998; Mertens 2010, Yin 2018). As Seidman (2019) points out, the purpose of conducting interviews is to learn about other people's experiences and the meaning they create of those experiences. Interviews may enable participants to re-create minute details of their literacy socialization both within and outside the classroom. In this study, in-depth interviews allowed me to understand the perspectives of my seminar students to unpack their hidden intentions.

Participation in the individual interviews was voluntary. When they agreed, each participant was scheduled for a fifty- to sixty-minute interview in my office. All interviews were conducted in Japanese. I believe that using the native language in interviews is meaningful for eliciting insider views of the participants. Therefore, illustrating both Japanese versions and translated English texts is a way to represent the participants' fresh voices and interrater reliability. With permission, I recorded their academic literacy events and experiences and socialization processes both within and outside class.

I interviewed participants using semi-structured and open-ended questions in response to my study topic. I started by asking casual interviewing techniques to build trust. Then, open-ended questions were asked to allow "the respondent's concerns and interests to surface, providing a broader lens for the researcher's gaze" (Mertens 2010, 371). These included: "How did you attempt to read the academic articles?" "How did you increase your understanding of the content?" and "With whom did you collaborate on the reading assignments?"

Focus Group Interview

Following the individual interviews, I conducted a focus group interview with the research participants in Japanese. The focus group interview method has substantial benefits for eliciting information about participants' feelings of their ADS and identity construction. Given that the primary objective of this group interview was to reach a deeper understanding of the participants' thick and complicated accounts, sharing hybrid interactions within the group contributed to elucidating the genuine nature of each participant's experience of academic literacy events (Kamberelis and Dimitriadis 2011; Krueger and Casey 2014). A ninety-minute focus group interview with all participants was organized in a classroom setting. I videotaped the participants' interactions with other interviewees based on my open-ended questions.

Data Collection Procedure and Analysis

Data collection took place during the second semester of the 2012 academic year. I invited a female colleague with a PhD, who had experience in conducting human subject research, to join my research seminar classroom. I left the classroom during her explanations and waited in my office until the informed consent papers were signed. She read a letter of consent signed by the university president, dean, and head of the English program and explained the informed consent procedures clearly. Then, students were asked whether they were willing to join the study. When they agreed, my colleague encouraged them to sign the informed consent form. After completing the documents, my coworker placed the consent forms in an envelope, sealed them with tape, and handed them to me.

The major data sources in this study were the participants' voices, since this analysis emphasized the process of ADS and identity construction. To begin with, I organized each participant's interview transcript chronologically. After completing the transcription process, I translated the content from Japanese to English. Similarly, if participants kept weekly reflection journals and final narrative in Japanese, I translated them into English. I conducted member checks to verify that the translations and interpretations were correct. Then, I coded, classified, and recombined the data to ensure consistency and to meet the study aim.

Once the transcripts and data were accessible, I conducted a thoroughly recursive and inductive analysis of the data sources. Qualitative research is defined by the concurrent gathering and processing of data. Owing to the long data stream employed in qualitative research, division into subsets is essential (Merriam 1998; Yin 2018). Grounded in the recursive and inductive process, I analyzed the data in the following steps: explorations of interviews and writ-

ten documents; categorization of data sources; and finding emergent evidence in narratives and interviews.

During the first phase, I read and analyzed all interview transcripts, blog comments, and other written materials (e.g., literacy autobiographies, weekly reflective journals, and positionality narratives) to gain a comprehensive understanding of each data source. Then, I marked the margins of the texts with comments, questions, impressions, and memos. This technique resulted in significant advantages of establishing the framework or “data-bank,” which was then utilized to conduct further research and generate questions for both the individual and focus group interviews.

The second phase aimed to classify the data into thematic categories. To do this, I reviewed and summarized the comments in the margin of each participant’s written papers (autobiographies, reflective diaries, and positionality narratives) from the first phase, while also identifying any recurring themes. Then, I created a list to keep track of the temporary theme categories allocated to each participant. By revisiting the full data-bank produced in the first stage, I refined emerging categories and developed three tentative theme categories for this study: (a) multiplicity of academic literacy practices, (b) building of disciplinary knowledge through CoP, and (c) positionality of self.

The next step involved assembling evidence from the transcripts of individual and group interviews, which uncovered thematic categories in the second stage. I created descriptions of individual cases from an emic perspective, classifying the raw data by the categories identified during the second phase.

Methodological Disruptions

Although I chose to gather data in English, I conducted both individual and focus group interviews in Japanese. As mentioned above, using the participants’ main language was effective in eliciting candid responses and cultivating a sense of comfort. Additionally, I requested that participants write their weekly journals and final narratives in either English or Japanese. To alleviate learners’ fears of making errors in English, I provided writing assignments. Another purpose of the written documents in Japanese was to elicit the participants’ inner thoughts with detailed descriptions. When the participants wrote the papers in Japanese, I translated them into English and conducted member checks to ensure that their opinions and my interpretations were consistent.

Trustworthiness and Reliability of Data

Both qualitative and quantitative research are concerned with the trustworthiness, credibility, validity, and reliability of their findings (Guba and Lincoln

2005; Lincoln 2009; Mertens 2010). However, there are different criteria for assessment according to the assumptions and methodologies inherent in each method.

In qualitative inquiries, trustworthiness and dependability are discussed to address questions of validity or reliability that underpin various epistemological perspectives (Lincoln, Lynham, and Guba 2011). Namely, validity and dependability are based on the many ways in which reality is interpreted in qualitative research paradigms. Trustworthiness and dependability call into question the consistency of the research findings in order to improve the quality of the study (Mertens 2010). The primary issue of this study was that data collection should be internally consistent rather than generalizable. To ensure the trustworthiness and reliability of the obtained data, I adopted three strategies: crystallization and member checks, a dependability audit, and a prolonged engagement with the participants.

Crystallization

Crystallization is an approach to integrating data from multiple sources into a cohesive text to ensure consistency (Denzin and Lincoln 2017). The notion of crystallization has been articulated as one of the methods of post-qualitative research (Ellingson 2011). According to Yin (2018), the rationale for using data from case studies is that there is a greater requirement for additional gathered sources than other research methodological approaches. The primary advantage of using a variety of data sources in case studies is “any finding or conclusion in a case study is likely to be much more convincing and accurate if it is based on several different sources of information” (Yin 2018, 128).

Apart from these advantages of combining different types of data, crystallization has a significant benefit as a “process of separating aggregated texts (oral, written, or visual) into smaller segments of meaning for close consideration, reflection, and interpretation” (Ellingson 2011, 595). In this study, learners’ weekly reflective journals were used as the primary data source. However, additional data from various sources were used to crystallize the data, such as participants’ English literacy autobiographies, their portfolios, positionality narratives, course blog posts, follow-up individual interviews, and a focus group interview.

Member Checks and Dependability Audit

Throughout the interview, the researcher and the participants completed member checks. Following the completion of the written documents, I

showed them to the participants to confirm their accuracy. Since the recorded interviews had been translated into English, I also asked the participants to confirm that these accurately conveyed their perspectives.

Dependability audits highlight the many steps of the research process in order to “attest to the quality and appropriateness of the inquiry process” (Mertens 2010, 259). To perform dependability audits, researchers created written documents such as memos, researcher reflection papers, or field notes. These materials served as thick descriptions of the study. Such documents should be publicly inspected since change is either anticipated or expected under the constructivist research paradigm (Yin 2018).

Ethical Considerations

As this study involved the use of personal information, it had to comply with ethical standards that protect the individuals’ dignity. As a first priority, the students had the freedom to choose whether or not to participate, a decision that they made independently without coercion. Additionally, the students had the right to terminate their participation and refuse to provide any additional information. Despite the use of interview sessions, which afforded a degree of privacy and anonymity, students could not be pushed into participating. All pertinent information about the investigation, such as the study aims and methodology, was provided to the participants. Informed consent was a prominent theme in this study. All the students were asked to provide a written document clarifying that they were voluntarily participating in the project. Owing to the researcher’s stringent security measures, no one could access the information gathered throughout the study. The confidentiality of data and recordings related to this study were ensured.

In the next chapter, I highlight the cases of ADS and construction of academic identity of seven multilingual learners in my research seminar course. To draw greater attention to the case descriptions, their written products and extracts from the follow-up interviews in Japanese, as well as their English translations, have been included.

Part II

**CASES OF ADS OF SEVEN
MULTILINGUAL LEARNERS**

Chapter Two

Case Descriptions of Academic Literacy Socialization

This chapter illustrates the cases of ADS and academic identity construction of the seven undergraduate multilinguals who were enrolled in my research seminar course during the 2012 academic year. This study was conducted from a sociocultural perspective, with a particular emphasis on the zone of proximal development, CoP, and LPP, to respond to a research question: How do undergraduate multilinguals enrolled in a required research seminar course negotiate and socialize themselves into their academic discourse and construct their academic identities by reading various English scholarly texts and through mediation by their teacher?

To investigate this, I synthesized the data obtained from multiple sources (i.e., literacy autobiographies, weekly journals, course blog posts, a final narrative, individual interviews, and a focus group interview). Data analysis revealed that the participants first adopted their own approaches to academic discourses. Then, they developed their academic literacy skills through discourse socialization by engaging in peer interactions. Akiko, Jonghyun, Taisei, and Chiaki became socialized with peers, improved their understanding of academic discourses through scholarly articles, and constructed their academic identities. Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta attempted to socialize into the discourse community, but remained peripheral members throughout the process of discourse socialization. In addition, they recognized that they were participating in a disciplinary area but refrained from taking the necessary steps to develop their academic identities.

The next section profiles the cases of participants' ADS and construction of academic identity. The case descriptions demonstrate how the students tried to examine and understand academic discourses using the scholarly articles through socialization into the research seminar course and construct their academic identities.

AKIKO

Akiko, enrolled in the Elementary Education Course, attended my research seminar class even though she was not majoring in English. Akiko was motivated to improve her disciplinary English proficiency since she aspired to teach high school English. As a result, she sought to acquire the practical pedagogy useful for Japanese English education.

Akiko began by attentively reading the academic articles by herself. Nonetheless, she felt that her commitment to examining the written discourses deviated significantly from her expectations. As she put it, “ゼミで使ったアーティクルは難しかったですけど、なんとか読書課題をやり遂げたかなって思います [The academic journals used in the research seminar course were difficult, but I felt I could manage them because of the reading assignments]” (Individual Interview 2013). Akiko did not know how to interpret the texts within the disciplinary discourse and deepen her understanding of the main points in the articles.

Akiko engaged in various processes to identify potential techniques for developing her reading proficiency with regard to scholarly texts. She had difficulty interpreting the meaning of the written discourse because the intricate structures of the articles were unfamiliar to her. Akiko expended considerable effort adapting to the disciplinary discourse patterns by tackling the articles using a dictionary. Although Akiko examined the articles carefully, she faced difficulties in comprehension. She then attempted to alter her way of reading the texts. Akiko lamented as she reflected on her early studies in the research seminar course: “今までの自分の英語の勉強ってなんだっただらう、意味なかったのかなって感じました。内容も難しく、ジャーナル自体、ほとんど理解できませんでした [How meaningless my previous English study was . . . It was almost impossible to understand the language of the academic journals in addition to the difficulty of the content]” (Final Narrative 2012). Thus, finding effective ways to examine the scholarly articles was her utmost priority at the beginning of the research seminar course.

To facilitate her understanding of the English scholarly articles, Akiko applied her skills to examining the academic discourse styles such as “簡単に読めるように、文章に線を引いたり [underlining the texts to read the articles easily]” or “繰り返し出てくる単語を取り上げ、意味を調べて暗記しました [noting down the terms that appeared repeatedly, absorbing their meanings, and memorizing them]” (Final Narrative 2012). In this way, she acquired certain skills for understanding the content of English articles. Eventually, her motivation for reading the scholarly literature increased. Akiko stated, “自分の読解力が本当に上がったとわかった時は、嬉しく感じました [I felt fulfilled when I realized that my reading comprehen-

sion had improved a lot]” and “難しいから諦めると考えるよりも、理解しようとする方が少し楽に思えたので、もつとジャーナルを読んでみようと考えを変えました [I changed my mind, trying to examine the journal more because it seemed a little easier to understand, rather than giving up reading because it was difficult]” (Final Narrative 2012).

While grappling with her difficulty in examining academic discourses, Akiko sought to create a formula for reading scholarly papers. As a solution, she shifted from intensive individual reading to cooperative learning with other seminar members, allowing her to become intimately involved in comprehending disciplinary discourses. She discovered that collaborative work was an effective method for negotiating and comprehending English academic discourses through socialization. It also facilitated the acquisition of broader specialized knowledge. Akiko and her seminar peers, Chiaki and Miho, decided to meet once a week in the library or student lounge for group study. They read the articles in advance at home and brought some questions to the meeting. Similarly, Akiko had to make a presentation to another seminar member, Sayaka, about the articles. Akiko worked hard on the article with her peers, summarizing the topics based on several questions.

While collaborating with Sayaka on the presentation assignment and reviewing the articles with the other seminar members, Akiko was able to thoroughly examine the scholarly texts and gain a correct understanding of the authors' statements. Akiko noticed the benefits of journal reading with peers as she reflected on her group sessions with Chiaki and Miho. As she answered, “カジユアルに話をしながら記事の内容を注意深く解釈できました [I could interpret the meaning of the articles well with my partners through casual discussions]” (Individual Interview 2013) and “グループワークで、準備した人のメモやノートを見て、綺麗に書いていると、「自分も頑張んなきゃ」って思ったし、私と組んだ人が大変じゃないように、自分で出来るだけのことをしようと思って [In group work, when I saw how well organized my peers' memos or notebooks were, I thought 'I have to work hard.' Then, I tried to do what little I could, not to make my partner(s) bothered]” (Individual Interview 2013). Akiko focused more on understanding the meanings of the disciplinary texts after observing her peers' sincere efforts to explore the academic journals during group work. Her classmates' diverse approaches to the articles increased her interest in academic discourses. Akiko stated, “ゼミのメンバーは記事を深くじっくりと読んでるので、私は他のメンバーの学習方法とジャーナル読解の習慣を見習いたいです [I would like to follow in my seminar peers' footsteps with regard to learning and their habits related to examining journals because they delved deep into the articles]” (Weekly Journal #5 2012).

The joint work provided Akiko with clues as to how to examine the English scholarly articles.

Furthermore, Akiko's collaborative enterprise with her classmates had a synergistic impact, which contributed greatly to the growth of her agency in establishing L2 writing scholarship. Such socializing with her peers gave her several opportunities to broaden her appreciation for academic knowledge through scholarly resources. Specifically, effective exchanges of ideas in the research seminar classroom provided her with insight into the disciplinary area. Akiko claimed that discussing and expressing her perspectives on the disciplinary journals in class allowed her to validate her knowledge and improve her ability to accurately describe the content of the articles. She stated, “私にとって共同作業は自分の研究理解力と認識について説明することを求めるものだと思います。こうしたインプットからアウトプットへの認知作業は、ディスカッション中に自然に行われます [Collaborative work required me to explain my understanding and awareness of my research. The cognitive work of moving from input to output can be naturally done during the discussions]” (Weekly Journal #11, 2012).

As a result of these continual classroom interactions, she gained fresh views on her seminar topic, L2 writing. Akiko noted:

自分と似たような考え方の人もいれば、違う観点の考えの人もいて、違う考え方の人の意見を聞くと、こういう見方もあったのかととても参考になる。その観点からまたテーマに沿って考えてみると、また違う考えが浮かんできそうになる。ゼミの中でディスカッションを多く行っていることは、自分の考え方や視野が広がるので、私はとても好きです。(Original Weekly Journal #6 2012)

I thought some students had similar opinions as mine, while others had different opinions. When I heard others' distinct ideas, I thought, “Oh, I could see it that way.” Their fresh ideas were very interesting and allowed me to view the topic in a different light. Engaging in such lively discussions in the class broadens my field of vision. That is why I like discussions. (Translation Weekly Journal #6 2012)

Akiko addressed the importance of collaborative learning in the research seminar course. She stated, “誰かと意見を交換しながら作業をすることは、自分が課題に対して理解や把握をしていることを、頭の中での認識から相手に伝わるように説明しなければなりません [To work through interactions with others means I have to clearly explain my understanding about the assignment; it is not just about having my own thoughts on the content]” (Weekly Journal #9 2012). She conceptualized immersion in the research seminar course as a process that elicited a stronger commitment from those with whom she interacted. According to Akiko, the participants assembled and constructed disciplinary knowledge in-depth through com-

plete interactions that inspired one another. She utilized the concept of a “class culture” to characterize the research seminar, saying: “ゼミは良い ‘class culture’ なので、一緒に勉強できる人がいると難しいことも頑張ってみようと思うことができます [The research seminar course has a ‘classroom culture’ that sparks a drive to take on challenges with capable others]” (Weekly Journal #5 2012).

Akiko’s willingness to deepen her perspective on the specialized field expanded as a result of her peers’ significant efforts to learn about L2 writing challenges, as she was socialized into the research seminar course. As Akiko pointed out:

ゼミという「ポジティブなプレッシャー」があり、自分の学びへの刺激になりました。専門知識のインプットとアウトプットを交互にすることができたので、自分の英語読解力が上がっていることを実感することができました。さらにお互いの意見を比較し、そこからL2 writingの考えや新しい見解を見出すことができました。(Original Final Narrative 2012)

I had a “positive pressure” in the seminar class but I received inspiration from my classmates. Thanks to the reciprocal input and output, I felt my academic literacy developing. I was able to express my thoughts about and have new views on topics related to L2 writing, comparing my opinions and thoughts to others in the classroom. (Translation Final Narrative 2012)

Owing to her desire to teach English at the high school level, Akiko had a strong sense of self as an English learner prior to joining the university. Akiko recalled a teacher in high school who inspired her to study English more diligently: “The English teacher was a miracle. Her English was brilliant and she always introduced a variety of new English learning methods” (Literacy Autobiography 2012).

Akiko reaffirmed her goal to teach English in high school, but her position as an English learner remained ambiguous. Indeed, as a first-year university student, she had a strong sense of herself as: “ただの英語学習者でした [I was just an English learner]” (Focus Group Interview 2013), simply studying various English classes in college. As she said, “上のレベルのクラスで出来る人達と英語を学ぶのは確かに楽しかったですが、ただ課題をこなした感じがしました [It is true that I enjoyed learning English with diligent peers in the highest-level class, but I felt that I just performed my assigned tasks]” (Individual Interview 2013). Nonetheless, Akiko was eager to study English at the end of her sophomore year. In class, she was motivated to work collaboratively with classmates owing to the increased opportunities for group work, as she noted, “英語の授業で、グループでの作業が多くなったので [The English classes provided lots of opportunities for group

tasks]” (Individual Interview, 2013). Her perception of herself as just an English learner eventually transformed into one of a highly motivated English learner. She embraced her feeling of changing her mind throughout her two years of university English study to foster the development of her English language abilities.

Before enrolling in the research seminar course, Akiko discovered that she had progressively developed an image of herself as a motivated English language learner, as shown in the previous section. After delving into a specialized topic, Akiko saw that her experiences in the research seminar course had led her toward becoming a full member of the discourse community, resulting in maintaining good relationships with her classmates both inside and outside the classroom.

Through her participation in the community of the research seminar course, where the work was more demanding than any she had previously experienced, Akiko developed an understanding of herself as an academic learner. She approached difficult tasks, such as reading articles and writing her weekly reflection papers, from a professional standpoint. In particular, Akiko had a sense of moving toward becoming an academic English learner who attempted to nurture specialized knowledge through participation in a specific community. She progressively developed an interest in exploring academic articles and comprehending professional topics, and developed a strong dedication to discussing scholarly articles with her classmates. Through reciprocal interactions with peers in the research seminar course, she developed a strong sense of herself as an academic learner.

From the start of the seminar session, Akiko showed the attitude of an academic learner, which aroused her interest in the disciplinary field. As she said, “もっと発言したい、みんなの解釈を聞いてみたい [I wanted to express my opinions more . . . I wanted to try to ask other students’ thoughts]” (Weekly Journal #1 2012). As time passed, her weekly journals revealed her critical response to the assigned reading articles. In the weekly journals, she eventually wrote about her inner awareness of the realm of L2 writing. For instance, after finishing the article that highlighted the critical perspectives on contrastive rhetoric (CR), she mentioned:

第二言語で文章を書くことについて、「書く」ということは「話す」よりも、書き手自身が無意識の内に表現されていると思います。第二言語ライティングの研究というのは、その領域が言語学を越えて人文科学や社会科学、そして自然科学にまで及んでいると私は思います。終わりのないテーマだとも思いました。(Original Weekly Journal #4 2012)

In terms of writing in L2, writing itself includes the writer’s individual perspectives. The writer shows them unconsciously in writing rather than speak-

ing. That is why studies of L2 writing go beyond linguistics, extending into the realm of humanities, social science, and natural science. The area of L2 writing seems to be a deep and endless theme for me. (Translation Weekly Journal #4 2012)

Akiko attempted to think critically about the topics of the academic articles, but she also realized the complexities of learning L2 scholarship writing. That is why she felt as though L2 writing issues had been discussed continuously. She said, “第二言語ライティングは、社会学的だつたり心理学的だつたりと本当にその多様性に圧倒されるばかりです。本当に毎回授業後は、第二言語ライティングというのは、その研究が終わりや結論が見えないことを感じます [I am often overwhelmed by the interdisciplinary perspectives of L2 writing study such as sociology or psychology. Therefore, I felt there is no end in sight for research on and conclusions about L2 writing every time after the seminar class]” (Weekly Journal #5 2012).

Furthermore, through Akiko’s journey in the research seminar course, she developed professional clarity regarding the position of an English language teacher. Her voice in the course blog post, for instance, presented her thoughts as a teacher. As she illustrated,

教育的見地から自分たちのディスカッションの進行を振り返ると、不備が多かったです。私は教師的な役割を担っていたので、もつと「どこがどういう風に分からないのか？」などと具体的に質問をして、その人の意見を何かしら引き出した方が良かったのかと反省しました。(Original Course Blog Post 2012)

From the educational viewpoint, I was not able to manage the discussions well, reflecting on my presentation of the article. Even though I made a presentation like an in-service English teacher, I should have drawn out other members’ personal opinions, asking which parts were difficult for them to understand. (Translation Course Blog Post, 2012)

Akiko contended that gaining membership into the discourse community may be realized through a strong will that entails various actions and learning processes. Her sense of being an academic learner was shaped by her real socialization into the discourse group and her specific future goal.

Akiko developed an image of herself as an experienced seminar member who acquired specialized knowledge through engaging in the community and interactions with her classmates. However, she did not regard such processes of negotiating her identity as a professional researcher within the research seminar group. She revealed, “もしかなり研究分野に入り込めば、研究者 identity を確立したと思っています。でも専門分野の研究内容を突き詰めるってことはできないですよ。だってジャーナルの中の学者の批判的な態度や意見に圧倒されるだけでしたから [If I immersed

myself in the professional area deeply, it would be correct that I constructed my ‘researcher identity,’ but I could not get deeply involved with pursuing the inquiry of the disciplinary area further because I was overwhelmed by the critical attitudes and perspectives of the expertise presented by scholars in the journal articles]” (Individual Interview 2013).

JONGHYUN

Jonghyun was a diligent student in the research seminar course. His first language was Korean, and he was also proficient in Japanese and English. Jonghyun was involved in many social activities and volunteered often in the university’s academic events. His strong commitment to constructively participate in various activities indicated his enthusiasm for pursuing academic education at the university level.

