

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Seonhee Cho entitled “International Graduate Students in U.S.-based TESOL Discourse Communities: Finding and Creating a Space.” I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Education.

Patricia Davis-Wiley

Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Ilona Leki

Judith Boser

Edward Counts

Accepted for the Council:

Anne Mayhew

Vice Chancellor and
Dean of Graduate Studies

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

**INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS IN U.S.-BASED TESOL
DISCOURSE COMMUNITIES:
FINDING AND CREATING A SPACE**

A Dissertation Presented for
Doctor of Philosophy Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Seonhee Cho
August 2005

I dedicate this dissertation to my beloved parents and my great mentors for their trust and support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who helped and supported me during my Ph.D. program of study. Without them, I could not have made it.

My deepest appreciation goes to Dr. Patricia Davis-Wiley for her kind advice and guidance during each step of my graduate study, and her thorough editing processes of my dissertation writing. I also benefited from the opportunities to teach and to present with her. I learned from her how to balance both a personal and an academic life. She treated me like part of her family, inviting me to all special holiday dinners and parties. I also wish to thank her husband, Steve Wiley, for his openness, support, and kind words of encouragement.

I am so indebted to Dr. Ilona Leki. Her insights on scholarly works guided me, and her warm human empathy never failed to encourage me. Her high expectations for me also pushed me to think more and learn more. She is the professor and scholar, who I want to become some day.

I am also thankful to Dr. Judith Boser and Dr. Edward Counts. Dr. Boser provided me thorough and insightful suggestions and feedback on my dissertation study, particularly methodology. Dr. Edward Counts was a wonderful and empathetic supporter. Their generosity and warm-heartedness allowed me to write the dissertation that I wanted to.

I also owe special thanks to Dr. Handel Wright, Dr. Barbara Thayer-Bacon, and Dr. Diana Moyer in the Cultural Studies program area. The courses they allowed me to audit, in critical theory and feminist studies, helped me broaden my perspectives and form my research background.

I was so lucky to have Dr. Dwight Atkinson, a mentor and supporter of my research endeavors outside of the UTK academic community. I was inspired by his scholarly works and conversations with him. I truly benefited from his nurturing and caring mentorship. I am also grateful to my friends and former colleagues, Dr. Jenelle Reeves and Dr. Ethan Krase, for their support and encouragement. I enjoyed their company at conferences; our conversations were always fruitful and inspiring. My best friend in Korea, Dr. In-sook Yang, cheered me on from a great distance; it would have been much more difficult to get through the Ph.D. process without her.

I owe special thanks to Jill Fox, Beth Shaver, and Heather Sims who were my colleagues and friends in the early years of my doctoral study. I learned America through their eyes and enjoyed their true and genuine friendship. My heartfelt thanks go to another wonderful human being, Amela Porca-Malkic, for her emotional support. She was always there for me when I had difficult times. Thank you, Amela; you gave me a shoulder to cry on. I also would like to express my special thanks to: Laura Bilderback, who showed me how to enjoy life and *loosen up*; Erica Yacso, who

helped me with the editing process of my writing; Adam Gacs, who gave me an opportunity to experience his openness and music; and to Dr. Erik Bledsoe, an academic who already has been through the same process, who cheered me on and supported me. I also truly appreciate the opportunity to have worked with Joann Ng Hartmann, my supervisor, Dr. Jim Gehlhar, and the CIE family. Without their support and kindness, it would not have been easy for me to have completed my Ph.D. It was also truly a privilege and eye-opening experience to work with international students at the Center for International Education; it helped me grow beyond my belief.

My special gratitude goes to my parents, my sister and brother; without them, I could not be who I am now. Their love, trust, and support are beyond description.

Finally, but not last, I am greatly indebted to my nine research participants for their time and willingness to participate in this study. I also admit that I was very inspired through conversations with them.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation study reports the findings of a qualitative interview study examining the issues of international graduate students who pursue their graduate degrees in U.S.-based TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) discourse communities. Through in-depth interviews with nine international graduate students, in four different U.S. institutions, this study explored international graduate students' perceptions of their respective TESOL graduate programs, and, their academic discourse socialization processes. Based on the notion of *situated learning* and critical discourse perspectives in TESOL education, the interview data were analyzed through inductive and interpretive analysis.