During his second year of university, Jonghyun enrolled in a four-month study abroad program at a private institution in the western United States. His research there reawakened his interest in applied linguistics and L2 teaching. Jonghyun chose to explore L2 writing studies in my research seminar course after perusing the catalogue for all the research seminar courses offered by the English program. He was the second student to express a desire to join my seminar class because he was interested in the differences in writing in English, Japanese, and Korean.

Jonghyun made every effort possible to read academic articles at the beginning of the semester. Jonghyun spent considerable time examining articles sentence by sentence, but did not emphasize translation. He engaged in an active performance of looking up terminology while examining academic discourses, as he indicated, “和訳はしなかったけど、難しい単語の意味を調べながら読みました。訳したとしても、すごくおかしいんですよ [I read the paragraphs intensively, looking up the meanings of difficult words in the articles even though I did not utilize the translation approach at all. Even if I translated, the interpretation became very odd]” (Individual Interview 2013). When he explored academic discourses with complex structures, he considered mediation by the first language pointless. Thus, he attempted to read the whole article thoroughly, concentrating on individual words. Jonghyun marked sections of the articles he considered significant. However, he sometimes discovered gaps between the parts of the articles highlighted in the classroom and those he considered important. He recalled his process of reading academic references: “I sometimes wondered to what extent my understanding of the scholastic journals was legitimate” (Final Narrative 2013).

As his strategy for reading academic articles was unsuccessful, Jonghyun used an alternative approach: he attempted to comprehend articles holistically. Instead of examining every word, he began scanning them to get an idea of their overarching meaning. When he came across jargon during his reading assignments, he guessed the meaning based on context, rather than looking up each phrase in a dictionary.

Jonghyun was able to participate in academic discourses entirely on his own, creating voluntary countermeasures. A few weeks into the research seminar course, he realized that increasing his commitment to socializing with his classmates encouraged his desire to gain a better understanding of the scholarly papers. For instance, Jonghyun often felt that technical phrases were appropriately interpreted when examining the discourses. Additionally, he realized that socializing with his peers improved his academic reading abilities. As a result of his peer interactions, he was able to quickly understand terminologies and comprehend the content of papers. As he stated, “良く言えば、ゼミの人と話すことで新しい用語の意味が深く学べると感じました [To put it better, I felt I would be able to obtain a deeper understanding of new terms through dynamic interactions with my seminar classmates]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Moreover, Jonghyun overcame difficulties in understanding disciplinary articles by socializing with peers during the research seminar course. As he attempted to increase his direct involvement with research seminar members, he found himself facilitating ongoing discussions with his peers. He mentioned, “自分が読んだ中で見落としていた部分を教えてくれたし、発表でわかりやすく説明してくれて、それで自分も理解して、「どう思いますか。」とか討論して [My peers explained the parts I had overlooked and the contents clearly in their presentations. Then I understood and interacted with my seminar peers in a group, asking ‘What do you think?']” (Individual Interview 2013). He felt that lively classroom conversations helped broaden his understanding of the articles. This engagement in the classroom encouraged him to increase his involvement in all aspects of the research seminar course. As Jonghyun said, “ディスカッションでは、論文だけでなく皆の考えもプラスされているから、何ていうか、深みがたつというか。そしてそれらが全て合わさって持論になったりしました [Classroom discussions, which covered the article content and also included the opinions of my seminar peers, helped me gain a deeper understanding of the articles. This contributed to the formulation of my own arguments]” (Individual Interview 2013).

While Jonghyun used various approaches to examine the English scholarly texts, he believed that the mediation of a third party was necessary for com-

prehending disciplinary discourses. As a novice to disciplinary discourses and the community, Jonghyun saw the critical nature of both deeply engaging in discourses and receiving proper assistance from capable peers. He stated:

専門分野の初心者は学術的な discourse に深く関わらないと、学術のジャーナルの中身をできるほどじゃないと思うんですね。学生が article にマークしたり線を引いたり、あとは先生から助けてもらったりすれば、学術リテラシーはのびると思うんです。(Original Individual Interview, 1/31/2013)

I think that novices are not proficient enough to comprehensively understand the content of academic journals even if they plunge into exploring the academic discourses. If students grasp the main points of articles through highlighting or double underlining important ideas or a supplemental source from the teacher, they can experience an uptake of English academic literacy. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

During the individual interview, Jonghyun made an insightful statement on the value of peer interactions. Constructive interactions with his seminar classmates resulted in more significant academic improvements than self-study. In addition to reviewing the significant points of the articles, reciprocal exchanges of individual knowledge with classmates promoted active engagement in critical discussions and a deeper understanding of academic articles and L2 writing. Jonghyun stated, “何よりも英語の専門的 discourse の理解ができたのはクラス内でのトークとか discussion があつたからで、それにその article や L2 writing に対する持論が持てましたね [My understanding of the disciplinary discourses of English certainly arose from discussions and talks in the classroom more than anything else. I was able to have strong arguments concerning the articles and research on L2 writing as well]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Jonghyun recognized that interacting with his classmates facilitated better comprehension of the topic than reading alone. Additionally, mutual understanding with other seminar members was beneficial. As he said, “皆に教えてもらって、意見を作れた [I was taught by my peers in the class, which led to the expression of my views]” (Focus Group Interview 2013). As he sometimes missed a critical point in assignments, the presentations made by his classmates as well as joint interactions strengthened his grasp over the journal content. As such, Jonghyun developed the ability to thoroughly review the topic in question and make his own arguments on L2 writing studies.

When Jonghyun was a first-year student, he expressed a strong desire to improve his English proficiency. At the beginning of his undergraduate career, his goal for studying English was to develop his language abilities. He said, “専門知識を身につけるよりも聞くこと、単語力とか読解力を高

めたかった [I wanted to improve my everyday English skills such as listening, vocabulary, and reading rather than pursuing professional knowledge]” (Final Narrative 2012). When Jonghyun endeavored to improve his English skills, he set an explicit goal of enhancing his language performance as a communicative tool, similar to how he had studied Japanese: by using words and phrases from the target language in speaking and writing. Jonghyun discussed his approach to English learning before beginning the research seminar course, reflecting on how he had attempted to enhance his Japanese language abilities. He mentioned, “日本語を学ぶのと同じように勉強しましたね。ただ言語を上達させるのではなくて、ツールとして英語を学んでいるという [I studied English in the same way as I learned Japanese. I was learning English as a tool, not just improving my language skills]” and “たぶん、みんなは ‘learning English’ なんだろうけど、私は、‘using English as a tool’ なんですよ [Probably, everyone thinks of English as ‘learning English’ but for me, it was ‘using English as a tool’]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Jonghyun developed his English abilities during his first year of university. As he progressed through university, he became conscious of shifting from a language learner to an individual with an interest in applied linguistics. He attempted to refine his skills by rekindling his interest in investigating the English language from a more disciplinary perspective when he participated in a study abroad program in the United States: “留学中、英語を言語学的に分析したり、英語指導についても考えるようになりました [During my study in the US, I came to analyze the English language linguistically and to consider the teaching of English]” (Individual Interview 2013). He was able to develop an awareness of and vision for creating his disciplinary knowledge by questioning what he wanted to achieve and giving professional attention to his studies throughout the research seminar course. He learned the theory and practice of L2 writing in particular from numerous eminent L2 writing experts during the research seminar course. He felt that his experience in the research seminar course was quite different from another course, and he had the sense that he was cultivating knowledge.

Jonghyun experienced several difficulties with English writing during his studies in the United States. He noted several differences between English and the languages he spoke (Korean and Japanese). However, the research seminar course felt familiar to him. Additionally, he had several opportunities to reflect on L2 writing courses by reflecting on his personal experiences. He stated, “自分のL2 writingの振り返りはリサーチの問題点を挙げることや、書くことを学ぶ重要性を考えさせられました [Self-reflection on my L2 writing broadened my vision; I thought of some research questions and felt a strong need to learn to write in English]” (Course Blog Post 2012)

and “個人の経験は専門分野に対する理解が深めてくれて、自分の英語学習や教育背景とか日本の英語教育の現状を混ぜながら意見を言えました [Individual experiences yielded insights into the specialized area. I formed opinions by blending my individual experiences, such as those related to learning English, my educational background, and the current state of English education in Japan]” (Focus Group Interview 2013).

Besides, Jonghyun showed enthusiasm for acquiring disciplinary knowledge as an academic learner. He attempted to explore the literature on L2 writing from a disciplinary perspective and to incorporate his knowledge of L2 writing theory and practice into other disciplinary classes. As for his interests, he enrolled in a course to learn the nuances of teaching English to children. Through the lectures and practicum related to teaching children English, he not only grasped the history and present state of L2 writing but also understood the possibilities inherent in the field. Jonghyun mentioned, “ゼミの授業で専門的に考えられるようになったので、専門知識が他の講義で活かされていると、学術的identityが築けているなってわかりました [I developed a better sense of my profession when my deeper disciplinary knowledge was applied in other classes because I could think more professionally in the research seminar course]” (Individual Interview 2013). Additionally, Jonghyun gained confidence in the development of a positive attitude as an academic learner since he had distinct impressions of exploring the disciplinary area: “様々な点から専門的な問題を楽しく追究し、専門的内容に批評できる態度になったなど [I developed an attitude toward exploring the disciplinary questions from multimodal perspectives (e.g., pedagogical or theoretical levels) in an enjoyable format and revealing critical reactions to the professional subject]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Jonghyun’s journey of learning in the research seminar course enabled him to discover new avenues for academic exploration. He felt sure that he could enhance his constructive attitude as an academic learner by applying his professional learning to various learning environments.

TAISEI

Taisei, a transfer student, worked hard in the research seminar course to overcome the challenges of L2 writing. Actually, his performance with regard to course requirements was outstanding, and he frequently proffered his thoughts during class discussions.

Taisei had an insatiable desire to improve his English skills during his high school years. Various events concerning English reading and writing were vividly presented in his literacy autobiography. He focused his energies

on preparing for an English certification test in high school, a generalized test called *Eiken*, or the Society for Testing English Proficiencies (STEP) in Japan. As Taisei described, “I tried to achieve grade two of *Eiken* during my high school years. Though I did not study a lot, I attempted to take the STEP several times and failed” (Literacy Autobiography 2013).

Taisei was a four-year university student who majored in commerce. He took a variety of skill-oriented English classes throughout his freshman and sophomore years that were too easy for him. He had decided to move to another institution in his second year. Taisei then began studying for the TOEFL in order to apply to university. Unfortunately, he was unable to attend his school of choice; however, his autonomous learning proved beneficial in motivating him. As he mentioned, “Unfortunately, I failed to transfer to the university I had desired, but all my attempts improved my English and gave me confidence” (Literacy Autobiography 2013).

Taisei had devoted significant effort in developing his academic literacy during his independent studies at the previous institution. He decided to enter a research seminar course focused on the specific field of applied linguistics. Taisei voluntarily tackled difficult scholarly articles as one of the ways to meet his aim of developing his academic reading skills in the research seminar course. “I did three things to understand the articles better: read many times, use dictionary and websites, and paragraph reading” (Final Narrative 2013). The first and second techniques were used to interact with academic discourses and develop skills for understanding disciplinary articles written in English. For example, when some technical phrases made it difficult for him to comprehend the content, he used websites (e.g., Wikipedia) to look up the words. Websites proved beneficial since they showed the meanings of the terminology in Japanese and offered sample sentences. He describes his method of searching for scientific papers on the internet as follows:

ALC provided many words with example sentences. So, this website was very useful for me. Wikipedia was helpful as well, especially for technical terms. Some technical words were not listed on ALC, so I searched Google and found the meaning on Wikipedia. (Final Narrative 2013)

He read the papers again after double-checking the definitions of the terms. Taisei used inductive learning to expand his understanding of academic discourses, promoting consistent involvement.

Moreover, when understanding the meaning of difficult words proved insufficient with regard to gaining a comprehensive understanding of the articles, Taisei worked on interpreting the texts paragraph by paragraph. As Taisei commented, “Reading paragraph by paragraph led me to understand the whole articles more easily. If I could not understand a paragraph in one

go, I read and reread it until I could. Further, I tried to summarize the meaning of each paragraph” (Final Narrative 2013).

Taisei consistently followed his preferred method of reading when it came to exploring academic discourses through scholarly papers, reflecting on his own learning habits. Except for collaborating with his presenting partner, Kenta, Taisei had few encounters with anyone outside of the classroom. Taisei and Kenta discussed the articles, key points, and procedures while preparing to present the allotted parts. Aside from these preparations for presentations, Taisei strove to work independently. He also focused on classroom debates. Kenta, on the other hand, engaged in socializing with his classmates to gain a better understanding of the disciplinary discourses. As a novice to the specialized community, he sought opportunities to communicate with his peers. When he first became involved in the research seminar course, he said, “先生やクラスメートが言ったことをメモし、また自分の意見を高めるためにも積極的に discussion に参加しました [I took notes regarding what the teacher and my classmates said and actively joined the discussion sessions to put forth my opinions]” (Individual Interview 2013). Taisei raised questions about the articles and offered his own ideas during group discussions, raising questions for his peers to answer. He emphasized the importance of socializing with seminar classmates because of his engagement in interactions with others. He included a part in his weekly reflections called “Impressions of the Class,” in which he expressed what he learned and thought in the classroom. Some of the reflection papers supported the success of productive discussions: “他人の意見を聴くことができて良かった [I was glad to hear my peers’ thoughtful ideas]” (Weekly Journal #3 2012); “メンバーの contrastive rhetoric の未来について様々な意見が聞けて面白かった” [it was very interesting to hear the members’ future perspectives on studies of CR]” (Weekly Journal #6 2012); and “Jonghyun 君の最後の discussion question や彼自身の考えはとても興味深かったです [I was impressed with Jonghyun’s final discussion question, and his opinions on the pedagogical focus on L2 writing were very meaningful]” (Weekly Journal #8 2012).

Taisei emphasized interactions with his peers and learned that participating in classroom discussions broadened his perspective on disciplinary studies. He mentioned, “共同作業だと、違う見解を知ることができるんですね。もし独学だったら1つの観点しか持てないんですが、共同作業はいくつかの側面を教えてくれるので、柔軟になり自由な気持ちにさせてくれます [I can understand the different viewpoints through collaborative work in the classroom. If I study by myself, I have only one

perspective about the topic, but collaboration gives me several perspectives. So, it will make me flexible and open-minded]” (Individual Interview 2013). Besides, he confirmed that his academic reading proficiency developed through interactions with his peers, broadening his vision of the specialized field. Taisei stated:

自分は予測で訳していた部分があったので、自分の主観で理解していることが多くて、他の人の意見を聞くと、「あ、こんな意味だったんだ」という発見もつこうあったりしました。(Original Focus Group Interview 2013)

While reading the articles, I translated the texts and tried to understand the content from the perspective of one fixed meaning. But when I heard others’ ideas, I saw the potential for alternative meanings. (Translation Focus Group Interview 2013)

At the beginning of the semester, Taisei focused on his strategies for exploring academic articles. Simultaneously, he attempted to socialize himself into the research seminar course by engaging in reciprocal interactions with peers. His earlier experience of reading a variety of academic discourse genres for the TOEFL also helped him understand academic conversation. He came across various terminological items when reading scholarly works, which slowed his progress in comprehending the main points of the texts. However, it was fairly simple for him to understand the content once he learned the jargon. As Taisei said, “I did not feel any aspect influenced my understanding of the academic texts. However, my previous experience of studying for the TOEFL greatly helped me understand the texts” (Final Narrative 2012).

Taisei was a self-motivated student who thrived on difficulties because of his strong motivation to develop his English proficiency. After enrolling in the current university, Taisei sought to actively engage with English rather than just learning the language. When he looked back on his first two years at the previous university, he realized he was a different kind of student. He stated:

前の大学の英語授業は難しくなかったので、むしろ、パソコンを使ってたくさんの人と会話をしながら英語を使っていました。英語学習者というidentityはなかったです。(Original Individual Interview 2013)

English courses in the previous university were not hard for me. I would say that I tried to use English a lot, talking with a lot of people via computer, but I did not have my own identity as an English learner. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

His positioning as an academic was uncertain before he started the research seminar course. As a result, he concentrated only on fostering his language skills with a positive attitude.

Taisei became aware of notable disparities in exploring the disciplinary topics when he was enrolled in the research seminar course. He mentioned, “TOEFLの勉強で academic discourse には馴染みがあったが、ゼミで扱うものは違っていた [Actually, I was familiar with academic discourses because of the TOEFL. However, the discourse styles totally differed from those of the scholarly articles that I examined in the seminar course]” (Individual Interview 2013). By going through the steps of understanding the meaning of academic articles, he began to examine the disciplinary field in-depth. His commitment to increasing his academic reading comprehension reinforced his need to develop specialized knowledge. Taisei reflected on his efforts in the research seminar course and stated, “2つ目か3つ目の article を読んでいた時に、学術的なアイデンティティーに気づいたような...。専門分野を深く学んでいるんだ、みたいな [When I examined the second or third article, I began viewing myself as a member of the academic community... feeling like I was exploring a specialized field]” and “article を読んで discourse に触れていると「このことについてもっと知りたいな」ってよく感じました。これが今まで学んできた中で驚くくらいの違いですね [I always felt, ‘I want to know more about this issue’ during my negotiation of the academic discourses in the professional journal. This was such an amazing difference from my previous learning]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Taisei made a strong commitment to negotiating the meaning of scholarly articles. Furthermore, he was heavily involved in the research seminar course. He paid close attention to his peers’ discussions during group work inside the classroom. This focus on others’ opinions generated within him an interest in the research issues of L2 writing. His weekly notebooks also demonstrated his critical questions and opinions about the articles he read. For example, he recognized the impact of L1 on writing in L2, “最後のディスカッションフェーストンを聞いて、現地の言葉を学び、教育を受けた場合、L2 言語が L1 のレベルを超えることはあるのだろうか? [When I heard the last classroom discussion, I questioned whether or not the L2 language ability goes beyond that of L1 when one receives education and learns L2, not using L1]” (Weekly Journal #3 2012)? Besides, he remarked on the issue of CR, “Rhetoric 研究は contrastive rhetoric から Intercultural rhetoric へと移行する必要がある [Research on CR should be shifted to the study of intercultural rhetoric]” (Weekly Journal #6 2013).

Taisei was very interested in strengthening his specialized knowledge through socialization into the research seminar course. His independent learn-

ing, such as for the TOEFL, had familiarized him with academic discourses in published articles. Furthermore, through collaborative activities in the research seminar course, he fully recognized the value of social interaction in academic exploration. As he stated, such collaborative settings are essential for the formation of academic identities: “Academic identity は、特定の目的やテーマを持った学術の環境で作られる [Academic identity is created through academic situations that have a particular purpose or topic]” (Individual Interview 2013).

CHIAKI

Chiaki was a dedicated student in the research seminar course, working hard to improve her disciplinary skills. For the first two years after starting university, she had a positive attitude toward improving her English skills, particularly her oral proficiency. Of course, she invested great effort in her assignments. She had aspired to “learn better-balanced English (basic four English skills)” since she was in secondary school (Literacy Autobiography 2012). She desired to take part in a demanding research seminar course. I recall the ice-breaking conversations we had before starting the individual interview. She informed me during our informal chats that when she became a third-year student, she planned to gain specialized knowledge and finish her graduation thesis on a topic in the field of applied linguistics.

On the threshold of reading the scholarly journals, Chiaki became devoted to her individual practices related to academic literacy. In particular, her processes involved understanding the jargon, consulting a dictionary, and translating English into Japanese. She adhered rigidly to looking up the meaning of unfamiliar technical words in the initial stage of understanding the content of academic articles. Then, she attached excessive importance to the interpretation of the scholarly articles while examining academic discourses. Chiaki recalled her first stage of examining the disciplinary discourse as follows: “長い段落を読むのには意味ない方法なんですけど、専門用語を見つけると、辞書で意味を調べていました [When I came across unfamiliar terminology, I checked the meaning in the dictionary even though it was not an efficient way to read long paragraphs. . . . My first process of negotiating the academic articles did not help me gain a deeper understanding of disciplinary discourses]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Chiaki branded this word-focused approach to examining disciplinary discourses a fruitless endeavor. Chiaki’s reinvented process was as follows: “段落の要点を理解して、意味をさぐりながら、ざっと一段落を読みました [I read one paragraph roughly, understanding the outline and

negotiating the meanings]” (Final Narrative 2012). She found this a more efficient method of exploring scholarly articles. Chiaki was able to build strategies for disciplinary discourses through a deepening of her knowledge of the articles. She said, “文章の読み方を変えてから、少しずつ段落の意味がわかってきましたね、前のやり方と比べると [After I changed my way of examining the scholarly texts, understanding the paragraphs gradually became easier]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Chiaki acquired a better understanding of the specialized community—the research seminar course—through her own techniques for exploring academic discourses. Chiaki claimed that she switched from independent reading to collaborative reading with her peers after realizing the benefits of teamwork. She mentioned, “友達と話すと、自分の間違いにも気づくんで [When I talked with my friends, I noticed my misunderstanding of the meaning of the texts]” (Individual Interview 2013). Chiaki attempted to socialize with her peers to focus on joint work. Akiko, Chiaki, and Miho organized their own weekly group work session. Chiaki read the articles before the meetings and reviewed them with Akiko and Miho. Through these casual group discussions, she sought to summarize academic articles so as to engage in critical examinations of journal contents. She also discovered that she needed to read the articles more attentively many times to understand the content clearly. Chiaki said, “教えてもらうことはすごくためになるんだけど、逆に自分が教えると、自分の中でも、「人に教えないといけないからより理解しなくちゃ」、という部分がありました [Being taught by my peers was very helpful, but when I taught the content to my friends, I had the feeling that I had to have a comprehensive understanding because I needed to be able to explain the material]” (Focus Group Interview 2013).

Through their independently organized group work, Chiaki also learned to appreciate discussions with peers inside the classroom. She described the tangible sense of immersing herself into the research seminar course: “ゼミのメンバーと課題について話し合うと、正しい文の意味がわかるし、もっと内容が理解できるので良かったです [Talking about the assignments with my peers helped me realize the correct meaning of texts and understand the content further]” (Individual Interview 2013). Then, through ADS, Chiaki developed and revalidated her own opinions about the articles:

article を一人で読んでいるだけだと、その article の主張を理解するだけで、自分の考えは生まれないんだけど、それをもとに皆で話し合うことで、自分はこの article についてこんな意見を持つてたんだなっていうか、生まれるっていうか。(Original Individual Interview 2013)

While examining the articles, I just tried to understand the whole content, and did not come up with critical ideas. However, during the discussions with my

peers, I thought, “I have an idea like this” or I felt as if I was creating my ideas. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

Chiaki gradually discovered that direct interactions with people encouraged her to express and clarify her critical viewpoints: “YES/NO かの話し合いをやった時に、自分はこの人と同じ考えだとか、その言うことはわかるけど、ちょっと違うなと [When we discussed the questions with YES/NO answers, I thought, ‘I have the same idea as this student’ or ‘I understand your opinion, but it is a little different from mine’]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Chiaki strengthened her disciplinary knowledge and gained a deeper understanding of academic discourses in scholarly literature by committing to the research seminar course. She tended to express her critical insights on the themes of L2 writing research in her weekly diaries, such as: “writing は様々な要素によってつくり、人それぞれであることを考えよう、ということであるならば明確な CR の研究目的は何なのだろうと思つた [I wondered what the specific purpose of the research on CR is as long as writing contains various elements of the writer and writing styles vary by individual]” (Weekly Journal #5 2012), or “academic discourse が求められるならば、communication 能力だけでなく、専門の discourse を学ぶ必要がある [If (the ability of) academic discourses is necessary, we have to learn not only communication skills but also the disciplinary discourse]” (Weekly Journal #9 2012). Chiaki strongly believed that joint work was much more advantageous than independent study. Her peers provided the contextual implications to deepen her understanding of discourses, as she had difficulty understanding the meaning of articles. Socialization into the seminar class provided her with the inspiration to continue developing her academic literacy and navigating disciplinary discourses.

In the different academic courses that Chiaki took (SLA and Methodology for Teaching English), she conceived the classes as specialized communities. These offered her several possibilities to socialize into discourse communities and to develop broader professional expertise. She said, “The classes were related to the topics in the seminar class, for example, second language education, issues of ESL, and so on. So, I think the classes encouraged my understanding” (Final Narrative 2012).

Chiaki learned to deepen her understanding of applied linguistics and L2 writing through her active participation in the many courses. Her greatest opportunity to demonstrate her grasp over the required academic reading came in the SLA course. In SLA class, she had a lot of discussions with her classmates regarding the assigned topics. Here, Chiaki recognized how well she comprehended and interpreted the significance of the reading assignments. When she presented her opinions clearly and simply to her peers, she

was convinced that her understanding of academic discourses was firm. On the contrary, if she struggled to express herself effectively, she was often perplexed by her poor performance in examining disciplinary discourses. Chiaki stated:

もし、自分がクラスメートに情報を提供できたならば、自分がどの程度、文献を理解できているかわかりますね。専門の授業では、クラスメートが自分の説明をちゃんと理解できるように、内容をきちんとまとめました。(Original Individual Interview 2013)

If I could share my information with my classmates well, the extent to which I grasped the meanings of the references increased. In the disciplinary classes, I made a resolute attempt to discuss the content, so that my classmates could understand my explanations clearly. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

Chiaki developed a deeper understanding of the articles by initiating discussions both within and outside the research seminar course. She had numerous ways of examining academic discourses, but she quickly noticed that collaborative effort to understand the content of the texts was crucial. Then, via classroom discussions and external group work, she was able to express her critical opinions in her weekly journals. She also enrolled in other specialized classes, which helped enhance her specialized knowledge by encouraging her to socialize with other students in the classroom. Chiaki affirmed:

ゼミと他講義において「コミュニティー」の関連性に気づきますね。ゼミだけでなく、他の学術講義のコミュニティーに入ると、academic literacy 発達に繋がると思います。(Original Individual Interview 2013)

I realized that the communities of the research seminar course and other courses were connected. I recognized that being socialized into not only the community of the research seminar but also that of other related academic courses enriched the development of my academic literacy. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

Chiaki illustrated her efforts to build her language identity as an English major at the university. For instance, she said, “When I was a first- and second-year student, I developed my identity as an English learner: being a good speaker of English” (Final Narrative 2012). Chiaki wished to develop her oral skills since she had many opportunities to present in English in her classes. Thus, she made an effort to strengthen her desire to study English to improve her speaking proficiency. Chiaki felt neutral toward her confidence in her English skills when she reflected on her studies throughout her first and second years. She stated, “ちょっと否定的な気持ちが強いですね、自分の語学に対する identity を高めたかと言われれば。英語の大学に

いる割には、納得していないような [I feel a little conflicted if I am asked whether or not I was able to construct my language identity. As someone studying English in the English program, I have not been satisfied with my language ability]" (Individual Interview 2013). Chiaki was proud of her progressive approach to different tasks. Her language performance, on the contrary, was not entirely satisfactory since it was challenging to obtain her better-than-expected outcomes.

After interacting with others in the research seminar community, Chiaki gained a deeper understanding of her academic learning style. Especially, while coping with various disciplinary tasks of L2 writing, she strongly felt that “これって正にアカデミックの勉強だなって [this is the very essence of academic learning]" (Focus Group Interview 2013). At first, she felt conflicted regarding her positioning as a member of the research seminar course. She considered herself a novice since it was so difficult to examine academic discourses using scholarly texts. Chiaki then assumed she was doing her best since others also felt the need to pay close attention to the challenging assignments. She stated, “皆も学術の文に携わるのは初めてなんで、自分も出来るだろうって [As my peers were also exploring academic texts for the first time, I thought I could manage]" (Individual Interview 2013). Students in the seminar course were obliged to read academic articles, participate in extensive discussions, and maintain a weekly journal. As such, her English learning in the research seminar course changed quickly. Furthermore, she discovered that the links between several topics in the seminar course and other specialist courses contributed to her willingness to pursue the specialized field. For instance, in SLA class, because the core textbook included English scholastic literature, certain vocabulary and content overlapped with the research seminar course. Chiaki said, “今でも文法や語彙力は英語のスキルを上げるのに役立ちます。でも、ゼミや SLA とか教科教育法のような専門授業では、自分の経験や知識が専門力を高めますね [Until now, grammatical as well as vocabulary ability was useful to develop my English skills. But in the disciplinary courses such as seminar, SLA, and teaching methodology, my experiences and knowledge nurtured my professional scholarship]" (Focus Group Interview 2013).

Chiaki discussed how, at the beginning of the semester, she had regretted enrolling in my research seminar course, saying, “I thought that my identity was broken, rejected, and clashed. . . . I felt oppressed when the class day was coming; I experienced ‘Tuesday blues’” (Final Narrative 2012). However, she attempted to rebuild by acquiring new knowledge in this entirely new academic field. She progressively transformed herself into a complete member of the discourse community by generating interactions and through socialization.

MIHO

During her first and second years, Miho was a dedicated student who excelled in practical English lessons. Owing to her school's unusual curriculum, Miho went through a variety of English speaking, reading, and writing activities in senior high school before attending university. She demonstrated several useful writing techniques in English at university (e.g., sentence-making, paragraph compositions with varied genres), visible in her literacy autobiography. Miho prioritized her speaking skills at the time because, as she said, "I did not know why writing is important for English study. I thought speaking is more important" (Literacy Autobiography 2012). However, the seminar topic sparked her attention since she wanted to immerse herself in the specialized community to nurture her disciplinary knowledge. Miho's involvement in the class helped enhance her English skills.

Miho's journey of exploring scholarly papers began with challenges in interacting with academic discourses. She confronted difficulties in examining the texts right from the time of entering the research seminar course. It took her a long time to tackle the academic discourses in the articles. She noted, "When I read the academic text, it took a long time because there are many academic words in the articles, and sentences are too long" (Final Narrative 2012). Her persistent anxiety about improving her academic reading abilities was exacerbated by the intricacies of disciplinary discourses. Miho reflected on the beginning of the research seminar course as follows: "I read the articles every Sunday and Monday after school. I spent most of my time examining the articles . . . In April and May, I got depressed because I really did not understand the content of the academic texts. To tell the truth, I came to hate English a bit" (Final Narrative 2012).

When Miho finished the first assignment, she realized that fully comprehending the content of academic articles was too big a task to achieve by herself. Furthermore, she thought that owing to her lack of professional knowledge, reading disciplinary publications alone limited her ability to gain a comprehensive understanding of academic discourses. She noted, "I needed to motivate myself" and "in addition, I am not all alone in my concentration on reading" (Final Narrative 2012). Miho tried to console herself by thinking that all seminar students had similar problems. Therefore, she began engaging in active collaborative reading with her classmates. As Miho was still not used to examining academic discourses, she was often bewildered by the jargon and complicated discourse structures, which prevented her from progressing to the stage of complete comprehension. Miho stated, "When I read the academic journals, it took a long time because of the jargon, and the sentences were too long. So, reading was very difficult" (Final Narrative 2012).

After a brief interval, Miho decided to refocus her efforts on examining the scholarly articles. Fortunately, she requested Chiaki to work with her; subsequently Akiko also joined. The fundamental goal of collaboration with seminar peers was to facilitate a better understanding of the content of articles. She believed that navigating disciplinary discourses by herself would reduce her motivation for improving her academic reading abilities. Miho attempted to understand the meaning of the texts in collaboration with Akiko and Chiaki by looking up specialized terms. She explained how she went through reading the disciplinary articles at first, saying:

I was always confused with some words because one word has many different meanings.

So, we looked up each word in our dictionary, and considered which meaning was appropriate. Even if I understood specialized terms in the articles, I did not understand the contents of the text. (Final Narrative 2012)

At the beginning of the semester, she found it difficult to examine academic discourses. She felt that working on reading tasks individually was ineffective. However, Miho continued to work hard with her seminar classmates on reading the professional articles every week. Before the meeting, she and her peers carefully read the articles for which they were responsible. They mainly discussed complicated texts to interpret the meaning during their group work. She stated, “journal の課題をするのに役割分担を決めると、自分も担当箇所をしっかりとやらなきゃという気持ちになり、はかどりました [When we clarified the division of the roles in order to explore the academic journals, I felt somewhat obliged to complete my parts]” (Individual Interview 2013).

By expanding her collaborative efforts to explore academic discourses, she eventually predicted the arguments in the articles. One of the reasons was “専門用語になれたこと [the familiarity with several jargons]” (Focus Group Interview 2013). Another issue was to hold frequent informal discussions on the articles with her classmates outside of class. Miho had the opportunity to hear her classmates’ opinions about the topic while socializing with peers outside of the classroom. Miho stated:

「あーこの人は面白い意見持つてるなあ。」とか「なるほど、それって独特な意見だな。」って感じましたね。仮に自分の理解がメンバーと違っていても、自分の理解が悪いつて否定的に見るのではなく、その人の批評が良いんだって肯定的になりました。 (Original Individual Interview 2013)

I felt like “Oh, this member has such an interesting idea,” or “I see. This is a unique thought.” Even if my understanding totally differed from that of my peers, their critical thoughts were a remarkably positive influence, rather than

making me interpret my understanding in a negative light. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

Miho was able to achieve effective mutual interactions outside of the classroom. Nonetheless, she would occasionally refuse to discuss the content of articles with others in the classroom. She sometimes attended the research seminar course uneasy in her understanding of the reading homework. She listened to her classmates' every word intently during their presentations and appreciated their succinct descriptions of the articles, which stimulated her interest in the topic. Miho frankly revealed why she did not participate in classroom interactions: "I think there are mostly excellent students in this seminar course. In fact, it also made me nervous. I always felt nervous in the class" (Final Narrative 2012). She was unable to effortlessly integrate into the interactions with her peers owing to her psychological uncertainty. Rather, she committed herself to listening to what the others were saying as an apprentice, despite her regret for not expressing her opinions. She stated her true emotions as follows: "Unfortunately, I regret that I could not speak in the class. I listened to what someone said and someone's explanations. I did not have the ability to express my opinions. I wish to voice my opinions next semester" (Final Narrative 2012).

In Miho's case, being socialized into the community and with her peers was a crucial component of exploring and negotiating English academic discourses. She was able to comprehend the disciplinary discourses because of the joint effort with her peers rather than focusing on individual reading.

Miho enrolled in the English program to pursue a career in academics and wanted to improve her English skills with the goal of having a solid command over the language. Thus, she was keen to ask professors questions and visited the Foreign Language Center in the university, where full-time support staff encouraged students' language study in an accessible manner. Miho considered herself more than a mere learner of the English language when she looked back on her past experiences of learning English at university. Yet, she questioned her attitude toward learning English. As she said, "もちろん授業では一生懸命取り組んだんですけど、えー、でも、他人と比べると、例えば外国語センターが主催しているようなイベントとかには参加しませんでしたし [It is true that I took serious efforts on many English tasks in the classes. But compared to others, I wasn't involved in numerous side projects such as those offered by the Foreign Language Center or school]" (Individual Interview 2013).

Miho gained a deep understanding of the academic field in the research seminar course, in contrast to her earlier English studies. She aimed to explore several topics of L2 writing research from the perspectives of learners'

backgrounds and pedagogical contexts in different countries. Her past style of learning English was relatively passive, but she became more engaged by socializing with her research seminar peers, particularly outside of the classroom. She had had few opportunities to interact with others in previous skill-based language classes, even if she had some questions. She tried to adopt an open attitude so as to become involved with her competent peers after being initiated into the seminar community. As Miho said, the more time she spent immersing herself in the community, the more she learned about developing her disciplinary knowledge:

確かに専門分野にどっぷりと浸かるような academic identity を作り上げたとは言えないけど、ゼミの皆と色々なテーマを批判的に議論して、L2 writing の研究を深く理解できたことは間違いないです。ゼミ内での社会的な活動は、その独特な discourse community に入りこむ楽しさと自分の専門分野の知識を高めるきっかけになりました。(Original Individual Interview 2013)

I cannot argue that I constructed my academic identity by being heavily involved in the professional field. However, I believe that I was able to deepen my understanding of various studies of L2 writing by discussing critical issues with my group members. This social activity in the course helped me find happiness in socializing into the unique discourse community and in promoting my disciplinary knowledge. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

Moreover, Miho discovered a link between L2 writing and other academic areas; she had never examined how her studies in linguistics and applied linguistics influenced her studies in other fields. Such a finding helped her cultivate her expertise in L2 writing research. She noted, “The articles that we examined covered issues related to psychology, sociology, social sciences, and so on. I could learn many disciplines in the research seminar course” (Final Narrative 2012).

Even though she sometimes did not read up on them by herself, Miho began to conceive of herself as a member of the specialized community who strived to understand the professional area fully. Miho defined academic identity as “専門分野の知識を得ることと、専門分野を学び、様々な状況において社会的に貢献することです。学術 identity を高めるには、人との調和を大事にして、意欲を示すことが必要だと思います [It is about knowledge construction of the specialized area and social contribution to various situations through being inspired by our own interesting expertise. To develop an academic identity, it is necessary to emphasize harmony and display willingness]” (Individual Interview 2013). Her academic identity, as defined above, showed a change in her approach toward studying English.

SAYAKA

Sayaka's spirit thrived on challenges, allowing her to cheerfully engage in a variety of academic tasks. She was the first student to show an interest in joining my research seminar before leaving for her study abroad program in the United States. Her motivation for joining my seminar group was to put herself in a serious learning atmosphere where she could explore a specific disciplinary topic by reading English scholarly references.

Sayaka had had an interest in writing in English since the time of maintaining English journals in elementary school. As she mentioned, "I found that the more I tried to improve my diary, the more I understood the skills of writing" (Literacy Autobiography 2012). Furthermore, while participating in the study abroad program in the United States, Sayaka started to keep another journal. She reflected on her school days, illustrating her memories, events, and the English words she had learned. She had American writing assistants revise her diaries and give her tips for English writing on a regular basis. She said, "While I tried to keep my diary hard, my mistakes were decreasing. I could tell how much I had improved . . . I made two books for my diary. It is one of my treasures. I'm going to cherish them forever" (Literacy Autobiography 2012). Writing a reflective diary in English sparked her interest in improving her English literacy skills and exploring L2 writing research from a professional perspective.

Sayaka's journey of reading scholarly publications began with a significant challenge: committing to the specialized discourse. Embracing the complexity of examining specialized discourses was a distinguishing element of improving her academic reading skills. Sayaka noticed that the written discourse of the academic articles included a lot of jargon and complicated sentence structures. Understanding academic terminology was the most difficult for her at the beginning of the semester. Sayaka had never examined disciplinary texts before, so her first objective was to understand the meanings of academic texts by understanding the terminology. In her own words:

At the beginning of the semester, I looked up all unfamiliar words in order to understand the articles. However, sometimes, even after doing so, I could not figure things out. When I became fed up with my assignment, I realized that I needed to understand the articles' meanings in their entirety. (Final Narrative 2012)

At first, Sayaka went through the inductive process of examining academic discourses by herself. She tried to look up all unfamiliar specialized terms in a dictionary, underlining the texts. She found that interpreting the meanings of articles was a crucial step. As she stated, "わかんない単語がいつ

ばいあったので、わからないところは全て線を引いて、全部調べましたね [Since there were a lot of unknown words, I underlined and looked them up]” and “それでもわからないところは、フィーリングで、ここは大事なかなというところを自分なりに解釈しました [if I still did not understand the texts, I tried to interpret the parts that seemed important for the articles in my way]” (Individual Interview 2013). Sayaka used these techniques for a while because she thought that she should translate the sentences to properly comprehend articles. As she hesitantly said, “だつて訳さなきゃ意味がわからないじゃないですか？だから訳せるところは、きつちりと訳しました [Well, it is difficult to understand the meanings without translation, right? So, I tried to translate the texts into Japanese, which I could do]” (Individual Interview 2013).

However, Sayaka adjusted her approach to negotiating disciplinary articles after working with her presenting partner, Akiko. When examining the texts with Akiko, Sayaka was mostly concerned with grasping the meaning of the texts. They pondered over the author(s)' arguments and offered critical comments based on the conclusion. Then they spent a lot of time discussing the allocated parts of the articles. Sayaka asked Akiko whether she had any trouble understanding the passages. Although Sayaka was too shy to ask questions during the joint work, she eventually came to appreciate Akiko's assistance since her understanding of the articles was much deeper. She mentioned:

一人でやるとこれがあつているのかわかんなくて、これあつているのかなとか、全くわかんないから。ペアでやっていると、「あ、こういう意味だったんだ」ということが多くて、すごいためになるというか、新しい発見があるというか。(Original Individual Interview 2013)

In studying by myself, I often wondered if my interpretation was right or wrong because I had no idea what to do. But, during the pair work, I always felt, “Oh, I got the meaning,” and then I thought that pair work was very beneficial and allowed me to learn something new. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

This cooperative work served as the beginning of Sayaka's involvement in socializing with her peers in the classroom. She came to realize the importance of productive classroom interactions to gain a better understanding of the articles while receiving tips on examining disciplinary discourses. She stressed the need for interactions with peers to strengthen her academic literacy since she had generally read scholarly articles by herself. Exploring professional journals interactively was probably an effective method to come up with novel techniques for tackling the academic literature. In the classroom, Sayaka offered her thoughts and listened intently to others' contributions. She was able to refine her opinions regarding L2 writing studies based

on her classmates' remarks. Sayaka said, “ひとりで行っていたので、何が正解で何が間違っているのかわからないので、ディスカッションで人の意見を聞いて参考になったし [I did not know what was right or wrong concerning my understanding of the articles because I did the reading assignment alone. So, it was really helpful to hear my peers' opinions during the classroom discussions]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Sayaka had a great chance to reaffirm the content of the journal assignments through peer discussions. She made a new discovery in terms of suitable methods of examining academic discourses. At the beginning of the semester, she spent a lot of time searching for the meaning of terminology and reading texts, and as she noted, “Many words I did not know made me tired and annoyed” (Final Narrative 2012). Classroom discussions helped deepen her understanding of the content as she actively participated in the research seminar course. She said:

「あ、これってこういう意味なのか！」と思うことが多々ありました。自分の解釈とは違ったことに気付けるし、あんまり堅苦しく考えずに流し読み程度がちょうどいいのではないかと気づきました。(Original Translation Weekly Reflection #5 2012)

I had much to notice, “Oh, the meaning of this part was this!” I noticed the differences in interpretations (during discussions). I thought I should skim through the articles rather than think too seriously. (Translation Weekly Reflection #5 2012)

Despite the importance of socializing with peers in the research seminar course, Sayaka sometimes hesitated to participate in classroom discussions. Sayaka had an inner conflict over her limited understanding of articles. She stated:

予習をしたつもりだったけど、実際に疑問に思う点や質問などがあまり見つからなくてディスカッションを盛り上げられなかった。また、理解がまだ浅いと感じる。Taiseiが難しい質問をしていてついていけなかった。彼に負けないくらい先生に質問をぶつけられるように理解を深めたい。(Original Weekly Reflection #3 2012)

I thought that I was prepared for the assignment, but in fact, I could not identify questions for classroom discussions. So, I could not enliven the mood for the classroom discussions. I could not follow Taisei's questions because they were difficult. I would like to have a deep understanding to be able to ask teachers as many questions as Taisei did. (Translation Weekly Reflection #3 2012)

She learned to obtain a better grasp of the reading assignments through discourse socialization in the research seminar course. While negotiating the discourses in the academic articles, she mostly relied on individual learning.

As she indicated, “一人でやるのが好きでしたからね。でも先生や他のゼミの子に聞いたりもしていましたけどね [I prefer to do my work alone. But as you know, I sometimes asked you (teacher) and my seminar members the meanings of the texts]” (Individual Interview 2013). Yet, when Sayaka collaborated with her presentation partner, Akiko, she made a strong commitment to gaining a deeper understanding of the reading material in order to “summarize the content precisely and provide explicit explanations to my peers” (Weekly Reflection #7 2012). Sayaka also confirmed that the learning atmosphere of the discourse community pushed her to work hard. Despite initially feeling like a newcomer in the research seminar environment, her competent peers encouraged her to participate in collaborative work. As she reflected, “自分の周りはずごく頭が良かったんで、もつと頑張んなきゃっていう良い意味でのプレッシャーはありましたけど [Well, others around me were clever, so I had a positive pressure to push myself]” (Individual Interview 2013).

At the start of the research seminar course, Sayaka adopted her own strategies for examining the discourses. She then attempted to work with a partner outside of the classroom to improve her academic literacy. As time passed, she became more engaged in the research seminar community, interpreting the academic journal content in-depth and recommending the advantages of joint work for developing academic literacy: “やっぱり人とやるべきですね。意見交換できるし、違う意見を聞けるので [All in all, we should have collaborative sessions because we can exchange and hear different ideas]” (Individual Interview 2013); and “話をすることで、新しい発見がありました [Through discussions, I could discover new things]” (Focus Group Interview 2013).

Sayaka had been passionate about improving her English language proficiency since her high school years. She continued to work on improving her English skills with unwavering zeal for the next two years after starting university. In her second year, she engaged in developing her English skills during a four-month study abroad program in the United States. This experience of studying overseas increased her interest in advancing her English language proficiency. She then wanted to learn more about a specific academic field.

During our vigorous discussions in the interview regarding her experiences studying English over the years, I predicted that she would be successful in exploring scholarly articles. However, Sayaka did not wish to acquire specialized knowledge by reading academic articles. She only acknowledged that she made an effort to properly examine several topics of L2 writing research. She perceived the distinction between improving her language abilities and pursuing a specialized field. She said with a touch of surprise: “最初の article を読んで思いましたね、今まで英語をやっていたけどこんなに違う

んだ [When I examined the first article assignment, I realized how different investigating research was compared with my previous study of the English language]” (Individual Interview 2013). Sayaka attempted to keep up with her work in the research seminar course by interacting with her peers. “出来る人がいると自分にプレッシャーがあり、頑張らないといけないという意欲があつた [I was greatly influenced by my seminar peers. As there were some ‘experts’ around, I was under pressure to work hard]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Sayaka did not strive to modify her position as an English learner who desired to develop disciplinary knowledge, despite the fact that she enhanced her awareness of a disciplinary area by seeking to understand the content of the articles in the seminar course. As Sayaka stated, “学術的な研究を追究したいのではなく、学術的な内容に触れて英語レベルを上げたいんですね、特に語彙と読解力です [I did not want to pursue academic research, but wanted to develop my English abilities further, especially vocabulary and reading comprehension, by examining the academic articles that we dealt with in the seminar course]” (Individual Interview 2013). Sayaka hoped to develop her professional expertise by engaging with disciplinary discourses, but she focused on improving her English abilities.