The findings of this study reveal that the international graduate students' perceptions of their respective TESOL graduate programs were varied, depending on the availability of assistance, support, and equal opportunities. Furthermore, when they could relate what they learned, based on their personal experiences and their future teaching environments, their perceptions of their discourse communities were positive, and their academic discourse socialization processes progressed. Academic discourse socialization processes, however, were not only social and political, but also personal and individual. Nevertheless, this study found that international graduate students in the U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities do not simply embrace the

practices and knowledge of their discourse communities, rather, they negotiate, resist, and strategize. The latter appeared specifically through their utilization of insiders' knowledge about their native EFL (English as a Foreign Language) contexts and cultures, and their own ESL (English as a Second Language) learner experiences in various academic activities. This study suggests that international graduate students are contributing members in TESOL discourse communities. They also have the potential to transform western-centered TESOL discourse communities into a more open and inclusive space for learning and exchanging ideas. Supportive environments of TESOL discourse communities are crucial for this to be accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER.....	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Research Questions.....	7
Significance of the Study.....	8
Assumptions.....	9
Limitations and Delimitations.....	9
Definitions of Terms.....	9
Organization of the Study.....	16
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	17
TESOL Discourse Communities.....	17
Discourse Community.....	17
Characteristics of TESOL Discourse Communities.....	19
Context-Specific TESOL Theories/Practices.....	26
Critical Approach to TESOL Education.....	29
Situated Learning and Academic Socialization.....	31
The Sociocultural Approach to Learning.....	31
Issues on International Graduate Students' Disciplinary Socialization.....	34
Summary.....	45
III. METHODOLOGY.....	46
Research Design.....	46
Research Paradigm.....	46
Role of the Researcher.....	48
Data Collection Methods.....	50
Data Collection.....	52
Sampling Method.....	52
Data Collection Procedures.....	54
Research Participants.....	59
Participants' TESOL Graduate Programs.....	67

Instrumentation.....	73
Interview.....	73
Documentation.....	75
Data Analysis Procedures.....	75
Summary.....	79
 IV. FINDINGS.....	 81
Perceptions of TESOL Graduate Discourse Communities.....	82
Availability of Support and Opportunities.....	83
Textual Knowledge.....	89
Academic Socialization.....	96
Alpha University TESOL Program: Oral Participation and Teaching Opportunities.....	97
Beta University Program: Struggling with New Multi-roles.....	110
Delta and Gamma University Programs: Supportive Networks and Introduction into Professional Communities.....	118
Challenges and Strategies.....	131
Summary.....	150
 V. DISCUSSION.....	 152
Becoming Critical.....	153
Relocating TESOL Discourse Communities.....	154
Being “Non-native” Teachers.....	159
Learning by Participating and Interacting.....	166
Newcomers: Outsider or Legitimate Peripheral Participation?.....	169
Increasing Engagement in a Professional Conversation.....	172
Finding and Creating a Space.....	177
Summary.....	182
 VI. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	 184
Overview of the Research.....	184
Implications and Suggestions.....	189
Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research.....	193
Limitations.....	193
Unresolved Queries and Recommendations for Further Research.....	194

REFERENCES.....	197
APPENDICES.....	211
Appendix A: Interview Guide Questions.....	212
Appendix B: Research Invitation Letter.....	215
Appendix C: Informed Consent Form.....	216
Appendix D: A Sample of Written Data Summary.....	218
VITA.....	223

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE.....	PAGE
Table 1: Interview Information.....	58
Table 2: Background Information of Master's Students.....	60
Table 3: Background Information of Doctoral Students.....	61

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Second language teaching communities in the U.S., under various program names such as applied linguistics, Second language studies, ESL (English as a Second Language) education, ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages), TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language), and TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), have grown with the influx of non-native English speaking immigrants and international students pursuing their postsecondary degrees. In addition, the world-wide spread of English has contributed to the augmentation of TESOL graduate programs in North America. The Directory of Professional Preparation Programs in TESOL in the United States and Canada, 2002-2004, lists 208 U.S. and Canadian institutions offering more than 400 programs in TESOL: 28 doctoral programs, and 206 master's programs (Garschick, 2002, p.v).

As one of the English-native speaking countries enjoying its prestige in the area of second language theories and practices and teacher education programs, U.S. institutions have attracted many international students from all over the world who seek higher degrees in order to become future teachers and teacher educators. The number of international students in TESOL academic communities is growing fast. It

is reported that international graduate students actually outnumber American students in the TESOL programs in some universities (Johnson, 2003).

Those international graduate students, however, are from different TESOL communities such as EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and EAL (English as an Associate Language). According to Nayar (1997), global TESOL communities can be classified into three major groups, depending on the purpose of learning English and TESOL culture: EFL, EAL and ESL. Each TESOL community can be referred to as a discourse community (or a community of practice), in that it shares a common way of speaking and writing, a way of acting and interacting (e.g., conventions, traditions), and valuing (e.g., interests and visions) (Gee, 1990; Swales, 1990). In EFL communities, English is learned as a foreign language mostly through formal education for the purpose of international communication. In EAL communities, English is used as an associate language, in addition to the native language in the domains of education and on official occasions. Furthermore, in ESL contexts, English is used as a second language (not native language) in an English native environment, with the ultimate purpose of learning English being successful integration into the mainstream (Nayar, 1997). Accordingly, each TESOL discourse community has different agendas, policies and traditions. As a result, international graduate students who are from different TESOL discourse communities, are more

likely to have different concerns, interests and experiences than domestic American graduate students.

Graduate study ushers students into their professional academic discourse communities by engaging them in the topics under discussion, language (e.g., rhetoric, technical terms), conventions and practices (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1988, 1995). Graduate study, as such, constitutes a significant part of the target academic discourse community. Prior (1998) contends that SL (Second Language) graduate students are adjusting themselves into their new academic discourse communities through participation, interaction, and negotiation. This becoming or transforming process occurs through a complicated and multi-dimensional process with the system, culture, and people acting together (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Statement of the Problem

There have been concerns that most TESOL theories and practices have been developed in native English-speaking countries, (i.e., in ESL contexts). As such, EFL and EAL contexts have been significantly underrepresented in L2 (Second language) theories and practices (Canagarajah, 1999b; Pennycook, 1994; Sridhar, 1994).

Furthermore, the applicability and appropriateness of teaching methods and theories that have been developed in and for ESL communities have been questioned and reexamined. The imported L2 theories and practices from native English-speaking

countries into EFL/EAL countries do not match the local situation, and, therefore, may have a penchant to clash with the existing local educational culture, policies and teachers (Canagarajah b, 1999; Jernudd, 1981; Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992).

This underrepresentation of EFL/EAL communities and inapplicability of ESL-developed SL theories and practices in certain contexts have been major arguments in previous studies with regard to the issues of different TESOL discourse communities. However, there is a paucity of studies that address what international graduate students' education in the U.S.-based ESL discourse communities means to those students, and, by extension, the further impact that graduate education has on a local or global TESOL community.

International graduate students in ESL discourse communities experience two different discourse communities: an ESL academic discourse community, in which they are trained through their graduate education, and an EFL/EAL academic discourse community, in which they had English learning/teaching experience prior to joining the ESL discourse community, and to which they may return. If each TESOL discourse community has its own unique culture, and therefore its corresponding TESOL theories and practices are crucial, questions about international graduate students' learning in the U.S.-based TESOL academic discourse communities arise. These include whether or not their concerns and interests which stem from their

learning/teaching experience are appropriately accommodated, and whether or not their graduate education in ESL contexts is adequate to serve their needs for TESOL education in their home countries.