KENTA

Kenta was a diligent learner of English in the research seminar course. He focused primarily on developing his English skills during his first and second years of university, experiencing new language tasks (e.g., reading, writing, and speaking) since his English lessons in high school had emphasized “mainly acquiring grammatical accuracy, making English sentences” (Literacy Autobiography 2012). Kenta attempted to make a fresh effort to achieve his desired academic performance. Especially, he came to boost his understanding of creating specialized knowledge after he joined a six-week study abroad program in New Zealand.

Kenta was able to improve his English proficiency, but reading scholarly articles was challenging for him. He thought of his first phase of examining academic discourses as throwing himself into a different world. He exerted too much pressure on himself since he had no idea what academic research or disciplinary ability meant. He said, “There are many words I do not understand . . . I have to remember the authors’ (scholars’) names . . . I have to submit a better report” (Literacy Autobiography 2012).

Kenta’s journey of exploring academic journals began with learning various disciplinary terms. He sought to open up a new frontier of cultivating his

expertise by examining professional articles. To comprehend academic texts, he initially looked up a lot of vocabulary in a dictionary, using the traditional technique of translation. Kenta struggled to understand the meaning of the terminology when reading the academic papers. Each time, he checked the meaning of the jargon to follow the content. He expressed his thoughts on the difficulty of reading scholarly articles: “何度も単語の意味調べて辞書を使いました。ジャーナルに全くわからない難しい単語があれば、いつも辞書に頼っていました [I used my dictionary a million times to look over the meanings of the words. As there existed many difficult words in the journals, which were beyond me, I always went to a dictionary]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Over-reliance on a dictionary made the process of reading articles rather tedious. Kenta then shifted his focus from translation toward an understanding of overall article structure. He just attempted to highlight and memorize frequently used terms. Although he did not have a firm grasp over the articles at first, he came to understand the content progressively without the use of a dictionary and came to comprehend the primary themes. Kenta mentioned:

最初に概要をつかむために、ざっとarticleに目を通し、それから段落を注意深く読みました。もし article が今まで読んできたものと似ている点があれば、 article の内容は前の授業を復習しながらして理解するのは簡単でした。(Original Individual Interview 2013)

I initially tried to scan the articles to catch the general ideas, subsequently reading each paragraph carefully. If the article had similar points that I had read, it was a little easier to understand the content. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

He noticed that examining the academic discourses with a critical eye boosted his academic reading skills. Actually, Kenta went through various processes of examining academic discourses, but he eventually turned his attention to L2 writing issues. As he noted, “論文が難しいとも感じたが、とてもやりがいがあるものだと感じた [I felt that the article was very difficult, but it was a good chance to try to explore the topic]” (Weekly Journal #2 2012).

Around the middle of the semester, Kenta realized the value of the discourse community (research seminar course) in gaining a more complete understanding of journal content. Although Kenta first felt apprenticed and withdrew from classroom discussions: “自分の考えは浅はかに思える [My thoughts and ideas seemed to be flimsy]” (Weekly Journal #1 2012), he eventually sought to socialize with his research seminar peers in the classroom to obtain a better understanding of disciplinary journals.

At the outset of his involvement in the research seminar course, he attempted to listen to his peers' opinions during discussions and presentations,

taking notes on their thoughts. This helped broaden his specialized knowledge when reading scholarly articles. Additionally, he carefully listened to the PowerPoint presentations to discover the discussion leaders' perceptions of the articles. As Kenta mentioned, “クラスメートが発表や discussion をしている時、要点や全部の内容をはつきりとカバーできているように思いました。それが自分にとって復習するのに役立ちました [My classmates seemed to cover the main points as well as the whole content clearly when they made their presentations or offered discussion questions. This was very helpful for me to review the articles clearly]” (Individual Interview 2013). Throughout the class discussions, he made an effort to listen to his peers' perspectives rather than making remarks about the discussion topic. Owing to their clear explanations, his peers' ideas served as a steppingstone for Kenta to understand the content of the articles. Kenta confirmed his level of comprehension and offered his thoughts on scholarly articles. He attempted to demonstrate his interest in L2 writing scholarship as follows: “L1 と L2 の英語学習者の内容も印象的なものでした [The topic highlighting the issues of L1 and L2 learners was impressive]” or “L1 と L2 がどう定義されるべきか?” [How should L1 and L2 be defined?]” (Final Narrative 2013).

Kenta was impressed by the productive discussions throughout the research seminar course. Indeed, he was not so involved in socializing with others; his primary focus was to understand the ideas of capable others in order to develop specialized knowledge. As he stated, “デイスカツションで、哲学的な意見を出していたので、L2 writing についてもっと理解できました [My seminar peers shared their philosophical thoughts with us. The discussions inspired me to deepen my understanding of L2 writing scholarship]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Although Kenta stressed the importance of socializing within the research seminar community to understand the disciplinary articles, he adopted a passive approach when collaborating with his presenting partner, Taisei. When Kenta and Taisei read the articles together, Kenta just followed Taisei's advice. Kenta's positioning as a novice in the research seminar group enabled him to comply with his partner's instructions to engage in interpreting the discourse. Nonetheless, he acknowledged his weakness with a remorseful tone: “専門知識を増やすために、もっとゼミのメンバーと話をすれば良かったですね [I should have had more frequent interactions with my seminar peers to develop more specialized knowledge]” (Individual Interview 2013). He also said, “自分の意見と人の意見を照らし合わせて、もし同じ意見が意味合いを持っていたら、自信にも繋がるし、共同作業は良いと思います [If others' thoughts were similar to mine, group work gave me confidence and was very helpful]” (Individual Interview 2013).

As a newcomer to disciplinary learning, Kenta went through various processes of negotiating academic discourses. Within the classroom, he was careful about listening to his classmates' ideas in order to develop specialized knowledge. However, he did not seek to engage in peer discussions. Rather, he spent his time independently examining the scholarly articles.

At the beginning of Kenta's section, I noted that he completed many English tasks he had not engaged in in high school. As he came from an industrial high school, his English lessons had concentrated mostly on general English practices, particularly reading and writing. He felt “単なる英語学習者にしかなかった [I was not anything more than an English language learner]” (Individual Interview 2013). At the end of his second year, he joined a New Zealand program for a required study abroad class. He regarded himself as an English language learner, despite his growing interest in studying English. He retained his positioning as an English learner, saying “気持ちはほとんど変わっていない [(My positioning) remained almost stable]” (Focus Group Interview 2013).

Kenta immersed himself in a new learning environment after joining the research seminar course. Socializing himself into the research seminar community provided an opportunity for him to rediscover his English skills. It was, of course, the first step in his exploration of the disciplinary area. He recognized the depth of the disciplinary field, especially because the seminar course focused on the background and rationale for L2 writing research. Kenta said, “専門の background を学んでいる時に深くなつて感じた [When I examined the background of the specialized topic, I felt that this is a deep study]” (Individual Interview 2013). His insider's view indicated a shift in awareness in his exploration of the L2 writing issues to follow the research seminar course. He mentioned, “今までより、深くほりさげていると意味がないといけなかつた [It seemed meaningless unless I examined my disciplinary learning in-depth]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Kenta attempted to express his opinion during the individual interview by looking back on his learning over the research seminar course. He confirmed that he did not gain full membership of the discourse community to explore L2 writing or applied linguistics. However, he had at least built his specialized knowledge of L2 writing. He said:

ゼミのメンバーが意見を出すと、意見がとても哲学的な点に触れていたりしたんですね。その時に「あ、これは専門分野の community で専門知識を広げるってことなんだ」って初めて思いました。この community でメンバーと会話しながら、L2 writing の知識は広がったとは思っています。(Original Individual Interview 2013)

When the seminar members shared their thoughts, their critical comments touched on some very philosophical points. Then, I felt “Ah, this is the very

construction of the professional knowledge in the specialized community with others.” This was the first time I thought so. I believe I was able to expand my viewpoint of L2 writing by interacting with my seminar peers in the discourse community. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Based on the coding categories derived from the data sources, this chapter clarified the processes of ADS and academic identity formation of the seven participants. While all the participants adopted their own methods to understand academic discourses by reading English scholarly papers, there were some disparities among the students.

Most participants (Chiaki, Taisei, Miho, and Kenta) sought to interpret the contents of the discourses using a dictionary to overcome the jargon-related problems. Akiko, Jonghyun, and Sayaka, on the contrary, were engrossed in understanding the correct meaning through context. The seven multilingual learners tended to understand academic discourses by socializing into the discourse community of the research seminar course; they could better understand the meaning of the articles within the community by interacting with others or focusing on listening to their viewpoints. Akiko, Jonghyun, and Taisei, in particular, demonstrated agency by active involvement in the academic environment. While they were novices at the beginning of the semester, they became capable community members who supported others’ study of L2 writing topics. Even though classroom discussions were restricted, Chiaki and Sayaka eventually made a commitment to the community. Miho and Kenta, on the contrary, remained on the periphery, resulting in low engagement in peer interactions.

Academic identity reflected various points of view based on experiences of academic literacy. Owing to their positive approach toward exploring the disciplinary field, Akiko, Jonghyun, Taisei, and Chiaki were conscious of their feeling of belonging to the discourse community. They were able to reshape their identities as academic English learners who immersed themselves in the specialized discourse community through social activities. In Miho’s case, she recognized that socializing with seminar classmates helped nurture her academic knowledge. Kenta and Sayaka acknowledged their development of disciplinary knowledge in the research seminar course, but they continued to consider themselves English learners.

In this chapter, cross-case analysis of ADS and construction of academic identity was conducted in line with the participants’ case descriptions. The next chapter examines the themes that emerged from each participant’s case:

(a) acknowledging lexical difficulties in academic discourses, (b) implementing a more traditional translation approach, (c) practical collaboration with peers, (d) immersion into the discourse community, (e) power relations, (f) adapting to community roles, and (g) situating learners' positionality throughout the research seminar course.

Chapter Three

Cross-Case Analysis of ADS

The rich data sources (i.e., students' weekly journals and positionality narratives, course blog posts, individual interviews, and a focus group interview) revealed that the seven participants in my research seminar course utilized multifaceted processes and practices related to academic literacy development and academic identity construction. This chapter addresses each participant's exploration of ADS and academic identities from the researcher's perspective. In the previous chapter, seven significant themes emerged from the research participant's case studies: (a) acknowledging lexical difficulties in academic discourses, (b) implementing a more traditional translation approach, (c) practical collaboration with peers, (d) immersion into the discourse community, (e) power relations, (f) adapting to community roles, and (g) situating learners' positionality throughout the research seminar course.

This chapter discusses my interpretations and analyses of the development of academic literacy and ADS based on the themes that emerged from each participant's case as a cross-case study. Each section begins with a review of the literature to aid with visualizing the relationship between the data and existing theories.

ACKNOWLEDGING LEXICAL DIFFICULTIES IN ACADEMIC DISCOURSES

Often, newcomers find themselves confounded in disciplinary communities, finding it difficult to comprehend academic written discourses because of their unfamiliarity with discourse patterns (Casanave 2002, 2003; Casanave and Li 2008; Leki 2007; Riazantseva 2012; Wang 2020; Yamada 2016). The technical terminology often impedes novices from understanding scholarly

texts, resulting in a lack of enthusiasm for exploring the target discourses and immersion in the discourse communities.

To overcome the problems associated with jargon in academic articles, looking up specialized terms helps learners not only socialize into their disciplinary setting but also incorporates their techniques into learning. According to Ohata and Fukao (2014), learners' difficulties and solutions related to adjusting to disciplinary discourses and communities contribute to the process of conceptualizing "the notions of academic reading and academic readers" (88). In Ohata and Fukao's (2014) study, all ten participants employed dictionaries (English-Japanese and English-English) as strategic solutions in the English for Academic Purposes program. The participants identified their practical use of dictionaries as beneficial to academic reading comprehension.

In my study, all participants used a variety of strategies to negotiate the meaning of academic discourses. Without sufficient scaffolding, it was difficult for learners to comprehend the content of the journals. As seen in chapter 2, none of the participants had encountered disciplinary discourses before enrolling in my research seminar course. Thus, prior to engaging in ADS, all participants sought to formulate their own approaches to examining academic discourses and find ways to interpret scholarly texts.

The most common strategy during the first stage of reviewing English academic journals was to comprehend the meaning of the terminological elements of the specialized field. As the studies of ADS have shown, individuals experienced lexical difficulties while attempting to comprehend the content of scholarly literature. Additionally, most students sought to understand jargon via the use of a dictionary rather than contextually deducing the meaning of unfamiliar terms. For example, Chiaki, Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta relied on a dictionary to determine the meanings of technical terms in order to thoroughly examine academic discourse.

Chiaki emphasized both the use of a dictionary to understand the vocabulary and the translation of scholarly texts into Japanese. While she desired to complete passages, different problems with terminology hampered her comprehension of English academic discourses. Chiaki said, "まず最初に article を詳しく読みました。全文を読んで、難しい単語があったら、辞書で調べました。でも辞書を引いてると、内容を忘れてるんですね [Initially, I read articles in detail. I tried to read every sentence, and when I found difficult words, I checked the dictionary. However, I often forgot the content of the article while checking terms in the dictionary]" (Individual Interview 2012). Although focusing on individual words was sometimes detrimental to Chiaki's understanding of the overall content, she recognized the importance of improving her vocabulary. Making a deliberate effort to expand her vocabulary was a methodical approach to engaging in academic discourses.

Miho initially struggled to interact with English academic discourses owing to the unfamiliar words in the articles. She concentrated on looking up the terminology she encountered in order to understand the content of the academic journals. However, across journals, she experienced difficulties in comprehension. Miho stated, “Reading the academic texts took a long time because of the presence of many academic words and the length of sentences. In addition, sometimes one word had many meanings which was confusing” (Final Narrative 2012). Early into the development of her academic literacy, Miho found herself in a position, where she had to be familiar with a lot of difficult jargon. As Casanave and Li (2008) indicated, developing academic literacy requires English language learners to navigate multiple complexities of the specialized discourse patterns. Miho’s attempt at developing a deeper awareness of the target discourse norms enabled her to cope with the discovery of new terminology in scholarly works. She was compelled to face certain previously unresolved tensions within English discourses.

Sayaka’s struggles with academic discourses were related to comprehending the meaning of texts, which she accomplished by looking up terms in a dictionary. As this was her first experience of negotiating disciplinary discourses, she reasoned that she had no choice but to rely on her comprehension of different phrases. Sayaka lamented the degree of difficulty she experienced in understanding the content of professional references: “Our assignments were to read difficult articles, so I read them until I figured out the contents,” and “On confronting difficult terminology, she translated all the words I did not know in order to understand the article” (Final Narrative 2012).

Kenta started constructing his knowledge of technical terminology early in the semester. Owing to his lack of experience of interacting with academic discourses, particularly those with complicated linguistic structures, he sought to develop his own approach. While reading the journals, Kenta recognized that he lacked the specific knowledge required for applied linguistics. Thus, when he encountered a great deal of jargon in the articles, he examined their definitions in a dictionary. He revealed the only way to get through the lengthy articles:

私が文章を理解するため初めにしたことは、辞書を引くことからでした。分からない単語が多く存在し、自分の英語の能力ではどうにもならなかったので、辞書を引きました。かなりの数を引いたと思いますが、長い単語や複雑な単語が多く、あまり単語を覚えることができませんでした。(Original Final Narrative 2012)

To understand the meanings of the texts, which contained many unfamiliar words in the articles beyond my understanding, I first referred to dictionary. However, I could not memorize the complicated words because of their sheer number. (Translation Final Narrative 2012)

While some students were adamant about examining the jargon in scholarly articles, most were puzzled about how to improve their vocabulary ability. Akiko, Jonghyun, and Taisei, however, found other means of learning specialized phrases to negotiate academic discourses rather than relying largely on a dictionary.

In Akiko's case, finding proper methods for examining English academic discourses was critical because of their patterns, especially the specialized words. Akiko made an effort to jot down specific new terms in her notebook in order to familiarize herself with them. Jonghyun attempted to derive the meanings of new terms from their contexts whenever he encountered them. Then, he looked up and memorized words that appeared often in scholarly literature. When Taisei experienced difficulties in understanding technical terminology, he was able to resolve them using the internet (i.e., word-searching websites). Taisei developed his grasp of technical phrases with the use of these technological tools. He did not, however, commit to memorizing words; rather, he attempted to develop a deeper understanding of the vocabulary items he reviewed, particularly their appropriate contextual use. As he noted, "ALC provides many words with example sentences" (Final Narrative 2012); thus, he appreciated the adequate aid provided by a few websites, which enabled him to construct the scaffolding necessary for navigating academic discourses in his unique manner.

Using a dictionary for academic jargon seemed critical for all participants during the early phase of adjusting to academic discourses. As the participants in the research seminar course had never investigated disciplinary discourses, they regarded vocabulary searching as a necessary foundation for examining scholarly literature.

IMPLEMENTING A MORE TRADITIONAL TRANSLATION APPROACH

As shown by the brief descriptions of an approach for teaching English in Japan in chapter 1, translation is a common practice. Grammar translation is promoted among English instructors as a way to prepare students for high school and university entrance examinations. As entrance examinations do not assess speaking proficiency, the grammar translation approach known as *yakudoku* is widely used to strengthen students' reading and writing abilities (Gorsuch 1998; Takanashi 2010). Additionally, L2 students often use this translation strategy in their English disciplinary writing. In Leki's (2007)

study, English writing of a few L2 students was mediated by their first language as part of a process of disciplinary English writing.

Indeed, there is much controversy about the implications of adopting the translation technique when teaching English; many claim that while it is important to the success of reading and writing abilities, it can distort the precise meaning (Peterlin 2014). However, Japanese students obtain instruction in grammar translation, which includes reading English texts, comprehending grammatical structures, searching for the meaning of unfamiliar terms, and translating phrases into Japanese. This translation strategy is ingrained in students' minds as a long-standing habit of language learning.

Most participants emphasized the critical nature of researching diverse terminological terms in professional articles. Additionally, several students (e.g., Chiaki, Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta) sought to understand the meaning of English discourses through the medium of Japanese. Since they had learned English through the *yakudoku* practice in secondary school, they continue to use this approach even for exploring academic discourses. *Yakudoku* became a prominent method of developing reading proficiency in English lessons: "In the class, students read the textbook and checked the meaning in Japanese" (Akiko's Literacy Autobiography 2012); "I had English I & II class and grammar class. In English I & II and grammar classes, a textbook was given, and students read the paragraphs and translated them literally" (Chiaki's Literacy Autobiography 2012).

Chiaki sought to read quickly to absorb the meaning of the content, using the same strategy she employed in "Extensive Reading," another class she was enrolled in. Chiaki clarified:

Extensive Reading みたいに、とりあえず単語は最初調べないで読もうと思っただけ。まず内容を大体つかんで、それからわからない単語を調べればという気持ちで読んでいました。(Original Individual Interview 2013)

Like in the Extensive Reading class, I tried to read the texts without checking the vocabulary. First, I focused on understanding the content roughly. Then, I examined the articles with the feeling that I should check the unknown words. (Translation Individual Interview 2013)

However, she discovered that this fast-reading process was ineffective for understanding academic discourses. Thus, translating English disciplinary texts into Japanese was a feasible method of initiating the examination of professional references. Chiaki said, "でも結局うまくいかなかったんで、訳にこだわるしかなかったですね [But, this process did not work well, so I had no choice but to engage in the translation of texts]" (Individual Interview 2013).

Miho's examination of academic discourses involved numerous translations into Japanese. Miho faced significant impediments in negotiating the meaning of professional discourses while navigating the complexity of the written structures of English. Miho said that the primary step in reviewing the articles was to grasp many terminological terms. Simultaneously, she got immersed in a quick translation of the academic books into Japanese in order to discuss the class projects with Chiaki during their informal meeting.

Sayaka concentrated on the translation of texts, as is customary for meaning-making assignments. Sayaka believed that translating discourses was the only way to negotiate the meaning of scholarly texts, since she was unable to find another way of examining academic discourses at the beginning of the semester. While negotiating the meanings of the academic discourses, she often felt vulnerable to the adjustment to a disciplinary subject. She stated, “読むのにすごい時間かかりましたね、3から4時間かかった時もありました。自分はすごく気にしちゃうんですよね、ちゃんと合ってるのかなって [It took many hours to read the articles, sometimes three to four hours overall. I always worried about my work, whether or not my interpretation was correct]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Kenta stressed his development of vocabulary and his ability to translate scholarly texts. In chapter 2, he demonstrated his attempts to absorb the broad meaning of articles and concentrate on paragraph reading, stating that, “簡単に内容をつかむために、ざっと読んで、それからじっくりと各パラグラフを読みましたね [to scan the articles first to catch the general ideas and then read each paragraph carefully]” (Individual Interview 2013). His original approach for negotiating professional English discourses was to translate the English texts literally into Japanese. At the onset of the process of negotiating the meaning of academic discourses, he used the conventional translation method. Additionally, his weekly reflections demonstrated his translation strategies for the academic discourses at the beginning of the semester. Kenta noted, “主に分からない単語を調べ、それをまとめて日本語に訳しながら読みました [I mainly checked the meaning of unknown words. After reviewing the words, I read side by side with translation]” (Weekly Journal #2 2012). Even though he realized that not all translations were successful, he maintained his use of *yakudoku*. He described, “部分的に読み取る点を意識し、重要な単語などを把握しながら読むことが必要だと感じました [I promoted my awareness of reading the main points. Then, I felt that examining the articles with an understanding of the crucial words was important]” (Weekly Journal #4 2012).

While many participants used the traditional learning method of translation to navigate academic discourses, Akiko, Jonghyun, and Taisei developed their own techniques for interpreting journal articles. Akiko attempted to

summarize the key ideas of the articles and then convened informal discussions with her peers. Jonghyun leafed through the journal articles, underlining certain significant points. Taisei highlighted the importance of his reading assignments being mediated by online sources.

Akiko experienced quite a struggle to comprehensively understand the content of articles. She attentively examined texts, but discovered that careful reading did not work out well. She opted to go at the whole text instead since she was engaged in the disciplinary discourse. As the patterns of English academic discourses differ greatly from those of Japanese, Akiko had to learn to understand the overall picture of the articles in English. She revealed: “一言一句完璧に日本語に直すのではなくて、全体像やそれが持つ意味自体にまずは着目して、そこから英文を英語で理解できるように読んだ方が効率はいいのではないかと思いました [I think it would be more efficient to take particular note of the general representation first, and then read the paragraphs and understand them in English]” (Weekly Journal #6 2012). Furthermore, she sometimes encountered problems when tasks in a small group were less than effective. Akiko thought that navigating English academic discourses through strong mediation by the first language impeded collaborative work since her peers overstressed translation. She mentioned, “みんなテキストを日本語に完全に変換しようとしすぎていて、それがうまくいかないと、テキストをより難解に感じてしまい、だから全体像がなかなか見えにくいと思いました [Everyone depended too much on understanding the scholarly texts in Japanese. If this did not work well, the members felt that the texts were difficult. That is why they had difficulty in understanding the whole content of the articles]” (Weekly Journal #6 2012).