Little is known about how TESOL graduate programs accommodate international graduate students and how international graduate students adjust themselves into new academic TESOL discourse communities in North American ESL contexts. The existing body of published literature focuses heavily on the issues of international graduate students' academic literacy activities, especially academic writing (e.g., Biggs, Lai, Tang, & Lavelle, 1999; Silva, Reichelt, & Lax-Farr, 1994). However, the new paradigm that emerged in the 1990s shifts the view of academic literacy activities and learning from autonomous and neutral activities to socially constructed and conventionalized practices. As a result, learning is seen as socially-situated activities rather than individual learners' isolated cognitive activities (Gee, 1990, 2000; Lave & Wenger, 1991). This shift of paradigm also brings change into the recent studies of disciplinary enculturation issues. These studies reflect more personal, social, and contextual dimensions and dynamics of students' academic socialization process in conjunction with the concern of students' identities and subjectivities (Casanave, 2002; Morita, 2004; Prior, 1998).

Thus, it is important to examine how international graduate students from native EFL/EAL TESOL discourse communities acculturate themselves into a new ESL discourse community, and in what ways they interact with their new ESL discourse community. This includes how they perceive their graduate discourse community, and how they engage themselves to become members of the relatively new academic discourse community. What is significant is how and where they find their own academic space in new TESOL academic discourse communities in U.S.

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to explore the issues concerning international graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities, particularly, TESOL graduate programs. Graduate study is a vital component of the academic discourse community in that it not only introduces the target academic discourse community to the students, but also (re)shapes the academic discourse community through interactions.

The purpose of this study is to find out how international graduate students perceive their U.S.-based TESOL academic discourse communities and, in particular, their graduate programs; how they academically socialize in their graduate discourse communities, and how contexts of their discourse communities and their subjectivity shape this process. Hence, this study attempts to investigate what perceptions international graduate students have toward practices of their graduate TESOL

discourse communities, including the textual knowledge they gain, and how they participate in, interact with, and negotiate their new TESOL academic communities. However, this research does not limit international graduate students to the terrain of their linguistic challenges, such as academic writing and oral proficiency. Rather, the main concern of this research is to explore international graduate students' critical reflection on practices of their graduate discourse community, participation modes, and the negotiation process, in the hope of finding and creating a space for international graduate students/scholars in ESL-dominated TESOL discourse communities.

Research Questions

1. How do international graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities perceive (or how are they critically aware of) practices of their graduate programs and textual knowledge?
2. How do international graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities participate in the practices of their TESOL graduate discourse communities?
 - a. How do contexts shape their participation modes (or academic socialization process)?
 - b. How does their subjectivity have an effect on this process?

Significance of the Study

Although the number of international graduate students/scholars in U.S.-based TESOL academic discourse communities has recently been growing fast, little has been investigated concerning how most TESOL discourse communities have prepared for accommodating those international graduate students' needs efficiently and appropriately. In addition, research has not adequately addressed how international graduate students perceive their discourse communities, how they participate in them, and what strategies they employ. The findings of this study may contribute to the body of knowledge about international graduate students' issues in TESOL discourse communities. Furthermore, the findings may also be instrumental in designing and implementing a curriculum for TESOL teacher education programs which house a large number of international graduate students.

This study is significant in that it explores the issues of international graduate students who may have difficulty in finding their space in their relatively new U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities. In so doing, it can potentially lead to U.S.-centered academic TESOL discourse communities becoming more democratic and inclusive academic communities for exchanging ideas and scholarship.

Assumptions

First, it is assumed that the participants in this research are able to communicate in English. Next, it is assumed that all the participants are honest in giving their opinions, expressing their feelings, and recalling the experiences about which they are asked. Finally, it is assumed that the researcher does not lead nor bias the research participants' responses.

Limitations and Delimitations

The particular participants of this study have been selected through *purposeful sampling*. Therefore, they do not represent that population, and the results of this study cannot be generalized to a greater population. This study also restricts itself to interviewing international graduate students in four TESOL graduate programs in the United States. In addition, since English is the researcher's and the research participants' second language, there might be subtle language differences that cannot be fully expressed in English.

Definitions of Terms

Definitions of terms that are used throughout this study are provided for the purpose of common understanding of some technical terms between the researcher and the audience.

Academic discourse socialization/disciplinary enculturation

A process of becoming a member of or learning a particular target discipline through participation and involvement in various types of academic (disciplinary) activities (Prior, 1998)

Center

Native-English-Speaking countries such as the United States, Canada, Britain and Australia. It is named as a center for the reason that these countries lead economical, political, and cultural power in the world (Phillipson, 1992).

CLT Communicative Language Teaching. This covers a variety of approaches that focus on helping learners to communicate meaningfully in a target language (Nunan, 1999). CLT emphasizes speaking and listening in real settings. It does not prioritize reading, writing, and grammar. Methodologies for CLT tend to encourage active learner involvement in a variety of activities and tasks, and strategies for communication (Carter & Nunan, 2001).

Community of Practice/ Discourse Community

A community that shares the same language patterns, rules, goals, conventions, and practices. Therefore, the members of a discourse community have similar ways of speaking and writing, understanding and valuing (Lave

& Wenger, 1991; Swales, 1990; Wenger, 1998). The two can be used interchangeably.

EAL English as an Associate Language. It also stands for English as an Additional Language. English is taught and learned in communities where English is used as an additional language to indigenous languages, in the domain of education and on official occasions.

EFL English as a Foreign Language. English is taught and learned in academic communities where it is not widely used for communication outside of the classroom.

ELT English Language Teaching

ESL English as a Second Language. English is taught and learned in academic communities where it is widely used for communication by the population outside the classroom, in a native English-speaking environment.

Feminist Qualitative Research

The second wave of feminist research that has been influenced by postmodernist thought is more self-conscious of the complexity of the nature of research and more methodologically innovative than the first wave of feminist research that was conducted in a conventional paradigm. According to Olesen (2000), since the mid-1980s, feminist research is increasingly

aware of, “the definition of and relationship with whom research is done, the characteristics and location of the researcher, and the very creation and presentation of knowledges created in the research” (p.217). Therefore, these questions are vital in order to examine and reflect the knowledge presented, “... whose knowledges? Where and how obtained and by whom, from whom, and for what purposes?” (p.217). Dona Haraway and Sandra Hardings are pioneer feminist researchers who attempted to make the relationship between knowledge and knower transparent by locating researchers.

L2 Second Language

M.A. Master of Arts

NES Native English Speaking

Newcomer

Lave and Wenger (1991) use this word to indicate a new person to a community of practice (discourse community). In this study, it refers to a international graduate student who is new to an U.S.-based TESOL discourse community.

NNES Non-Native English Speaking

Periphery

Non-native English-speaking countries that are economically and politically marginalized as they follow the center's norm and criteria (Phillipson, 1992).

Positivism

A paradigm of thought that values empirical and scientific knowledge.

Therefore, measurable, repeatable, verifiable measurement is valued, whereas experiences and questions that are not measurable are not (Williams, 1985).

Postmodernism

The postmodernist view critiques and questions received knowledge and traditional values such as science, reason, and truth. It accepts the fragmentation and partiality of contemporary existence. This has influenced qualitative research in the human sciences and in education on the issues of inequality and power, knowledge construction, and researcher positionality.

Postmodernism is influential, particularly in feminism and postcolonial studies (Sarup, 1993).

Rhetoric

The study of using language effectively to persuade readers or listeners to accept the arguments presented. According to Leki (1992), rhetoric consists

of the rules “for presenting ideas and strategies for explaining or defending them” (p.88)

Scaffolding

It refers to a special kind of help or support that assists learners to move toward new skills, concepts, or levels of understanding. It is widely used to refer adults or more experienced people’s help to enable language learners (children) to perform tasks and construct communications which are at the time beyond their capabilities (Gibbons, 2002; Carter & Nunan, 2001).

Situated learning

Learning by participation in social practices of the target community.

Learning consists of situated activities and it is “an integral and inseparable aspect of social practice” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.31).

Situated knowledges

As one of the main arguments that postmodern feminist researchers espouse, the main point is to locate research in particular social, cultural, and historical contexts. The location of the researcher allows for partial and imperfect views of his/her research so that he/she is responsible for the knowledge that is discovered (Haraway, 1988).

Status quo the existing condition or state of affairs

Subjectivity

Judgment based on individual personal impressions, feelings, and opinions rather than external facts. The concept of subjectivity in this study is used in two aspects: one indicates a researcher's subjectivity to approach research and interpret the data, and the other signifies the willpower of people to alter and transform the system or structure where they are involved.