Jonghyun investigated the academic discourses to completely comprehend the content rather than translating individual phrases. He found innovative methods of examining the full text, such as emphasizing the key points of the articles and retaining jargon. Since Jonghyun thought “translation was meaningless” (Individual Interview and Focus Group Interview 2013), he reaffirmed his confidence in summarizing the articles in his own words. He convinced himself of his ability to cope with reading tasks by sticking to his own path of reading the scholarly papers: “今までわからなかった文章が少しずつ分かるようになり、どこがメインポイントなのか、どのパートは必ず要約に含まなければならないのかがわかった [I gradually learned to understand the scholarly texts which had previously never made sense. Also, I understood which parts are significant and which parts I should include in the summary]” (Final Narrative 2012).

Taisei had difficulties interpreting academic texts. In terms of his tactics for examining discourses, he attempted to negotiate the right meanings of

academic articles, using websites that assisted him in clearly understanding specialized terms. He was able to adopt online sources effectively since they supplied solid example sentences that helped him understand technical words. Using the internet aided his academic literacy growth as well as his understanding of disciplinary articles.

Taisei checked the meanings of several difficult terms in Japanese, but he believed it was pointless to translate academic English texts into Japanese. He discussed why he did not use Japanese as a mediator when negotiating disciplinary discourses with his critical notions as follows:

和訳の利点は) 英語を勉強するのか、英語で書かれたコンテンツを勉強するかによって変わってくると思うんです。(中略) 日本語で訳しても理解するのが大変なので、たとえ日本語で訳されている文を読んだとしても多分、時間がかかると思うんですね。だったら何度も読んで、英語で理解しちゃった方が、ジャーナルを読んだ時、情報収集が早くなると思うんです。(Original Focus Group Interview 2013)

The merits of the translation approach depend on what we want to do; that is, we are trying to develop English skills or learn English content . . . I think it would take some time to read the articles, even if they are written in Japanese, because the content is hard to understand. Then, we can grasp the important points quickly by reading the texts many times and understanding them in English. (Translation Focus Group Interview 2013)

Thus, Taisei engaged in reading the articles many times by himself to absorb the content in his own manner rather than translating the contents literally.

All participants navigated the academic discourses in the scholarly articles in their own individual ways. However, they did discover that discourse socialization involving collaborative work to construct better knowledge and understand the meanings of specialized discourses was critical. Students in the research seminar course developed their own strategies for interacting with one another, exchanging and building disciplinary expertise. They attempted to improve their academic literacy through discourse socialization, even though the socialization procedures of the research seminar discourse community seemed relatively complicated.

PRACTICAL COLLABORATION WITH PEERS

Wenger (1998) emphasizes the nexus between community and practice. According to Wenger, as practice, collaborative endeavors enable participants to become a knowledgeable peer of the community. Mutual involvement is

defined as exchanging perspectives on information and contributing to the reconstruction of knowledge that each member has or lacks.

Moreover, practice encompasses both explicit and implicit components, such as “what is said and what is left unsaid; what is represented and what is assumed” (Wenger 1998, 47). All participants in this study engaged in particular behaviors, either explicitly or implicitly, to improve their academic literacy through ADS. They engaged in explicit interactions and activities in order to shift from beginners to experts in the specialized discourse group.

Akiko began engaging in group work and informal meetings outside of the classroom to enhance her comprehension of articles and to expand her academic literacy skills. This was her first move toward interacting with other participants in the research seminar. As Akiko pondered how other students sought to examine academic discourses, she discovered that familiarity with their practices and processes of academic literacy provided her with some helpful clues for negotiating academic discourses in English. She realized that others’ unwavering dedication to exploring disciplinary discourses molded her attitude toward discourse community commitment and discourse comprehension through socialization. Akiko was grateful for the opportunity to participate in some group work, as she highlighted, “一緒に勉強してくれる人がいる環境は、そんなになかったので本当に助かりました [It was really helpful for me to have an environment in which we could work together]” (Weekly Journal #4 2012).

Chiaki was continuously juggling various academic literacy experiences in English. She had problems with the content of comprehension of the unfamiliar terminology in articles. For a while, this confusion persisted as she attempted to overcome various difficulties with academic literacy; she would mostly rely on a dictionary or highlight the focal points of individual paragraphs. Then, outside of the classroom, she interacted with Akiko and Miho and became engaged in cooperatively constructing the meaning of academic discourses. The collaborative group formed a mutual supportive partnership that aided in academic literacy socialization. M. Kobayashi (2016) demonstrated that informal group sessions significantly facilitated discourse socialization. As with M. Kobayashi’s findings, Chiaki undertook difficult tasks, navigating the meaning of academic discourses through the medium of her native language and sharing her personal thoughts during their informal gatherings. She underscored the value of collaborative work outside of the classroom: “わからないところを聞くことによつて、前後の流れもわかつてきて、それが全部の article をさらによく読むきっかけになりましたね [By asking my peers about unfamiliar things, I came to understand the flow of content, which led me to examine articles in-depth]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Chiaki's academic literacy socialization provided her with critical viewpoints on L2 writing studies. As a newcomer in the disciplinary field, Chiaki was progressively initiated into new academic environments. This socialization into the research seminar and other specialized classes helped her develop a good attitude toward membership in specialized societies. She sought to gain support for her membership in these groups while also critiquing the discourses of the specialized genre (Wingate 2012).

Miho placed a greater emphasis on autonomous learning than on collaborative work outside of the classroom at the start of the semester. Although she experienced the complications of developing academic literacy, she made an effort to find efficient solutions to understand the meaning of English academic texts. It was difficult for her to navigate the negotiation of disciplinary discourses. Miho then convened a casual meeting with Chiaki and Akiko to thoroughly analyze the articles. By discussing the meaning of academic works with her peers, she was able to develop a more nuanced grasp of content. Miho discovered that collaborative work outside of the classroom encouraged her to improve her knowledge of the articles, as she answered in the individual interview (see chapter 2). Additionally, during the casual sessions, Miho valued her peers' varied viewpoints on the academic texts: “捉え方で意見も異なるので、ためになる [There were various thoughts because my peers perceived the content differently. So, that was helpful]” (Focus Group Interview 2013).

Akiko, Chiaki, and Miho argued that mutual practice with peers in a specialized community was favorable for developing their expertise. A reciprocal relationship is defined by both constructive interactions (i.e., harmony, agreement) and challenging conditions (conflicts, tensions) between members. Through their collaborative efforts outside of the classroom, the three participants ensured their harmonious coexistence throughout the stages of academic literacy socialization.

IMMERSION INTO THE DISCOURSE COMMUNITY

The concept of CoP defines learning as a process that fosters social involvement and is a necessary component of mutual interaction (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). Participation in this case entails “a more encompassing process of being active participants in the *practices* [italic in original] of social communities and constructing *identities* [italic in original] in relation to these communities” (Wenger 1998, 4). As they had never explored academic discourses previously, all students in the research seminar course framed their learning as valid peripheral involvement. They engaged in a variety of

practices and processes with other members of the research seminar in order to shift from novice to expert at navigating discourses. Additionally, Wenger (1998) emphasizes that participation encompasses the idea of “the possibility of mutual recognition” (56) and is related to “all kinds of relations, conflictual as well as harmonious, intimate as well as political, competitive as well as cooperative” (56). Participation is a vital and unavoidable part of the process of establishing a specific community and shaping experiences and practices with its members.

Human beings interact with others community members through various activities. After being initiated into the discourse community, students in the research seminar course maintained reciprocal involvement. All students developed their disciplinary knowledge through classroom interactions, which supported the growth of each seminar member’s expertise. Mutual interaction is not exclusively restricted to one’s own capacity growth. Rather than that, constructing knowledge is mutually fostered by the exchange of individual thinking. Mutual involvement, as Wenger (1998) indicates, capitalizes on “our ability to connect meaningfully to what we don’t do and what we don’t know—that is, to the contributions and knowledge of others” (76).

Akiko enthusiastically participated in class discussions, expressing her ideas on journal articles with her classmates. Peer interactions broadened her horizons in terms of professional knowledge:

ゼミのディスカッションでは、みんなの考え方を知ることができた。自分と似たような考え方の人もいれば、違う観点の考えの人もいて、違う考え方の人の意見を聞くと、こういう見方もあったのかととても参考になる。その観点からまたテーマに沿って考えてみると、また違う考えが浮かんできそうになる。ゼミの中でディスカッションを多く行っていることは、自分の考え方や視野が広がるので、私はとても好きです。(Original Weekly Journal #5 2012)

During the classroom discussions, I was exposed to other opinions about the topic. It was really valuable because some ideas were similar to mine, but others were different. The different opinions helped me to understand the critical perspectives. When I think of a topic from the different viewpoint offered by my peers, I come to have new ideas. As having many discussions in the classroom broadens my ideas, I really like it. (Translation Weekly Journal #5 2012)

Akiko demonstrated respect for others’ opinions. The interactions with her research seminar peers prompted her to further develop her knowledge of L2 writing studies. She said, “お互いの意見を比較し、そこからみんなで新しい意見や見解を見出すということも、みんながそれぞれ一生懸命頑張ったからこそ成り立っていたことだと思います [Discovering new findings and opinions after collaborating with others could be achieved because everyone worked so hard]” (Final Narrative 2012). Thus, she gained

a better understanding of the discourses in the articles through interactions with others and felt more motivated to advance her academic literacy as well.

Akiko recognized that her involvement in discourse socialization and membership in the discourse community laid the groundwork for the development of her academic literacy. Akiko collaborated with her seminar peers by actively participating in classroom discussions about L2 writing. She also had several opportunities outside of the classroom to participate in the group work associated with presentations, establishing mutually supportive relationships with others. Her socialization process within the specialized community of the research seminar course led to the development of her academic literacy. Academic literacy perspectives derived from Casanave and Li (2008) and Leki (2007) became congruent with Akiko's strong dedication to engaging in disciplinary discourses through the reading of scholarly journals. Akiko implemented components of academic literacy socialization into her research seminar course, allowing her to enhance her comprehension and interpretation of disciplinary journals through active involvement.

At the beginning of the semester, Jonghyun struggled to comprehend scholarly works. Therefore, he employed a variety of techniques and methods to autonomously build his academic literacy. By using various strategies for navigating disciplinary discourses, he realized that participating in the academic community was the most effective way to develop an understanding of the articles. Even though communal action in Jonghyun's situation was primarily confined to the classroom (i.e., group work and classroom discussions), supportive interactions helped him co-construct knowledge in L2 writing research. A strong dedication to continuing classroom discussions was critical to Jonghyun's academic literacy socialization, which resulted in a deeper understanding of academic discourses in the scholarly articles.

Jonghyun, in particular, paved the path for the establishment of an ideal atmosphere conducive to mutual comprehension of academic written discourses. As he said, “皆でディスカッションしたことと実際の論文の中身を踏まえて考えていくうちに理解ができた [I came to understand the articles in accordance with the classroom discussions and the content of the actual papers]” (Individual Interview 2013), and “ディスカッションを授業でやることは、論文だけでなく皆の意見もプラスされているから、何か深みが出たというか [the mutual discussions in the classroom helped me move toward a deeper understanding of the articles]” (Focus Group Interview 2013). His collaborative effort inside the disciplinary discourse community evolved into an “oral space” to ensure that his interactions with other members encouraged deeper understanding of the content of academic journals.

Taisei recognized the critical role of reciprocal exchanges in developing his ability to appreciate English academic discourses. Apart from presentation preparations, he attempted to work independently on reviewing professional literature. Taisei was socialized into the discourse community of the research seminar course, as demonstrated in chapter 2, by his participation in numerous classroom tasks with his classmates. Such active engagement with others yielded insights about his expertise in L2 writing scholarship. In his weekly journals, he frequently expressed appreciation for the opportunities to engage in in-depth conversations about various aspects of L2 writing, noting that classroom discussions were both intriguing and important. Additionally, Taisei established that his continual encounters with peers aided in the development of his disciplinary knowledge: “クラスメートと話すことで、専門知識が増えていってるというのがわかるんですね [I realized that my disciplinary knowledge was constructed through interactions with my seminar peers]” (Individual Interview 2013).

Sayaka focused on soliciting her peers' opinions during the discussions. She was somewhat silent in the classroom, but her classmates' interactions enabled her to develop disciplinary knowledge. Even when she misunderstood the meaning of the discourses in articles, she maintained a positive attitude toward developing her academic literacy. Additionally, casual meetings outside of class with her presenting partner (Akiko) contributed to her academic literacy socialization. Sayaka and Akiko discussed their perspectives on the journal articles as they prepared for the classroom presentations. Essentially, Sayaka underwent “member-coaching” and developed a stronger grasp of the material. As some studies have shown, external assistance in the form of direct exchanges and instruction from experts offers an effective scaffold for discourse socialization (M. Kobayashi 2003, 2006, 2016; Ho 2011; Leki 2007; Morita 2000; Seloni 2012). Sayaka was somewhat regretful about having avoided in-depth exchanges in the seminar course, but she attempted to comprehend academic discourses by interacting with members of the community.

Sayaka could improve her academic literacy through participation in her CoP both within and outside the classroom. Yet, despite her increased understanding of the specialized field of L2 writing scholarship, her peripheral position persisted.

Sayaka had mostly relied on self-directed learning to examine academic discourses until she became aware of the benefits of collaborative work. As she had never examined disciplinary articles in English, her development of academic literacy was fostered through deliberate repetition of discourse negotiations. A few weeks into the research seminar course, she developed

an appreciation for the members' zealous support for her comprehension of the article content.

POWER RELATIONS

As mentioned previously, many participants in the research seminar course developed a better comprehension of academic articles by strengthening their mutual interactions. However, most newcomers in a specialized community encounter a disproportionate power balance while they acclimate to their new learning environment. Such disparity in power between novices and more capable members of the group imposes restrictions on socialization (Wenger 1998). While the power disparity appears to have a detrimental effect on the community's disciplinary knowledge construction, it is a necessary condition for LPP (Lave and Wenger 1991). From a sociocultural perspective, experienced persons are critical in helping newcomers develop a sense of belonging in the target discourse community or obtaining community membership. As Leki (2007) argues, "little attention has been given to the actual nature of the socioacademic relations that develop, to the power differential inherent in any learning situation, or to the consequences" (274).

Miho and Kenta felt power relations within the classroom throughout numerous peer discussion, where they were socialized into the discourse community in this study. Actually, social interaction entails disputes, difficulties, and tensions. Miho and Kenta went through such psychological encounters when working in groups in the classroom. They had conflicting interpretations of academic discourses and were required to examine the unfamiliar written discourse structure of English scholarly works, which made socialization into the community more challenging. They experienced disparities in competence with other seminar students, which made it difficult to build classroom relationships.

It is true that Miho came to contribute to interactions with her research seminar peers by holding group sessions with her classmates. Yet, Miho felt a sense of alienation in discourse socialization, in particular during the classroom talks. Miho encountered difficulties in expressing herself in the research seminar course as she was overwhelmed by the students she viewed as expert or knowledgeable. Therefore, Miho's preparations for examining disciplinary texts involved listening with rapt attention to others' comments. As shown in chapter 2, Miho illustrated conflicts about her learning with a passive tone: "I regret that I could not speak in the class. I listened to what someone had to say and someone else's explanations. I did not have the ability to express my opinion" (Final Narrative 2012). Her insider characteristics included a

lack of professional knowledge, tension, and frailty, thereby instigating non-participation within the academic community, which is commonly found in peripheral learning (Casanave 2008; Riazantseva 2012; Wenger 1998). Miho's processes of academic literacy socialization exemplify the multiple complexities that impede newcomers from accessing the resources of specialized community.

Miho was hesitant to communicate with her seminar peers in the classroom owing to her lack of disciplinary knowledge. Notably, she believed that the underlying power imbalance hampered her ability to learn throughout the sessions. In fact, Miho viewed her relationship with informed peers as a mentor-mentee relationship. However, this implicit power imbalance harmed her capacity to effectively socialize with other seminar members. Miho perceived her friends as more capable individuals, which caused her to "feel nervous in the classroom" (Final Narrative 2012). Such disparities in knowledge remained peripheral in the seminar classroom, particularly during discussions.

Miho's academic literacy socialization was difficult, especially when she could not have active interactions with her seminar peers. However, outside of the classroom, informal group meetings helped her construct the meanings of academic discourse.

Kenta made an attempt to overcome adversity to improve his academic literacy. When he was enrolled in the English program, his English studies enriched the development of his language proficiency through a variety of skill-focused sessions. After enrolling in the research seminar course, he discovered that exploring academic literacy was more difficult than he thought.

Kenta confronted the same difficulties as many other inexperienced academic learners while attempting to comprehend academic discourses. He became aware of the difficulties of academic literacy practices as he navigated the multiple classroom tasks of the research seminar course. He struggled with the understanding of the meaning of specialized words, in particular, based exclusively on a dictionary. As Leki (2003, 2007) and Crosby (2009) indicate, understanding the jargon and discourse conventions of the disciplinary field was critical for surmounting some of the hurdles to academic literacy development. To foster the development of his academic literacy, he attempted to become initiated into the seminar course group. The CoP processes helped him gain a better understanding of the material with other members. His CoP paid much attention to his participation in group work as a novice. As his interview indicated, Kenta focused on listening to his peers' discussions and presentations. Nonetheless, he indicated reluctance to share his views with others in the community because of his anxiety and apprehension about making statements. Kenta struggled to balance many roles and engage with other seminar students within the CoP.

ADAPTING TO COMMUNITY ROLES

Mutual support from others, referred to as scaffolding, has a significant effect on learners' language development in classes. As seen from the case description in chapter 2, Akiko, Jonghyun, and Taisei appeared to help other seminar students develop specialized knowledge and facilitated discourse socialization. These participants acted as teachers, practitioners, or masters, assisting other group members in establishing a connection with the disciplinary community. Their activities constitute genuine participation, as they engaged in "the learning that membership entails, and then to open forms of mutual engagement that can become an invitation to participation" (Wenger 1998, 277). From the standpoint of CoP, Akiko, Jonghyun, and Taisei appeared to have "more to do with legitimacy of participation and with access to peripherally than they do with knowledge transmission" (Lave and Wenger 1991, 105). According to Lave and Wenger, being a valid participant and knowledgeable member of the target community is contingent upon group interactions and attitudes. These three participants' mutual interactions and participation guided other peers in the construction of critical knowledge.

Akiko, Jonghyun, and Taisei contributed to the membership of the discourse community through their interactions both within and outside the classroom. Even though Jonghyun and Taisei did not have any cooperative work outside of the research seminar course (e.g., casual meetings), Akiko met with Chiaki and Miho to discuss the reading materials. They accomplished the primary objective of the research seminar course by presenting their critical thoughts and providing opportunities for sufficient exchanges of opinions.

Regarding Akiko, she gave excellent advice at the informal encounters to help Chiaki and Miho improve their comprehension of the articles. As Miho stated, "I really did not understand the content of the academic texts. To tell the truth, I came to hate English a bit. So, I asked to work with the same friend (Akiko)" (Final Narrative 2012). Additionally, Akiko appeared to promote an understanding of the important points in articles. Sayaka was particularly taken aback by Akiko's in-depth knowledge and ability to articulate the main themes of the articles. Sayaka said, "二つのグループに分かれてからのディスカッションは Akiko さんがよく article を理解していることが印象強かったです。自分も理解しているつもりでしたが Akiko さんの訳し方とまとめ方がとても分かりやすく参考になりました [In the two-group discussion, Ms. Akiko's clear comprehension of the articles stood out in my mind. I felt that I did understand the content, but her translation as well as summary was easy and helpful]" (Sayaka's Weekly Journal #5 2012).

Jonghyun served as a mentor through various processes related to academic literacy. First, his apprentice mindset manifested itself both in and out

of the classroom. Jonghyun fostered his professional learning by socializing in the research seminar community and collaborating with peers, giving his critical opinions in the classroom. Several seminar participants assessed his critical expertise and expressed gratitude for his willingness to share constructive thoughts. For instance, “自由でありつつも保守的なところもある意見をよく言うなと思いました [He (Jonghyun) often provides his free and general opinions]” (Akiko’s Weekly Journal #5 2012); “最後のディスカッションクエストや、彼自身の考えはとても興味深かったです [(Jonghyun’s) last discussion question and his own ideas were so meaningful]” (Taisei’s Weekly Journal #7 2012); “発表では毎回、面白いディスカッションが行えてとても楽しいです [I really had interesting discussions when (Jonghyun) made his presentations]” (Taisei’s Weekly Journal #11 2012); and “Jonghyun 君が出した writer-centered と reader-centered どちらが重視されるべきかという discussion question はとても興味深かった [The discussion question that Mr. Jonghyun gave us (which should be valued, writer-centered or reader-centered writing?) was very interesting]” (Sayaka’s Weekly Journal #7 2012).

These affirmative actions positioned Jonghyun as a literacy broker (Lillis and Curry 2006) or a proficient actor who mediated the comprehension of academic content. Similar to Lillis and Curry’s (2006) study, diverse positions as literacy brokers play a critical part in supporting others in developing academic literacy.

Taisei went through various processes and roles within the seminar class to strengthen his academic literacy. He engaged in mutual interactions with the other seminar members. Taisei generated valid peripheral engagement in this instance through the CoP (Lave and Wenger 1991). He performed an important role in assisting other students in the research seminar course. Even though he was a novice to the seminar community, he performed a variety of roles, including fostering classroom discussions. In the research seminar course, he was promoted from apprentice to senior. Akiko remarked on Taisei’s views toward developing his academic literacy, stating “いつも冷静かつ論理的に物事をとらえるタイプなんだと、彼の意見を聞くたびに思います [Whenever I hear Taisei’s thoughts, I often feel that he is the type of person who tries to gain level-headed and logical perspectives]” (Akiko’s Weekly Journal #5 2012).

SITUATING LEARNERS’ POSITIONALITY THROUGHOUT THE RESEARCH SEMINAR COURSE

One of the factors that contribute to learners’ academic identity construction is their continuous commitment to the negotiation of target disciplinary

discourses. Newcomers have difficulties in interpreting the meanings of discourses, but seek to participate to become full members of the specialized community (Casanave 2002; Casanave and Li 2008; Muramatsu 2018; Seloni 2012; Wang 2020). Discourse socialization, in particular, assists learners in repositioning themselves toward becoming experts or complete members of discourse communities. As the primary concept of academic identity implies, it is co-constructed by others through interactions and the extent to which learners share their experiences through collaborative work (Henkel 2000; Kogan 2000).

Looking back on the participants' case descriptions, it is clear that diverse practices and experiences with academic literacy influenced each student's formation of academic identities. Having become socialized with others within the discourse community, the participants accumulated various positive and negative experiences as they developed their academic identities. Akiko, Jonghyun, Taisei, and Chiaki achieved their status as knowledgeable members by collaborative efforts during the research seminar course. For example, they played an important role, promoting active engagement in diverse activities throughout the research seminar course. Nevertheless, Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta were unable to completely integrate into the discourse community. Rather, they maintained their position as learners exploring a particular disciplinary subject, initiating into the community of the specialized field and cultivating their expertise.

By exploring the position of each participant in the disciplinary community, it became clear that Akiko, Jonghyun, Taisei, and Chiaki eventually constructed their expert identities, whereas Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta remained novices despite their access to the discourse community.

One reason might be that each participant had a clear objective. Akiko, Jonghyun, Taisei, and Chiaki had a distinct objective: to develop their academic literacy and to cultivate an interest in the academic field. For example, Akiko aspired to be a high school English teacher, Jonghyun was interested in acquiring academic knowledge and teaching English, and Taisei and Chiaki wish to develop their specialized expertise by negotiating academic discourses. Such a positive future vision hastened their negotiation of their identities inside their academic environments.

At first, Akiko struggled to comprehend academic discourses as a newcomer to the disciplinary community. She attempted to establish an identity that steered her toward the objectives of the research seminar community and drew her into developing a specialized discourse in her academic field. Akiko also learned to reconstruct her academic identity and positionality through the "game plays" of academic literacy, such as negotiating various disciplinary discourses (Casanave 2002, 2003). Akiko's reciprocal relationships with her

classmates served as a scaffolding for her academic identity construction. She developed her academic identity as a result of her socialization into the discourse community, shifting from a motivated English student to one cultivating knowledge of a specific field. As such, her discourse socialization fueled her enthusiasm for academic literacy and was crucial in forming her academic identity. Akiko shaped her position as an expert through numerous roles within the research seminar community. At the beginning of the research seminar course, she was a novice or apprentice in the disciplinary community. Akiko was gradually able to actively contribute to discussions and interactions by demonstrating a strong commitment to acquiring specialized knowledge in order to become an English teacher. By socializing into the research seminar community and with other seminar participants, she was able to establish her academic identity through the development of community-specific abilities via CoP.

Simultaneously, Akiko's transition to an expert identity prompted her to reconsider her position as a member of the research seminar course and a pre-service English teacher. Akiko found that multiple opportunities for collaborative work and classroom discussions boosted her understanding of disciplinary content. Additionally, Akiko's development as an old-timer was connected to a sense of delving into numerous topics within the specialized community. As Akiko noted, “学術的 identity とは、はつきりとした目的を持ち、目標実現に向かうこと [The purpose of forming our academic identity was to lay out a clear objective as well as to move toward realization of the goal]” (Individual Interview 2013). She eventually developed a professional mindset and sought pedagogical significance in the teaching of English at a Japanese secondary school, shifting from a novice to a key player through numerous roles in the specialized community.

Jonghyun participated more in classroom discussions than in the external of pair work. He recognized that engaging in ongoing discussions in the classroom with his peers facilitated the development of his disciplinary knowledge. He exerted his agency by playing a vital role in classroom interactions.

Jonghyun became a core member of the research seminar course as a result of his experiences of learning the specialized topic. He switched between his identities as a Korean and an English learner during the development of his English proficiency at university and during the study abroad program in the United States. Negotiating his multiple identities helped him develop his English language proficiency. He became increasingly aware of his construction of academic identity after enrolling in the research seminar course by examining the disciplinary discourses. Jonghyun then sought membership to the new academic context in order to establish himself an expert. Additionally, his personal interest in English teaching fueled his immersion in

exploring the disciplinary area. Other specialized courses related to L2 writing that he completed deepened his knowledge and theory and practice of applied linguistics. Engaging in the process of connecting L2 writing to disciplinary issues became a key element in the development of his academic identity. Jonghyun created his academic identity, indicating his willingness to engage in disciplinary discourse.

Taisei's process for gaining membership is comparable to the processes of negotiating English disciplinary discourses. In fact, he was accustomed to examining English discourses of all genres throughout his previous language test studies (e.g., TOEFL). Taisei had the opportunity to create the meanings of academic discourses in the scholarly articles and to broaden his professional expertise in the field of L2 writing after enrolling in the research seminar course. His enrichment of understanding of discourse conventions in journals enabled him to promote the formation of core membership. Additionally, as his weekly reflection indicated, Taisei highlighted his misgivings of the issues of L2 writing challenges in addition to the detailed descriptions of class activities and his reflections on classroom discussions and peers' viewpoints. These critical concepts, developed as a result of his participation in the research seminar community, helped him establish his expert identity. Taisei was able to expand his disciplinary knowledge by participating in LPP through CoP. Simultaneously, his participation in classroom discussions during the research seminar course contributed to the success of his discourse socialization.

In Chiaki's case, examining the academic discourses of the English scholarly articles allowed her to reshape her position in the discourse community. When Chiaki entered this new environment, she was forced to juggle adverse circumstances to overcome academic difficulties. Chiaki had positioned herself as an English language learner throughout her first two years of university. However, she began to perceive herself as a member of the research seminar course after engaging in numerous practices of academic literacy, constructing disciplinary knowledge. Chiaki gained academic literacy through discourse socialization with other seminar members. Her collaborative efforts with others both within and outside the classroom fostered her understanding of the academic discourses in journal articles. Additionally, her devotion to the academic environment transformed her into an academic learner pursuing a specific topic. Her positioning as a language learner was transformed to that of a disciplinary learner through CoP in several specialized classes related to the research seminar course.

To explore Miho's case, she encountered difficulties in active involvement in the academic community owing to her lack of knowledge and proficiency, conflicts with the development of expertise, and negotiating power relations.

While Miho struggled to socialize into the disciplinary community, this does not imply that her CoP was not successful. Given that CoP covers both positive and negative aspects (e.g., non-participation) (Wenger 1998), such a negative insider's perspective was a legitimate way to immerse her into the target discourse community.

Miho's awareness of her new positioning as an English language learner was heightened by her practices and experiences of academic literacy. In her past studies at university, Miho had focused primarily on developing her English abilities rather than academic proficiency. After joining the community of the research seminar course, Miho learned to create her disciplinary knowledge through negotiating academic discourses with skilled peers. Miho did not become an experienced learner through further exploration of the specialized discourses, as she stated in the individual interview in chapter 2. She did, however, take pleasure in gaining new knowledge of academic literacy through immersion in a novel academic setting. As a result, Miho remained a peripheral learner who acquired disciplinary knowledge through involvement in the discourse community.

Despite her strong desire to improve her language skills, Sayaka's positioning evolved differently than I anticipated. When Sayaka joined college, she maintained her enthusiasm for English learning throughout her first and second years. She was committed to enhancing her English proficiency by enrolling in various specialized English classes and participating in the study abroad program in the United States. Sayaka noticed a significant improvement in her learning after beginning the research seminar course; she made a strong commitment to expanding her understanding of L2 writing in the new academic learning community. As a highly motivated English learner, she attempted to negotiate her identity through friendly competition with her peers both inside and outside of class.

However, there was a disconnect between Sayaka's expectations of what she would learn in the research seminar course and her goals for academic literacy development. Her major objective for developing academic literacy was to improve her linguistic skills. In short, examining academic discourses of English scholarly articles fostered her language development (reading and writing) through reading disciplinary references. As seen in chapter 2, she had no intention of constructing an academic identity: “学術的な内容に触れて英語レベルを上げたいんですね [I want to develop my English abilities further, examining the academic articles that we dealt with in the seminar class]” (Individual Interview 2013). Thus, it seemed that Sayaka was more concerned with honing her advanced language proficiency through examining academic articles rather than with establishing her expert identity.

In Kenta's case, his identity shifted slightly as he learned a new specialized topic. Kenta spent the first two years of his undergraduate career developing his English language abilities. His positioning as an English learner was stable prior to venturing into the disciplinary area of L2 writing. When he enrolled in the research seminar course, he realized how different his previous studies were, compared to the language learning and knowledge construction required for a specialized scholarship. By engaging in the community of the research seminar, he enhanced his awareness of generating disciplinary knowledge through mutual understanding with others. He was conscious of his shift in status as an English language learner, which did not result in his becoming an expert. Rather, Kenta demonstrated an awareness of the expansion and exploration of his expertise.

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

In chapter 3, I presented my interpretations and analyses of seven major themes that emerged from the case renditions of each participant in chapter 2: addressing lexical problems in academic discourses, relying on traditional learning approaches such as text translation, collaborating as practice, participating in the discourse community, unpacking power relations, adjusting to community roles, and situating their positionality through the disciplinary course.

As the participants had never before negotiated disciplinary discourses, they were compelled to develop techniques for examining academic articles. Many participants (Chiaki, Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta) spent several hours on using a dictionary to resolve lexical problems. To comprehend academic English texts, which contained several unfamiliar technical terms, they relied heavily on looking for the meanings of the terminology. Nonetheless, Akiko, Jonghyun, and Taisei developed their own strategies for dealing with unfamiliar words, including memorizing words, guessing their meanings, and using websites.

The students then sought to increase their interaction with peers to gain a better understanding of the academic articles. Akiko, Chiaki, and Miho met informally outside the classroom, reading and discussing the articles together. Within the classroom, the participants engaged in meaningful conversations and discovered that mutual exchanges were extremely beneficial for the development of their academic literacy. While Miho and Kenta lamented their lack of language proficiency and knowledge, they admired their peers' shared critical perspectives on disciplinary matters. Akiko, Jonghyun, and Taisei acted as mentors within the discourse community during the research seminar

course, facilitating the co-construction of disciplinary knowledge as well as the meaning-making of academic articles.

With regard to the positioning of each participant, Akiko Jonghyun, Taisei, and Chiaki became core members by engaging in CoP activities such as socialization into the discourse community, collaborative work, and mutual interactions with peers both within and outside of class. By contrast, Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta attempted to socialize themselves into the discourse community and develop their specialized knowledge but retained their positioning as English learners who studied a disciplinary field rather than constructing their expert identities.

In the next chapter, I discuss the viewpoints of ADS based on the findings obtained from the present study. Then, I discuss the research and pedagogical implications of academic literacy socialization.

Part III

DISUCSSION AND SUMMARY

Chapter Four

Discussion and Implications

The primary objective of this qualitative case study was to investigate ADS and academic identity construction among seven multilinguals enrolled in a required research seminar course at a local four-year university in Japan. To gain a thorough understanding of the participants' processes, experiences, and practices of academic literacy socialization, I conducted an in-depth examination of multiple data sources (i.e., literacy autobiographies, weekly journals, final narratives, course blog posts, individual interviews, and a focus group interview). As studies of ADS indicate, socialization into specialized discourse communities is intricately linked to the development of academic literacy (Duff 2010b, 2020b; Duff and Hornberger, 2010; Duff and May 2017; Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, and Duff 2017). I illustrated each participant's process of academic literacy socialization because personal accounts reflect the complexities of an insider's perspective.

This chapter examines the perspectives of ADS that emerged from the participants' case descriptions and discusses the implications for teaching of and research on academic literacy socialization.

REVISITING THE STUDY'S PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTION

The main purpose of this investigation was to examine how undergraduate multilinguals developed their academic literacy and constructed their academic identities through discourse socialization. I delved into this issue with the following goals. First, I wanted to investigate how participants developed their academic literacy through socialization into a required research seminar

course. Through an examination of their written products (literacy autobiographies, weekly journals, course blog posts, and final narratives), as well as individual and focus group interviews, I discovered that they revealed their unique perceptions of reality in their learning situations to engage in English disciplinary discourses. The multilayered sources helped me understand how each of the multilingual participants attempted, through their own approaches, to devote their full attention to the English disciplinary discourses.

Second, I examined how my students constructed their academic identities during the period of this study. In several of their weekly journals, the participants documented their journeys toward professional knowledge development as they participated in discourse socialization and collaborated with others in the research seminar course. Additionally, a few students expressed their mindset shift from that of a general English learner to an academic, recognizing that they expanded their professional knowledge while also improving their language skills.

Third, I wanted to continue my research on academic literacy socialization across learning environments. Recent research on this subject has shed light on individual discourse socialization from a holistic perspective (Duff 2020b; Duff and May 2017; Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, and Duff 2017; Muramatsu 2018; Wang 2020); however, the research contexts remain centered on English-speaking countries targeted by L2 graduate or undergraduate learners. The current study may shed light on debates about academic literacy socialization from a critical perspective, resulting in the identification of commonalities and disparities between L2 learners in English-speaking countries and English language learners in diverse contexts.

Finally, I considered the pedagogical implications of teaching academic literacy in various learning contexts, especially in a Japanese university as a teacher-researcher. As demonstrated in chapter 1, Japanese universities offer English classes centered on a specialized subject with scholarly references, referred to as *zemi* or research seminar classes. The suggestions and implications for teaching derived from this study could facilitate the creation of diverse learning environments in which learners can engage in collaborative work in accordance with the institute's educational policies and curricula.

Against this background, I developed a research question based on my teaching experiences in a research seminar course, focusing on L2 writing scholarship studies at a Japanese four-year university:

- How do undergraduate multilinguals enrolled in a required research seminar course negotiate and socialize themselves into their academic discourse and construct their academic identities by reading various English scholarly texts and through mediation by their teacher?

This study utilized a qualitative method—the case study approach—emphasizing the participants’ cases to delineate their academic literacy processes, experiences, and practices. Additionally, I gathered and analyzed participant data from a variety of sources: literacy autobiographies, weekly journals, course blog posts, and final narratives. Then, I interviewed each participant individually and concluded with a focus group interview in Japanese. Written materials were mainly produced in Japanese, and all interviews were transcribed and translated into English. A member check was conducted between the author and participants to ensure the accuracy of the translations.

DISCUSSION

Academic literacy issues such as socialization and the construction of academic identities aided the framework of sociocultural theory in establishing a meaningful connection between humans and the societal world (Duff 2010b 2012, 2020b; Ferenz 2005; Zappa-Hollman and Duff 2015). The cognitive model of Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development has been used to validate the relationship between interactions with capable peers, and academic literacy, and identity construction. Academic literacy research has placed a greater emphasis on how learners demonstrate agency in acquiring disciplinary competence as well as membership in a particular discourse community (Morita and Kobayashi 2010).

The purpose of this study was to apply Lave and Wenger’s (1991) central sociocultural perspective of CoP to gain a better understanding of the complex processes of social involvement with disciplinary discourses and peers in the research seminar community. I examined how newcomers (the participants) integrated themselves into the specialized community (the research seminar course) and transitioned from newcomers to old-timers through interactions with others and the completion of various tasks in order to develop their academic literacy.

In this study, the concept of LPP was central to the objective regarding academic literacy socialization. As Lave and Wenger (1991) define, LPP is “the process by which newcomers become included in a community of practice” and embodies “important conditions under which people can become members of communities of practice” (100). Beginners made minimal efforts on the tasks at first, but eventually showed improvements through exposure to subject-related texts. Generally, newcomers progress from marginal or limited participation to active or full participation in target communities, with the savvy person playing a critical role. While peripheral participation occurs naturally, it “must provide access to all three dimensions of practice:

to mutual engagement with other members, to their actions and their negotiation of the enterprise, and to the repertoire in use” (Lave and Wenger 1991, 100). Additionally, Lave and Wenger assert that legitimacy is a critical component of newcomers’ success in gaining membership to the community. The apprentice establishes their legitimacy by adopting a variety of positive and negative characteristics (e.g., being active, comfortable, marginalized, or overwhelmed). It is critical for experts, elders, and even teachers to increase the legitimacy of novices attempting to enter specific communities.

Academic literacy socialization, from the perspectives of CoP and LPP, must ascertain the relationship between academic literacy development and discourse socialization, as well as initiation into target communities. Academic literacy can be acquired in unusual contexts, through a variety of learning attitudes and interactions with others, as well as through some struggles or conflicts with discourse patterns. Thus, the crux of academic literacy investigations is to dissect individual processes, experiences, and practices in minute detail. A holistic approach using a qualitative method is required to capture the authentic voices and descriptions of academic literacy socialization of each learner.

While much research on academic literacy socialization has focused on L2 or ESL learners in an English-speaking environment, in this study, I examined a very specific learning context (i.e., a research seminar course at a local university in Japan) that has received little attention in the past. Specifically, there have been almost no studies of academic literacy targeted at undergraduate multilingual learners (Fujieda 2016, 2019). As one of the reasons for the scarcity of studies in a particular learning setting, bias is one of the reasons for the scarcity of studies in EFL learning settings; learners’ primary goal is to develop English language proficiency rather than to cultivate their expertise using English. Thus, this study not only examines academic literacy socialization in a new context but can also spark some open discussions about ADS among learners from diverse backgrounds and in a variety of learning contexts.

This study illustrated the case of seven undergraduate multilinguals in my research seminar course as they developed academic literacy and academic identities through socialization. The cases contextualized how the students navigated English disciplinary discourses through the use of scholarly articles, developed their academic literacy through discourse socialization, and were initiated into the community of the research seminar course. My study focused on the descriptive accounts provided by each student via multimodal data resources. This naturalistic qualitative approach contributes to current discussions about academic literacy socialization by reinforcing the way involvement with others facilitated the development of academic literacy with a critical stance.

All participants developed their own processes and practices for negotiating academic discourses using English scholarly articles. When I examined the development of academic literacy abilities, I discovered that nearly all of the participants felt the need to learn the terminology. They initially relied on comprehension and memorization of the specialized terms encountered in professional resources, primarily by consulting a dictionary or seeking assistance from websites, as Taisei did. These strategies would be an inescapable obstacle for learners to overcome regardless of their language proficiency, as all the students had received traditional English reading comprehension instruction in secondary school. Numerous participants demonstrated in their literacy autobiographies that they relied heavily on the grammar translation approach, called *yakudoku*, to comprehend English paragraphs. As a result, students would naturally begin by searching for the definitions of technical terms.

Previous research has established that L2 learners are capable of resolving word-related issues in disciplinary discourses (Casanave and Li 2008; Crosby 2009; Leki 2003, 2007). For instance, Leki's (2003) study revealed that one Chinese learner was required to complete academic writing tasks in English despite her extensive knowledge of the specialized field. Additionally, Crosby's (2009) study revealed that the participants, Tiffany and Andrew, struggled to find appropriate methods for comprehending academic terms while reading their assignments. As Tiffany was hesitant to examine disciplinary texts because of difficulties in understanding terminology, the majority of the participants in this study took considerable time in interpreting the meaning of the discourses owing to a lack of academic lexical knowledge. Similarly, because my research seminar students had never had the opportunity to examine academic English written discourses, they had to learn a slew of new terms. As L2 and English language learners are required to examine the lexical items used in academic discourses, as previous research has demonstrated, the participants in this study were far from linguistically illiterate. However, encountering numerous roadblocks to comprehending the jargon served as a necessary platform for initiating oneself into professional discourse communities.

The majority of the students recognized that high levels of engagement and direct interactions with peers influenced their academic literacy development. The open classroom discussions about various aspects of L2 writing, in particular, contributed to a deeper comprehension of the content of the literature. As the students' case studies demonstrated, having opportunities for classroom interactions with their peers was critical for advancing academic literacy development through negotiation of the meanings of academic discourses. Social interactions provided an opportunity for students to share

their knowledge repertoires and to refresh their professional knowledge as well. While it was challenging for the participants to negotiate the meanings of disciplinary discourses, they noticed a significant improvement in their ability to construct disciplinary knowledge through interactions with others.

The students in the research seminar course attempted to socialize with their peers to develop a more nuanced understanding of discourses and facilitate the development of their academic literacy. According to some researchers, students go through discursive processes to become members of the discourse community during the initial phase of academic literacy development (Casanave and Li 2008; Duff 2010b; Leki 2007; Morita 2000; Muramatsu 2018; Wang 2020). The processes of enculturation into the specialized community vary according to the learners' learning situations and backgrounds. Casanave and Li (2008) and Leki (2007) illustrate the experiences of learners from diverse backgrounds and with varying levels of academic literacy across disciplinary settings. The writers resolve the incongruity of writing between their L1 and English in a large collection of L2 writers. They integrate into target communities and develop academic literacy skills (writing) through interactions with discourses and others. Leki reasons that participation in similar discourse communities is necessary for the development of academic literacy skills. Casanave and Li (2008) describe how diverse L2 graduate students navigated their practices and obstacles in order to be initiated into their specialized communities. Casanave and Li argue that it is necessary to consider individuals' frames of reference because it is beneficial to reflect on the variability of learners' situations.

In my study, the majority of the students, that is, Akiko, Jonghyun, Taisei, and Chiaki, were able to participate in the discourse community of the research seminar course, transitioning from LPP to active participation through mutual interaction. The participants agreed that interactions were critical in fostering academic literacy development. The participants took a variety of steps to ingrain themselves in the specialized community and to gain membership through active participation in class. While the seminar students encountered difficulties in developing their academic literacy skills through discourse socialization, the negative elements contributed significantly to their success. As Riazantseva (2012) notes, such negative attitudes and approaches demonstrated by learners are critical in generating situations conducive to achieving literacy proficiency.

Additionally, developing social networks both inside and outside of the classroom is critical for accelerating the development of academic literacy (Ferenz 2005; Zappa-Hollman and Duff 2015). The participants in this study were given the opportunity to collaborate on the presentation of the articles.

Additionally, Akiko, Chiaki, and Miho concentrated on casual meeting sessions in order to comprehend the content of the articles. They recognized that such extracurricular collaborations acted as scaffolding for the knowledge construction of the discipline and advancement of academic literacy. Chiaki expressed gratitude for the opportunities to interact with students enrolled in other professional courses. Throughout the classes, she engaged in discussions about a variety of educational and applied linguistics topics. She was aware that her mutual relationships with members of various specialized communities helped her become a member of the research seminar course's community. As a result, Akiko, Chiaki, and Miho valued their informal meetings outside of the seminar course. They took a step toward interpreting the meanings of the scholarly texts as a result of their mutual engagement in a comfortable environment.

However, despite their attempts to immerse themselves in the academic learning environment, Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta, had difficulty in actively participating in the disciplinary communities. Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta discovered a pattern that paralleled Barnawi's (2009), M. Kobayashi's (2006, 2016), and Morita's (2000, 2004) findings. Miho had some interactions with her peers both inside and outside the classroom, but struggled to take positive action in the classroom, participating in discussion sessions only minimally because of a power imbalance with others. Sayaka recognized the value and merits of initiation into the discourse community, but, like Kenta, missed opportunities to participate in classroom interactions because of the feeling of being overwhelmed by others' high language proficiency.

Academic identity is co-constructed through interactions with peers and experts in the target discourse community. The concept of academic identity formation is predicated on one's ability to establish reciprocal relationships with capable members of the community through ongoing interactions in collaborative work (Kogan 2000; Lave and Wenger 1991). Several participants, including Akiko, Jonghyun, Taisei, and Chiaki, developed their academic identities during the semester by cultivating disciplinary knowledge and progressing toward their goals. As Akiko and Jonghyun were interested in teaching English, their specific objectives resulted in the formation of academic identities and the expansion of the vision of the disciplinary field. On the contrary, Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta became aware of the specialized field of L2 writing but retained their English learner status.

This section discusses the research findings in relation to academic literacy socialization and the development of academic identities among my research participants. Following that, I will discuss some implications for teaching and research on academic literacy socialization in at the tertiary level in Japan and similar learning contexts.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING: PROMOTING ACADEMIC LITERACY THROUGH SOCIALIZATION

Certain colleges and universities in Japan offer a specialized course designed to provide English-major with expansive fundamental knowledge about the field and an opportunity to discuss a variety of topics using English scholarly texts. While English education in Japan has traditionally been classified as EFL, many English programs in Japanese higher education now offer more professional courses akin to English for Academic and Specific Purposes than general English language courses (Hüttner et al. 2012; Muller et al. 2012). Owing to the current state of Japanese tertiary English education, there is an urgent need to provide teachers with adequate guidance in discipline-oriented classes. In this study, I emphasized the unique learning environment, a research seminar course, offered by my institute's English program, which is critical for encouraging students to cultivate their specialized disciplinary knowledge. The majority of teachers in the program teach research seminar courses that use English scholarly references to introduce students to English academic discourses or to help them develop critical thinking skills in their specialized field.