TESL Teaching English as a Second Language

TESOL Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.

This is a blanket term covering situations in which English is taught as an L2, as well as those in which it is taught as a foreign language (Cater & Nunan, 2001).

TESOLer People involved in teaching English to speakers of other languages

Washback

The effects of testing on teaching and learning. The Washback effect of testing means that testing which purportedly includes and reflects what is taught and learned through curriculum, affects and changes curricula of teaching and learning (Brindley, 2001).

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into six chapters. Chapter I introduces the background of current related research and states the purpose and significance of the study. Assumptions, limitations, and definitions of key terms are also included in this chapter. Chapter II reviews the related literature about the issues of different TESOL discourse communities and international graduate students' academic socialization in their respective ESL academic discourse communities. Chapter III describes the research design, data collection and analysis procedures, which includes the research methods, selection of the sample, and background information of research participants, construction of the research instrument, administration of the research, role of researcher, and analysis procedures. Chapter IV presents the findings of this study through a detailed and descriptive data analysis. Chapter V discusses interpretive discussions of the findings in relation to theoretical frameworks and relevant previous studies. Chapter VI overviews this research by summarizing the purpose of this study, data collection and analysis procedures, findings and implications, and offers suggestions for further research on this topic.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter deals with the framework of international graduate students' perceptions, experience, and participation in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities by reviewing relevant published research. First, this chapter discusses what a discourse community is, and how it functions as a backdrop for the academic discourse socialization processes. Then, it addresses what characteristics TESOL discourse communities have at a macro level in order to understand international graduate students' background. Next, based on the notion of social theory of learning, it discusses how academic discourse socialization process takes place while international graduate students are matriculating graduate study. Finally, the issues of international graduate students' academic discourse socialization are dealt with, particularly in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities.

TESOL Discourse Communities

Discourse Community

The concept of discourse has been used in a variety of disciplines of education, literacy, and social sciences. Researchers' use of the term varies from indicating a simple language act (e.g., written, spoken, and signed), to including social

conventions and practices. Discourse community refers to a group that shares the same discourse. Gee (1990) defines Discourse,

A Discourse is a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group of ‘social network,’ or to signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful ‘role.’
(p.143)

Gee (2000) further argues that discourse is socially and culturally formed yet historically changed.

According to Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998), although a community of practice (discourse community) is not necessarily a well-defined, identifiable, socially visible group, “It does imply participation in an activity system about which participants share understanding concerning what they are doing and what that means in their lives and for their communities” (p.98).

Gee (1990, 2000) and Swales (1990) characterize that a discourse community is a group that has shared experience, expectations, rules, interest, vision as well as a language pattern. New members of a discourse community learn their communities of practices through observation and participation (i.e., a form of apprenticeship) (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Lave and Wenger, however, argue that the inherent nature of a

discourse community does not simply include transmitting their traditions and conventions to new members. Rather, challenges and transformation are a vital part of continuing and developing the discourse communities.

From this perspective, TESOL communities can be considered as discourse communities in which members are connected under the similar goals and concerns about teaching English to the speakers of other languages. At a macro level, this global TESOL discourse community can be subdivided into ESL, EAL, and EFL communities. This classification is useful to examine how different contexts have different needs, goals, culture, and practices in order to identify the issues that international graduate students have in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities.

Characteristics of TESOL Discourse Communities

Kachru (1990) categorizes global English communities into three groups—inner circle, outer circle, and extended circle countries—depending on the native language environment and the purpose of English use. Inner circle countries are native English-speaking countries (e.g., U.S.A., Canada, Britain, Australia), while outer circle countries are those countries where English was imposed during the colonial times, and where English still functions as an important medium of communication in addition to their native languages (e.g., India, Philippines, Singapore, Nigeria). The extended circle countries use English as a foreign language

for the purpose of international communication and connections (e.g., Korea, China, Germany).

Each discourse community not only has different goals of English learning, but also its own corresponding policies, agenda and cultures. Nayar (1997) notes that in an ESL context, a main concern of TESOL education is acculturation and integration into the native English-speaking society, which may affect curriculum planning, material development, and teacher training. In an EAL context, English has social functions along with a sense of identity and community to some extent, but yet has less strict characteristics than an ESL context. In an EFL context, unlike EAL, speakers do not have a sense of linguistic and cultural inheritance; unlike an ESL context, English in an EFL context has instructional purposes (e.g., passing exams, promotions) rather than integrative purposes.