This study emphasized Lave and Wenger's (1991) concepts of CoP and LPP. I discuss some of the pedagogical implications of the practical application of academic literacy socialization in Japanese higher education's specialized courses. Discipline-specific courses, particularly those that emphasize the negotiation of academic discourses through scholarly articles, have distinct objectives, expectations, and goal orientations. In this section, I argue that teachers should prioritize academic literacy by cultivating students' agency and providing space for exposure to diverse voices.

Additionally, teachers play a critical role in assisting students in becoming legitimate participants (i.e., veterans, seniors) and developing their academic literacy. Previous research on the relationship between a teacher's role and students' academic identity construction has established that a teacher's role in academic practices is a necessary component of learner development (Carbone and Orellana 2010; Kirkup 2010; Reveles and Brown 2008). Thus, a teacher's primary role is to strengthen the discourse community's social network by creating conducive environments for peer collaboration both inside and outside the classroom.

The findings of this study indicate that students enrolled in a research seminar course recognize the value of dialogic acts with peers in a variety of settings for enhancing their academic literacy. To promote academic literacy socialization, teachers must encourage students to take an active role in the classroom community and enrich mutual interactions. The participants in this

study discovered that mutual interactions with peers in the classroom were a way of comprehending academic discourses and thus developing academic literacy. Thus, teachers must provide a diverse range of appealing opportunities for students to influence academic literacy socialization reciprocally. Teachers should act as intermediaries, assisting students in integrating into the class (discourse community), while also engaging in the participation process themselves (Kucer and Silva 2012; Morita 2009). Creating communities through active engagement is critical for socialization and the development of academic literacy. To assist learners in developing a sense of community, teachers must focus their efforts on classroom discussions or group presentations. Sharing knowledge and engaging in discussions with other members of the learning community is an effective strategy for legitimate learning. Members of a community must work together to reconcile disparate values and interests, as the power balance in the teacher-student relationship plays a significant role in the socialization process. It is, therefore, critical to consider the extent to which community practices influence the learning process (Haneda 2006).

Further, teachers must provide additional opportunities for learners to engage in collaborative tasks, as collaborative work provides access to the target discourse community, a process known as ADS. While negotiating the meanings of texts, learners appreciate the complexities of academic discourse conventions. Students can deepen their understanding of disciplinary discourses and cocreate their new knowledge of the specialized field through oral interactions as a communal act. According to Seloni (2012), academic literacy socialization is a necessary component of the process of enculturation into the academic discourse community for various newcomers (e.g., graduate, undergraduate, and L2 learners). Additionally, as M. Kobayashi's (2016) study indicated, undergraduate-level Japanese learners in Canada engaged in discourse socialization outside of class in order to succeed with their classroom oral presentations. Their classroom strategies, such as collaborative work and oral presentations, had a significant impact on the development of academic competence.

Next, teachers must create a space for students to express themselves so as to investigate the ways in which they attempt to examine disciplinary discourses. As this study demonstrates, students enrolled in a research seminar course employ a variety of strategies for the examination of disciplinary discourses. Students' self-reflective journals and course blog posts shed light on the intricate details of their processes, practices, and experiences in order to engage with academic discourses. Additionally, the reflective journal (weekly) serves as an effective tool for review and professional knowledge construction. As students illustrated their thoughts and feelings, they were

able to demonstrate their engagement in academic literacy both inside and outside the classroom, for example, the social events they participated in to negotiate disciplinary discourses. Emphasizing learners' insider perspectives offers valuable insight into the process of acclimating to the discourse community. If teachers give students the opportunity to reflect on all journals at the conclusion of the course, they will become aware of the needs and expectations of the disciplinary discourse community. The learners' self-reflective accounts included their beliefs and assumptions, which assisted them in rediscovering their accommodation to new educational patterns in the professional learning setting (Ohata and Fukao 2014).

Another way to reflect students' voices is through the use of cyberspace. The integration of technology into teaching is pervasive in today's language classroom, allowing students to actively participate in meaningful mutual interactions. Online discussions result in the formation of social networks among peers or those who belong to similar discourse communities (Seloni 2008; Uzuner 2007, 2008). If teachers encounter difficulties with learning situations such as classroom size, institutional policy, or student characteristics, they have the option of incorporating online discussions with a video chat tool (e.g., Google Meet, Microsoft Teams, Zoom) into extracurricular activities. By expressing their opinions and thoughts, learners can ensure that their participation is meaningful.

Utilization studies have raised the question of how learners' attitudes toward academic literacy development change as a result of computer-based activities. While some critics argue that online interactions do not replicate "real" situations, technological tools for educational approaches foster students' autonomy in initiating themselves into target discourses. Students frequently struggle to comprehend the meaning of disciplinary references. In this case, they can consult with teachers and peers in a casual setting to brainstorm viable solutions. Additionally, students who participate infrequently in class will have the opportunity to express their opinions openly. Owing to their personalities, a few students (Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta) found it difficult to integrate into the discourse community of the research seminar course (feeling a lack of confidence, knowledge, or language competence). However, in their journals and final narratives, they describe their deeper thoughts and distinct voices. To ensure that online commentary is productive, meaningful, and constructive, each learner in the discourse community should participate in peer mentoring by providing feedback. As part of the class evaluations, teachers should require students to respond to their classmates' online comments. Each student is capable of participating peripherally in the community.

I discussed some strategies for teaching academic literacy through discourse socialization in this section, emphasizing the importance of fostering learners' agency and constructing their voices. The following section discusses several implications for future research on ADS that stem from the study's research problems and findings.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS FOR ADS

Academic literacy has been defined in a variety of ways, according to the purpose of the research. Previously, academic literacy was defined as the acquisition of writing proficiency with academic fluency or the capacity to comprehend academic discourses within a discipline (Swales and Freak 2012). However, this study indicates that academic literacy entails an understanding of the disciplinary discourse through socialization and interaction with members of the specialized community. Academic literacy research demonstrates the complexities and uniqueness of learners' ability to intervene in disciplinary discourses and achieve core membership in the discourse community from a personal frame of reference. ADS issues shed light on the relationship between academic literacy development and discourse socialization. Thus, implications for academic literacy research must pinpoint the nature of the learners' engagement in academic literacy development.

As I discussed in chapter 1, research on ADS has primarily been conducted in English-speaking countries and has concentrated on L2 undergraduate or graduate students who are placed in environments where English is constantly used. Additional discussions about ADS in diverse learning contexts are required to address academic literacy socialization issues.

Further research into the ADS of various undergraduate-level learners in a variety of contexts or specialized discourse communities (e.g., research seminar courses) is necessary, as these topics have not been comprehensively examined. For example, as in this study, it would be beneficial to examine the learning environment of a research seminar course that was offered as part of the English education curriculum at a Japanese local university. As multilinguals in a variety of learning environments are required to navigate complex forms of discourse by using both their main language and English, the unique contextual elements of each learner will naturally emerge. While L2 learners in English domain settings face some difficulties in developing academic literacy skills as a result of their cultural backgrounds, multilingual learners must commit to a more complex web of social, cultural, and educational milieux. Additional research should be conducted to determine the strategies

that each learner employs to acquire academic literacy and the factors that influence academic literacy socialization. Additionally, students in the research seminar course were assigned to examine professional L2 writing articles, but there are a variety of other academic text genres, including books, academic journals, and blog posts. Thus, future research should examine how learners socialize in other academic genres and the impact of different genres on academic literacy development and socialization (Séror 2014; Yamada 2016).

As the importance of academic literacy socialization in a variety of contexts has been recognized, studies utilizing qualitative approaches should be conducted to better understand this phenomenon. It would be particularly beneficial to examine an individual student's academic literacy socialization to make an adequate interpretation in the learning environment. A holistic perspective on a deeper personal frame of reference will contribute to a solid foundation for personal investments in advanced literacy acquisition in a variety of sociocultural contexts (Atkinson 2011; Ortega 2011). Thus, research on academic literacy in a variety of EFL contexts must dissect the students' ongoing discourse socialization processes in great detail. Such a micro-level analysis would yield findings about behavior or participation that are inextricably linked to the complexities of community socialization (Watson-Gegeo 2004).

To help participants gain a better understanding of their own experiences, the use of self-accounts or case studies is strongly recommended as a vehicle for the process of academic literacy acquisition (Duff 2020a). The case rendition encourages students to comprehend their inner feelings about their discourse socialization processes and "to reflect on their academic learning in informal environments where they can easily voice their concerns, negotiate meaning and ask questions" (Seloni 2012, 58). Additionally, the development of academic identities by students can be emphasized concurrently. Most learners initially struggle to comprehend the meanings of disciplinary discourses. Nonetheless, they gradually become aware of their purposes, roles, and responsibilities in the target community. According to Ohata and Fukao (2014), incorporating students' voices (in the form of accounts or interviews) increases students' self-awareness, "suggesting a change in their self-perception from 'language learners' to 'language users'" (88). It is beneficial to understand how students develop their identities as academics. As this type of research utilizing learners' voices emphasizes the importance of personal relationships within the constructivist theoretical framework, more detailed depictions of how one interacts with others in the community are required (Denzin and Lincoln 2017).

Additionally, to bolster the analysis of learners' literacy socialization, the perspectives or voices of teachers should be incorporated. As Morita and

Kobayashi (2010) suggest, “it seems crucial to examine instructors’ views and concerns about their students’ socialization as well as about their own challenges and transformations, as they attempt to deal with various learner needs” (251). Additionally, research conducted in diverse geographic settings must place a premium on the institution’s status quo. For example, in Japanese English education contexts, students do not always immerse themselves in the target language environment. They study English to accomplish a specific objective or to meet curricular requirements. Interactions with others in English are frequently limited, and approaches to teaching that are mediated by L1 are common. There are numerous educational constraints (e.g., policies, curricula, and classroom size); however, it is appropriate to bolster the unique practical efforts directed at English learning in the context of specific learning. As a result, further study is required to see how teachers react to institutional obstacles and conflicts, as well as a detailed investigation of institutional elements that both permit and hinder instructors’ choices and actions.

Chapter Five

Summary

The chapter begins with an epilogue of my narrative of future research and teaching directions of academic literacy socialization as a teacher-scholar at the university level in Japan. The unique specialized course, research seminar course in my university (called *zemi*) is a now-or-never chance to explore students' favorite professional field because students have to decide the seminar course by themselves; their major decisions include which professional area or topic they want to study and which professor they want to work with to complete their bachelor thesis. Like the English program in my university, professors in the English department of many colleges/universities set up a casual environment for discussions on disciplinary topics using specialized English references, not just giving one-way or teacher-fronted lectures in the research seminar course. The professors welcome their students as peers, novice researchers, or disciples in their *zemi* class. For students, they have to immerse themselves into the specialized discourse communities. They surely need to overcome numerous challenges and hardships to gain the membership of the communities.

Exploring the issues of ADS, I found that complexities of English academic discourses that students encounter are not only inevitable but also valuable to develop their academic literacy skills. I do not interpret learners' psychological affects (e.g., difficulties, anxiety, tensions) that students experience in a negative light. Most students have never tackled the disciplinary discourses with English scholarly texts during their first and second years. Their learning situations seem to have shifted from general English to English for Academic Purposes when students begin to learn their disciplinary topic. Even if their learning environments are suddenly changed, students will manage to handle the assignments of academic reading or writing.

Every year, I have some students who want to participate in my research seminar course and who have an interest in L2 writing or applied linguistics. When they were enrolled in my research seminar course, they struggled with the academic readings and participated in multiple tasks fully, but learned to nurture their academic and critical abilities through interactions with scholarly books. I felt that they never gave up their work when I glanced at their books replete with scribbled memos, underlines in different colors, and translations. They underwent discursive processes of developing their academic literacy skills and encouraged their autonomy by themselves or by working together with peers.

This study provided me a great opportunity to devote myself to research on academic literacy socialization and to improve my instruction in my own research seminar course. While reflecting on my ADS, I often looked back on my experiences and processes of L2 academic literacy in the United States. When I was an MA student, my work served as an entry point into the academic world. In fact, I discovered the hard way that socialization with like-minded persons, teachers, peers, and friends facilitated my academic literacy proficiencies. I still remember that very casual discussions about the up-to-date research topic with my classmates and my Japanese friends or asking simple questions about the references helped me to construct my knowledge of language teaching and to develop my academic literacy skills gradually. Moreover, when I began my PhD program, I attempted to reconstruct and reshape my academic identity, and further improve my L2 academic literacy in the same manner, interacting with various professional resources and collaborating on the tasks with my capable peers and mentors. This research allows me to engage in journeys of academic literacy socialization in order to provide an insight into teaching and research. Through my experiences of developing L2 academic literacy during my graduate student years in the United States, I have tried to apply my experiences and practices of academic literacy socialization into my teaching of the research seminar course: How should I create an opportunity to enter into the academic discourse community? How should I view my positionality in my research seminar course, a teacher, an old-timer, a facilitator, or a broker of academic literacy? How should I encourage my students to initiate socialization with others inside as well as outside the classroom? It is my belief that my students' difficulties in developing their academic literacy skills have contributed to further improvement of the course quality of my research seminar course and to the construction of my identities as a Japanese university-level teacher-researcher-scholar.

My journeys of academic literacy and English language teaching will be perpetual. I still have to progress my academic literacy skills and pursue new knowledge in my discipline, while being socialized into discourse communi-

ties; I will participate in the domestic and international professional conferences, talk with scholars, researchers, teachers, and work colleagues, and examine a wide variety of scholastic journals. This academic socialization will be important to mature myself as a researcher and scholar, who specializes in this research topic and L2 teacher education, especially in English educational contexts in Japan. Then, the processes of socialization into the discourse communities will be conducive to improvement of instruction in my research seminar course. In Japanese university settings, there are a lot of students who have diverse backgrounds of education and language. All students in Japanese learning settings do not always receive the same English instruction, nor can be positioned as “EFL learners.” Thus, to create a sound as well as student-friendly learning environment, I have to be involved in socializing with students, engage in having discussions, and co-construct my deeper disciplinary knowledge as a university-level teacher and a teacher as a learner.

This book presented clear pictures of academic literacy socialization by seven Japanese multilinguals, exposing the “behind the scenes” of the student’s feelings and beliefs. The findings obtained from my research were one case of academic literacy socialization in a different setting, which has yet to be fully undertaken. Yet, I would like to mention that this inquiry serves as a basis for study of academic literacy socialization in a particular learning context.

In addition, my investigation of ADS gave me a chance to reconstruct my positionality of a teacher-researcher-scholar as well. As a teacher in the research seminar course, I tried to introduce the area of L2 writing and encourage my students to construct their professional knowledge by examining the English references. Of course, I talked with my seminar students, discussed a lot on the issues of L2 writing with them, and shared my experiences and knowledge with them, building rapport among them. Reflecting on my previous positionality, I emphasized the development of teachability and approaches for academic discourses as a teacher side.

When I began analyzing the data sources of this study, I asked myself various questions about the students’ academic literacy socialization: What are the benefits of the peer interactions for them? What feelings did they have during the initiation into the discourse community? Did it lead them to a sense of membership in the community and construction of expert identity? Through engaging in my study of ADS, I found the importance of interconnection of research and teaching about academic literacy. As I mentioned, I can very much understand the necessity of my improvement of teaching in research seminar course classes to help students understand English academic

discourses through socialization. Then, studies of academic literacy in Japanese educational context need to be published internationally and expanded further in order to discuss the significance of exploring academic literacy socialization in various learning settings. I have to share my visions on and look into the feasibility of the issues of academic literacy socialization with a critical eye from a teacher-scholar's observation point.

CONCLUSION OF ADS AND CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC IDENTITY

This monograph explored academic literacy socialization and the construction of academic identities by seven multilingual students who joined my research seminar course in a Japanese university. The primary goal of this research was to show the case profile of the development of academic literacy through discourse socialization and formation of academic identities of each research seminar student.

Research on academic literacy and discourse socialization has been valuable with a qualitative method in the area of applied linguistics. Since learners go through various complex processes to engage in participation in the discourse community in a specific learning context, clear explanations of challenges and practices that learners confront are invaluable to understand the way they move toward gaining a membership in the community (Casanaue and Li 2008; Duff 2012; Watson-Gegeo 2004). Furthermore, a language socialization paradigm attaches importance to the sociocultural perspectives, especially, community of practice. All newcomers are situated as legitimate peripheral participants at the beginning and try to shift themselves toward becoming an expert and constructing identities as a core member of the community (Wenger 1998).

The seven research participants in the research seminar course adopted various strategies to negotiate the meanings of the English academic discourses via disciplinary texts at the beginning of the semester. After going through experiences and practices of academic literacy inside and out of the classroom, the multilingual students tried to socialize into the discourse community and engaged in mutual interactions in order to gain a better understanding of the disciplinary discourses. Such social interactions with others contributed to active participation in the specialized community for some students (e.g., Akiko, Jonghyun, Taisei, and Chiaki). Although discourse socialization facilitates a deep understanding of the academic discourses, inequality or power balance kept peripheral learning within the classroom. In this study, Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta felt a power imbalance, but realized that sharing informa-

tion with more capable peers emphasized the importance of cultivating their professional knowledge.

When students served several roles to help other seminar students, academic identities were co-constructed; moving toward becoming a core member and constructing expert identities. Exploring the professional area and socializing with others, Akiko, Jonghyun, and Taisei, especially, came to be aware of positive access to the community of the research seminar and shifted from peripheral learners to being more experienced. Miho, Sayaka, and Kenta perceived the differences between their previous English study and disciplinary learning in the seminar class. However, they continually remained of being English learners and peripheral learners.

In this book, I discussed implications for teaching of and research on academic literacy socialization in Japanese higher education. To nurture students' expertise, teachers need to help students enrich their participation in the community and more mutual interactions both inside and outside the classroom. To do so, teachers should provide various opportunities in order to encourage students to reflect interplay among others, serving their roles as an intermediary.

Further studies of academic literacy socialization need to focus more on the relationship between understanding of academic discourses and socialization into the target community from personal frame of reference. As multilingual learners in this study, learners with different backgrounds have to navigate complex discourse patterns using their first language, English, and other languages. Since the learners' contextual elements are valuable and unique, research needs to delve into the way the learners try to solve the problems of academic literacy and improve their professional knowledge, while being involved in the complex sociocultural milieu.

Even though this study showed a case rendition of academic literacy socialization and academic identity construction of seven multilingual learners in a Japanese university, the findings obtained from each case description shed light on the investigations of academic literacy socialization, which highlights a specific learning context in various countries.

Bibliography

- Atkinson, Dwight. "A Sociocognitive Approach to Second Language Acquisition: How Mind, Body, and World Work Together in Learning Additional Languages." In *Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Dwight Atkinson, 143–166. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Barnawi, Othman. "The Construction of Identity in L2 Academic Classroom Community: A Small Scale Study of Two Saudi MA in TESOL Students at North American University." *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 5, no. 2 (November 2009): 62–84.
- Becher, Tony, and Paul Trowler, eds. *Academic Tribes and Territories*. 2nd ed. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, 2001.
- Belcher, Diane, and Ulla Connor, eds. *Reflections on Multiliterate Lives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Block, David. "Identity in Applied Linguistics." In *The Sociolinguistics of Identity*, edited by Tope Omoniyi and Goodith White, 35–49. London: Continuum, 2006.
- Blue, George. "Developing Academic Literacy: Introduction." In *Developing Academic Literacy*, edited by George Blue, 1–10. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Braine, George. "Academic Literacy and the Nonnative Speaker Graduate Student." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 1, no. 1 (January 2002): 59–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585\(02\)00006-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(02)00006-1).
- Canagarajah, Suresh A. "Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling between Languages: Learning from Multilingual Writers." *College English* 68, no. 6 (July 2006): 589–604.
- Carbone, Paula M., and Marjorie Faulstich Orellana. "Developing Academic Identities: Persuasive Writing as a Tool to Strengthen Emergent Academic Identities." *Research in the Teaching of English* 44, no. 3 (February 2010): 292–316.
- Casanave, Christine P. *Controversies in Second Language Writing: Dilemmas and Decisions in Research and Instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.

- Casanave, Christine P. "Learning Participatory Practices in Graduate School: Some Perspective-Taking by a Mainstream Educator." In *Learning the Literacy Practices of Graduate School: Insiders' Reflections on Academic Enculturation*, edited by Christine P. Casanave and Xiaoming Li, 14–31. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008.
- Casanave, Christine P. "Transitions: The Balancing Act of Bilingual Academics." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7, no. 2 (May 1998): 175–203. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(98\)90012-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90012-1).
- Casanave, Christine P. *Writing Games: Multicultural Case Studies of Academic Literacy Practices in Higher Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002.
- Casanave, Christine P., and Xiaoming Li, eds. *Learning the Literacy Practices of Graduate School: Insiders' Reflections on Academic Enculturation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008.
- Chase, Susan E. "Narrative Inquiry: Still a Field in the Making." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 4th ed., edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 421–434. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2011.
- Cisero, Cheryl A. "Does Reflective Journal Writing Improve Course Performance?" *College Teaching* 54, no. 2 (2010): 231–236. <https://doi.org/10.3200/CTCH.54.2.231-236>.
- Clandinin, D. Jean, and F. Michael Connelly. *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
- Clegg, Sue. "Academic Identities under Threat?" *British Educational Research Journal* 34, no. 3 (June 2008): 329–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701532269>.
- Cox, Michele, Jay Jordan, Christine Ortmeier-Hooper, and Gwen G. Schwartz, eds. *Reinventing Identities in Second Language Writing*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2010.
- Crosby, Cathryn. "Academic Reading and Writing Difficulties and Strategic Knowledge of Generation 1.5 Learners." In *Generation 1.5 in College Composition: Teaching Academic Writing to U.S.-Educated Learners of ESL*, edited by Mark Roberge, Meryl Siegal, and Linda Harklau, 105–119. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Darvin, Ron, and Bonny Norton. "Identity and a Model of Investment in Applied Linguistics." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 35 (2015): 36–56.
- Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2017.
- Duff, Patricia A. "Case Study Research: Making Language Learning Complexities Visible." In *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, edited by Jim McKinley and Heath Rose, 144–154. New York: Routledge, 2020a.
- Duff, Patricia A. "Language Socialization, Higher Education, and Work." In *Language Socialization: Encyclopedia of Language Education*, vol. 8, 2nd ed., edited by Patricia A. Duff and Nancy M. Hornberger, 257–270. New York: Springer, 2010a.
- Duff, Patricia A. "Language Socialization in Classrooms: Findings, Issues, and Possibilities." In *Language Socialization in Classrooms: Culture, Interaction, and Language Development*, edited by Matthew J. Burdelski and Kathryn M. Howard, 249–264. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2020b.

- Duff, Patricia A. "Language Socialization into Academic Discourse Communities." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 30 (July 2010b): 169–192. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048>.
- Duff, Patricia A. "Second Language Socialization." In *The Handbook of Language Socialization*, edited by Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs, and Bambi B. Schieffelin, 564–586. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- Duff, Patricia A. "Second Language Socialization as Sociocultural Theory." *Language Teaching* 40, no. 4 (September 2007): 309–319. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508>.
- Duff, Patricia A., and Tim Anderson. "Academic Language and Literacy Socialization for Second-Language Students." In *Handbook of Classroom and Interaction*, edited by Numa Markee, 337–352. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015.
- Duff, Patricia A., and Nancy M. Hornberger, eds. *Language Socialization: Encyclopedia of Language Education*, vol. 8, 2nd ed. New York: Springer, 2010.
- Duff, Patricia A., and Stephen May, eds. *Language Socialization: Encyclopedia of Language Education*, vol. 10, 3rd ed. New York: Springer, 2017.
- Duranti, Alessandro, Elinor Ochs, and Bambi B. Schieffelin, eds. *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- Ellingson, Laura L. "Analysis and Representation across the Continuum." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 4th ed., edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 595–610. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2011.
- Ferenz, Orna. "EFL Writers' Social Networks: Impact on Advanced Academic Literacy Development." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 4, no. 3 (October 2005): 339–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2005.07.002>.
- Ferris, Dana, and John Hedgcock. *Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005.
- Fujieda, Yutaka. "Academic Discourse Socialization in a Research Seminar Course: A Case Study of a Japanese EFL Undergraduate Learner." *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher* 28, no. 2 (April 2019): 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-018-0416-z>.
- Fujieda, Yutaka. "Academic Discourse Socialization of Multilingual Undergraduates in a Research Seminar Course." *KOTESOL Proceedings 2015* (2016): 89–98.
- Gebhard, Jerry G. *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language: A Self-Development and Methodology Guide*. 3rd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017.
- Gee, James P. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. 4th ed. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Gorsuch, Greta J. "Yakudoku EFL Instruction in Two Japanese High School Classrooms." *JALT Journal* 20, no. 1 (May 1998): 6–32.
- Guba, Egon G., and Yvonna S. Lincoln. "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed., edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 191–216. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2005.
- Haneda, Mari. "Classrooms as Communities of Practice: A Reevaluation." *TESOL Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (December 2006): 807–817. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264309>.

- Henkel, Mary. *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley, 2000.
- Hirvela, Alan, and Diane Belcher. "Coming Back to Voice: The Multiple Voices and Identities of Mature Multilingual Writers." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10, no. 1–2 (February 2001): 83–106. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(00\)00038-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00038-2).
- Ho, Mei-Ching. "Academic Discourse Socialization through Small-Group Discussions." *System* 39, no. 4 (December 2011): 437–450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.10.015>.
- Hüttner, Julia, Barbara Mehlmauer-Larcher, Susanne Reichl, and Barbara Schiftner, eds. *Theory and Practice in EFL Teacher Education: Bridging the Gap*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters, 2012.
- Jacoby, Sally, and Elinor Ochs. "Co-construction: An Introduction." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28, no. 3 (June 1995): 171–183. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2803_1.
- Jawitz, Jeff. "Academic Identities and Communities of Practice in a Professional Discipline." *Teaching in Higher Education* 14, no. 3 (June 2009): 241–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510902898817>.
- Johnson, Karen E. *Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Kamberelis, George, and Greg Dimitriadis. "Focus Group: Contingent Articulations of Pedagogy, Politics, and Inquiry." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 4th ed., edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 545–561. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2011.
- Kanno, Yasuko. *Negotiating Bilingual and Bicultural Identities: Japanese Returnees Betwixt Two Worlds*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Kirkup, Gill. "Academic Blogging: Academic Practice and Academic Identity." *London Review of Education* 8, no. 1 (February 2010): 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14748460903557803>.
- Kitamura, Yuto, Toshiyuki Omomo, and Masaaki Katsuno, eds. *Education in Japan: A Comprehensive Analysis of Education Reforms and Practices*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2019.
- Kobayashi, Masaki. "L2 Academic Discourse Socialization through Oral Presentations: An Undergraduate Student's Learning Trajectory in Study Abroad." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 72, no. 1 (February 2016): 95–121. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.2494>.
- Kobayashi, Masaki. "The Role of Peer Support in Students' Accomplishment of Oral Academic Tasks." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 59, no. 3 (March 2003): 337–368.
- Kobayashi, Masaki. "Second Language Socialization through an Oral Project Presentation: Japanese University Students' Experience." In *Project-Based Second and Foreign Language Education: Past, Present, and Future*, edited by Gulbahar H. Beckett and Paul Chamness Miller, 71–93. Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 2006.
- Kobayashi, Masaki, Sandra Zappa-Hollman, and Patricia A. Duff. "Academic Discourse Socialization." In *Language Socialization: Encyclopedia of Language and*

- Education*, 3rd ed., edited by Patricia A. Duff and Stephen May, 1–17. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2017.
- Kobayashi, Yoko. *The Evolution of English Language Learners in Japan: Crossing Japan, the West, and South East Asia*. New York: Routledge, 2019.
- Kogan, Maurice. “Higher Education Communities and Academic Identity.” *Higher Education Quarterly* 54, no. 3 (July 2000): 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2273.00156>.
- Kouritzin, Sandra G., Nathalie A. C. Piquemal, and Renee Norman, eds. *Qualitative Research: Challenging the Orthodoxies in Standard Academic Discourse(s)*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Krueger, Richard A., and Mary Anne Casey. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2014.
- Kucer, Stephen B., and Cecilia Silva. *Teaching the Dimensions of Literacy*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Lantolf, James P., ed. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Lantolf, James P., and Matthew E. Poehner. *Sociocultural Theory and the Pedagogical Imperative in L2 Education: Vygotskian Praxis and the Research/Practice Divide*. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Lantolf, James P., and Matthew E. Poehner. *Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Language*. London: Equinox, 2008.
- Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Leki, Ilona. “Living through College Literacy: Nursing in a Second Language.” *Written Communication* 20, no. 1 (January 2003): 81–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088303253571>.
- Leki, Ilona. *Undergraduates in a Second Language: Challenges and Complexities of Academic Literacy Development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2007.
- Leung, Constant, and Jo Lewkowicz. “Second Language Academic Literacies: Evolving Understandings.” In *Literacies and Language Education: Encyclopedia of Language Education*, vol. 2, 3rd ed., edited by Brian V. Street and Stephen May, 169–180. New York: Springer, 2017.
- Lillis, Theresa, and Mary J. Curry. “Professional Academic Writing by Multilingual Scholars: Interactions with Literacy Brokers in the Production of English-Medium Texts.” *Written Communication* 23, no. 1 (January 2006): 3–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088305283754>.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. “Ethical Practices in Qualitative Research.” In *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics*, edited by Donna M. Mertens and Pauline E. Ginsberg, 150–169. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2009.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S., Susan A. Lynham, and Egon G. Guba. “Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences.” In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 4th ed., edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 97–128. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2011.
- Liu, Yichun, and Xiaoye You. “Negotiating into Academic Discourses: Taiwanese and U.S. College Students in Research Writing.” *International Journal of English Studies* 8, no. 2 (December 2008): 152–172.

- McGarr, Oliver, and Janet Moody. "Scaffolding or Stifling? The Influence of Journal Requirements on Students' Engagement in Reflective Practice." *Reflective Practice* 11, no. 5 (October 2010): 579–591. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2010.516968>.
- Mendoza-Denton, Norma. "Language and Identity." In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, edited by J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Esters, 475–499. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.
- Merriam, Sharan B. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education: Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.
- Mertens, Donna M. *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2010.
- Morita, Naoko. "Discourse Socialization through Oral Classroom Activities in a TESL Graduate Program." *TESOL Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (June 2000): 279–310.
- Morita, Naoko. "Language, Culture, Gender, and Academic Socialization." *Language and Education: An International Journal* 23, no. 5 (August 2009): 443–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780902752081>.
- Morita, Naoko. "Negotiating Participation and Identity in Second Language Academic Communities." *TESOL Quarterly* 38, no. 4 (December 2004): 573–603. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588281>.
- Morita, Naoko, and Masaki Kobayashi. "Academic Discourse Socialization in a Second Language." In *Language Socialization: Encyclopedia of Language Education*, vol. 8, 2nd ed., edited by Patricia A. Duff and Nancy M. Hornberger, 243–255. New York: Springer, 2010.
- Muller, Theron, Steven Herder, John Adamson, and Philip S. Brown, eds. *Innovating EFL Teaching in Asia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Muramatsu, Chie. *Portraits of Second Language Learners: An L2 Learner Agency Perspective*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2018.
- Neumann, Ruth R. "Disciplinary Differences and University Teaching." *Studies in Higher Education* 26, no. 2 (August 2001): 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070120052071>.
- Norton, Bonny. *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity, and Educational Change*. Essex: Longman, 2000.
- Norton, Bonny, and Carolyn McKinney. "An Identity Approach to Second Language Acquisition." In *Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Dwight Atkinson, 73–94. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi Schieffelin. "Language Socialization: A Historical Overview." In *Language Socialization: Encyclopedia of Language Education*, vol. 8, 2nd ed., edited by Patricia A. Duff and Nancy H. Hornberger, 3–15. New York: Springer, 2010.
- Ohata, Kota, and Akiko Fukao. "L2 Learners' Conceptions of Academic Reading and Themselves as Academic Readers." *System* 42 (February 2014): 81–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.11.003>.
- Ortega, Lourdes. "SLA after the Social Turn: Where Cognitivism and Its Alternatives Stand." In *Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Dwight Atkinson, 167–180. New York: Routledge, 2011.

- Pavlenko, Aneta. "Autobiographical Narratives as Data in Applied Linguistics." *Applied Linguistics* 28, no. 2 (April 2007): 163–188. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm008>.
- Pavlenko, Aneta. "'In the World of the Tradition, I Was Unimagined': Negotiation of Identities in Cross-Cultural Autobiographies." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 5, no. 3 (September 2001): 317–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069010050030401>.
- Pavlenko, Aneta, and Adrian Blackledge, eds. *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters, 2004.
- Pavlovich, Kathryn. "The Development of Reflective Practice through Students' Journals." *Higher Education Research and Development* 26, no. 3 (September 2007): 281–295.
- Pavlovich, Kathryn, Eva Collins, and Glyndwr Jones. "Developing Students' Skills in Reflective Practice: Design and Assessment." *Journal of Management Education* 33, no. 1 (February 2009): 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562907307640>.
- Peterlin,ANGES Pisanski. "Academic Discourse in Translation: Trainee Translators' Performance, Experience and Perception of Rhetorical Conventions." *Journal of English for Specific Purposes* 36, (October 2014): 60–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.001>.
- Pifer, Meghan J., and Vicki L. Baker. "Professional, Personal, and Relational: Exploring the Salience of Identity in Academic Careers." *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 16, no. 3 (July 2016): 190–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2016.1190729>.
- Reveles, John M., and Bryan A. Brown. "Contextual Shifting: Teachers Emphasizing Students' Academic Identity to Promote Scientific Literacy." *Science Education* 92, no. 6 (October 2008): 1015–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sc.20282>.
- Riazantseva, Anastasia. "'I Ain't Changing Anything': A Case-Study of Successful Generation 1.5 Immigrant College Students' Writing." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 11, no. 3 (September 2012): 184–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2012.04.007>.
- Seidman, Irving. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*. 5th ed. New York: Teachers College Press, 2019.
- Seloni, LisyA. "Academic Literacy Socialization of First Year Doctoral Students in US: A Micro-Ethnographic Perspective." *English for Specific Purposes* 31, no. 1 (January 2012): 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.05.004>.
- Seloni, LisyA. "Intertextual Connection between Spoken and Written Text: A Microanalysis of Doctoral Students' Textual Constructions." In *The Oral-Literate Connection: Perspectives on L2 Speaking, Writing, and Other Media Interactions*, edited by Diane Belcher and Alan Hirvela, 63–86. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008.
- Sérór, Jérémie. "'Or, Just It's My Fault, Right?': Language Socialization through L2 Writing Feedback." In *Reflexivity in Language Education: Rethinking Multilingualism and Interculturality*, edited by Julie S. Byrd Clark and Fred Dervin, 64–80. New York: Routledge, 2014.

- Sfard, Anna. "On Two Metaphors for Learning and the Danger of Choosing Just One." *Educational Researcher* 27, no. 2 (March 1998): 4–13. doi:10.3102/0013189X027002004, doi:10.1177/0741088397014001001.
- Swales, John M., and Christine B. Freak. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills*. 3rd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012.
- Takanashi, Yoshiro. "TEFL and Communication Styles in Japanese Culture." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 17, no. 1 (April 2010): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310408666678>.
- Turuk, Mamour C. "The Relevance and Implications of Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory in the Second Language Classroom." *Annual Review of Education, Communication, and Language Science* 5 (November 2008): 244–262.
- Uzuner, Sedef. "Educationally Valuable Talk: A New Concept for Determining the Quality of Online Conversations." *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching* 3, no. 4 (December 2007): 400–410.
- Uzuner, Sedef. "Multilingual Scholars' Participation in Core/Global Academic Communities: A Literature Review." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 7, no. 4 (October 2008): 250–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.10.007>.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Wan, Lam S. E. "Language Socialization in Online Communities." In *Language Socialization: Encyclopedia of Language Education*, vol. 8, 2nd ed., edited by Patricia A. Duff and Nancy M. Hornberger, 301–311. New York: Springer, 2010.
- Wang, Ming. *Multimodalities and Chinese Students' L2 Practices: Positioning, Agency, and Community*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2020.
- Watson-Gegeo, Karen A. "Mind, Language, Epistemology: Toward a Language Socialization Paradigm for SLA." *The Modern Language Journal* 88, no. 3 (August 2004): 331–350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00233.x>.
- Wenger, Etienne. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Wingate, Ursula "Using Academic Literacies and Genre-Based Models for Academic Writing Instruction: A 'Literacy' Journey." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 11, no. 1 (March 2012): 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.11.006>.
- Yamada, Kiyomi. "Cross-Disciplinary Variations: Japanese Novice Writers' Socialization into the Undergraduate Thesis." *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher* 25, no. 2 (August 2016): 207–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-015-0252-3>.
- Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2018.
- Zappa-Hollman, Sandra, and Patricia A. Duff. "Academic English Socialization through Individual Networks of Practice." *TESOL Quarterly* 49, no. 2, (August 2015): 333–368. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.188>.

Index

- academic communities, 15;
 enculturation into, 15. *See also*
 discourse communities
- academic discourse socialization (ADS),
 1, 2, 5, 6; case descriptions, 33–67;
 concept, 9; in the context of EFL,
 9–10; cross-case analysis, 69–91; in
 English-speaking countries, 9; future
 visions, 109–13; importance, 106;
 pedagogical implications, 102–105;
 research implications, 105–107;
 teachers' perspectives or voices for,
 106–107
- academic discourse styles, 34
- academic identity, 9–10
- academic identity construction, 1, 6,
 10; case descriptions, 33–66; cross-
 case analysis of, 69–91; educational
 discipline and, 16; future visions
 of, 109–13; interactions with peers
 and experts, 101; of L2 learners,
 17–18; premise of, 11; reciprocal
 relationships and, 101; students'
 voices and, 106; studies/research of,
 16
- academic journals, 34, 35, 42, 54, 61,
 62–63, 70, 71, 80
- academic literacy, 6; defined, 10, 105;
 issues, 97; social networks and, 15;
 studies/research, 9, 10, 13–16, 97,
 105
- academic writing, 15
- adapting to community roles, 84–85
- Akiko (pseudonym), 34–40;
 background, 21; collaboration with
 peers, 35–37; discourse community,
 38; identity, 39–40; inner awareness
 of L2 writing, 38–39; reading
 comprehension strategies, 34–35. *See*
 also cross-case analysis
- autonomous learning, 78
- Barnawi, Othman, 17–18, 101
- Block, David, 16
- blog entries, 25
- Braine, George, 14
- Canadian university, 5
- Casanave, Christine P., 15, 71, 80,
 100
- case descriptions, 33–67. *See also* cross-
 case analysis
- Chiaki (pseudonym), 49–53;
 academic learning style, 53;
 background, 21; collaboration with
 peers, 50–51; language identity,
 52–53; participation in courses,
 51–52; positioning, 53; reading

- comprehension strategies, 49–50. *See also* cross-case analysis
- Childhood Education Course, 34
- class culture, 37
- classroom discussions, 46–47
- cognitive development, 12
- collaboration with peers, 69, 100–101; Akiko (pseudonym), 35–37; Chiaki (pseudonym), 50–51; cross-case analysis, 69, 76–78; Jonghyun (pseudonym), 41–42; Kenta (pseudonym), 63–64; Miho (pseudonym), 55–56; Sayaka (pseudonym), 59–61; Taisei (pseudonym), 46–47
- collaborative learning, 35–36. *See also* collaboration with peers
- collaborative tasks, 103
- community of practice (CoP), 9–10, 78, 83; legitimate peripheral participation (LPP), 12–13, 97–98, 102; socialization process of, 12
- community roles, adapting to, 84–85
- comprehension. *See* reading comprehension strategies
- course blog posts, 103
- Cox, Michele, 17
- Crosby, Cathryn, 83, 99
- cross-case analysis, 69–91; adapting to community roles, 69, 84–85; collaboration with peers, 69, 76–78; immersion into discourse communities, 69, 78–82; learners' positionality, 69, 85–90; lexical difficulties, 69–72; power relations, 69, 82–83
- crystallization, 28
- cyberspace, 104
- data sources and collection, 6, 23–29, 69, 95, 111; ethical considerations, 29; methodological disruptions, 27; positionality narrative, 24–26; procedure and analysis, 26–27, 33
- dependability, 28
- dependability audits, 29
- dictionaries, 70; over-reliance on, 63; practical use of, 70
- disciplinary discourse patterns, 34
- discipline-specific courses, 102
- discourse communities, 3, 10, 69, 78–82
- Duff, Patricia A., 14, 25
- Eiken*, 45
- enculturation, 9, 15, 100, 103
- English as a Foreign Language (EFL), 3, 9–10
- English education/programs in Japan, 4, 102; professional courses, 102
- English for Academic and Specific Purposes, 70, 102
- English language proficiency, 98
- English scholarly articles, 98, 99. *See also* reading comprehension strategies
- ethical considerations, 29
- Ferenz, Orna, 15, 18
- focus group interview, 26
- foreign residents in Japan, 4
- Fukao, Akiko, 70, 106
- grammar translation. *See* translation approach
- identity, poststructuralist perspective, 16. *See also* academic identity construction
- immersion into the discourse community, 69
- individual interviews, 25
- informed consent, 23, 26, 29
- interview(s): focus group, 26; individual, 25
- Jacoby, Sally, 11
- Jonghyun (pseudonym), 40–44; background, 21–22; collaboration with peers, 41–42; disciplinary

- knowledge, 44; English writing, 43–44; reading comprehension strategies, 40–41. *See also* cross-case analysis
- journals: academic, 34, 35, 42, 54, 61, 62–63, 70, 71, 80; self-reflective, 24, 28, 103–104; weekly, 20, 23, 24, 27, 38, 52, 81, 96. *See also* reading comprehension strategies
- Kenta (pseudonym), 62–66; background, 22; collaboration with peers, 63–64; positioning, 65; reading comprehension strategies, 62–63. *See also* cross-case analysis
- Kobayashi, Masaki, 14, 77, 101, 103, 106–107
- L2 learners: academic identity construction, 17–18; word-related issues and, 99. *See also* cross-case analysis
- language acquisition, 12
- Lave, Jean, 12, 84, 97–98
- learners' positionality, 85–90
- legitimate peripheral participation (LPP), 12–13, 97–98, 102. *See also* community of practice (CoP)
- Leki, Ilona, 15, 72–73, 80, 82, 83, 99, 100
- lexical difficulties in academic discourses, 69–72; Akiko (pseudonym), 34–35; Chiaki (pseudonym), 49–50; Jonghyun (pseudonym), 40–41; Kenta (pseudonym), 62–63; Miho (pseudonym), 54–55; Sayaka (pseudonym), 58–59; strategic solutions to, 70–72; Taisei (pseudonym), 45–46. *See also* dictionaries; reading comprehension strategies
- Li, Xiaoming, 15, 71, 80, 100
- literacy autobiographies, 24, 99
- Liu, Yichun, 17, 18
- McKinney, Carolyn, 16
- member checks, 28–29
- Miho (pseudonym), 54–57; academic identity, 57; background, 22; collaboration with peers, 55–56; reading comprehension strategies, 54–55. *See also* cross-case analysis
- Moodle, 24, 25
- Morita, Naoko, 5, 14, 17, 18, 101, 106–107
- mutual support, 84
- Norton, Bonny, 16
- Ochs, Elinor, 11
- Ohata, Kota, 70, 106
- online commentary, 104
- online discussions, 104. *See also* social networks
- open classroom discussions, 99–100
- open-ended questions, 25
- participants, research, 20–23, 33. *See also specific participant (pseudonym)*
- peer collaborations. *See* collaboration with peers
- positionality narrative, 24–26
- power disparity, 82
- power relations, 69, 82–83
- qualitative research, 18–19
- questions, research, 18–19
- reading comprehension strategies, 69–72; Akiko (pseudonym), 34–35; Chiaki (pseudonym), 49–50; Jonghyun (pseudonym), 40–41; Kenta (pseudonym), 62–63; Miho (pseudonym), 54–55; Sayaka (pseudonym), 58–59; Taisei (pseudonym), 45–46. *See also* cross-case analysis; lexical difficulties in academic discourses
- reflective journals. *See* self-reflective journals

- reliability. *See* trustworthiness and reliability of data
- Research Seminar*, 1
- research seminar course, 2–3, 98; data sources and collection, 6, 23–29, 69, 95, 111; highlighting theoretical and pedagogical issues, 20; for juniors, 19–20; participants, 20–23; purpose and significance, 4–6; questions, 18–19; site, background of, 19
- Sayaka (pseudonym), 58–62; background, 22–23; collaboration with peers, 59–61; positioning, 62; reading comprehension strategies, 58–59. *See also* cross-case analysis
- scaffolding, 3, 84, 101
- Seidman, Irving, 25
- self-reflective journals, 24, 28, 103–4. *See also* weekly journals
- Seloni, Lisyia, 103
- Sfard, Anna, 12
- skill-oriented English classes, 45
- social interactions, 99–100
- socialization, 1
- social networks, 15, 100, 102, 104
- Society for Testing English Proficiencies (STEP), 45
- sociocultural theory, 11–12, 97
- Taisei (pseudonym), 44–49; background, 23; collaboration with peers, 46–47; positioning as an academic, 48; reading comprehension strategies, 45–46. *See also* cross-case analysis
- teachers/teaching, 5, 102–105; act as intermediaries, 5, 103; collaborative tasks, 103; integration of technology, 104; opportunities provided by, 103; oral presentations, 103; perspectives or voices, 106–107; role, 102–103
- Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), 1, 2
- technical terminology, 69–72. *See also* lexical difficulties in academic discourses
- technology, 104
- translation approach, 69, 72–76; online sources, 76; scholarly texts, 74; traditional learning method, 74–75
- trustworthiness and reliability of data, 27–29; crystallization, 28; dependability audit, 28; member checks, 27–28
- virtual/digital communication, 25
- vocabulary, 20, 22, 53, 62, 63, 70, 72, 74
- Vygotsky, Lev S., 11–12, 97
- Watson-Gegeo, Karen A., 13, 14
- websites, 45
- weekly journals, 20, 23, 24, 27, 38, 52, 81, 96
- Wenger, Etienne, 12, 84, 97–98
- word-focused approach, 49
- written discourse, 34
- yakudoku*, 72, 73. *See also* translation approach
- Yin, Robert K., 28
- You, Xiaoye, 17, 18
- zone of proximal development, 12, 33, 97

About the Author

Yutaka Fujieda, PhD, is professor in the Department of International Social Studies at Kyoai Gakuen University, Gunma, Japan. His research interests include second language writing and literacy, and language teacher education.