Native vs. non-native classification of global ELT (English Language Teaching) communities has been utilized to elucidate cultural, political, and economical implications of ELT. For instance, Phillipson (1992) and Canagarajah (1999b) use the concept of Center vs. Periphery ELT communities. Center stands for English native-speaking countries, while Periphery indicates non-native English speaking countries. The argument behind the notion of the Center vs. Periphery dichotomy is that the Center does not only have economical and political power, but

also leads the Periphery by setting norms and criteria. Center-developed theories and practices are exported to Periphery countries without consideration of cultural, social and contextual issues. Canagarajah (1999b), Phillipson (1992), and Tollfson (1995) postulate that the worldwide spread of English and the flourishing ELT enterprise tend to distribute unequal resources in the global community. Not only a one-way flow of knowledge from Center to Periphery, but also authenticity and authority of native English speakers in ELT bring native English speakers economical power with their easy access to jobs all over the world. Yet, the predominant paradigm of English as an international language fails in problematizing the notion of choice and access to English. People believe the false assumption that English spreads as a natural and neutral act and English will bring benefits to their home countries (Fairclough, 1989; Pennycook 1994; Phillipson 1992).

Hence, Pennycook (1999) posits, “Critical approaches to TESOL would do well to retain a constant skepticism, a constant questioning about the types of knowledge, theory, practice, or praxis they operate with...” (p. 345). Accordingly, language theories as well as practices, that have been taken for granted as neutral and beneficial, need critical interrogation.

Furthermore, it is important to note that that each TESOL discourse community context has different characteristics and needs. Therefore, context-and

culture-specific English language teaching theories/practices should be developed and implemented instead of following the model which has developed and prospered in native-English speaking context, (i.e., ESL context) (Canagarajah, 1999b; Holliday, 1994; Sridhar 1994).

ESL Discourse Communities in the U.S.

TESOL discourse communities in the U.S. have different cultures and focuses affected by many factors. Ramanathan, Davies, and Schleppegrell (2001), who investigated two MA-TESOL programs in the U.S., argue that each program has different attributes serving different local and community needs, graduates' job qualifications, departmental culture and faculty interests. The target English learners of a U.S.-based TESOL discourse community are diverse as well, and include adult immigrants, K-12 ESL students, bilinguals, international students in post-secondary schools, refugees, intensive English trainees, and overseas EFL learners (Ramanathan, 2002).

The issues that U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities have are varied. In K-12 settings, it has been the major issue on how ESL classes can help ESL students' successful linguistic and cultural adjustment into mainstream classrooms. In the process, what is upheld for ESL students is not to lose the value of their native languages and cultures but to add a new language and culture to what they already

have. However, this additional approach to educating L2 students has been challenged by the monolingual policies such as the *English only movement* and the ideology of standard of English (Auerbach, 1993; Wiley & Lukes, 1996).

In post-secondary settings, the issues of international students pursuing higher education degrees and their academic success have been discussed with the emphasis on academic writing that is a critical part of their academic success (e.g., Cadman, 1997; Silva, Reichelt & Lax-Farr, 1994; Spack, 1988). A recent paradigm shift from viewing students' learning as an individual cognitive activity to social and cultural implications of the learning process, brings up the debate of an ideological approach vs. a practical approach (Benesch, 1993, 2001; Santos, 2001). The practical approach advocates the idea that academic writing instruction should be able to provide what students need for their academic success, whereas, the ideological approach contends that academic writing should help international students not only be aware of power differentials, but also work to change the system for equity and justice (Benesch, 1993, 2001; Santos, 2001).

Thus, one of the main concerns that U.S.-based ESL discourse communities have is how they advocate diversity of races, languages, and cultures of the ESL population, and how they serve ESL students' various linguistic and cultural needs and expectations. Therefore, a wide range of issues are discussed, from investigating

the socio-political status of the ESL population to designing and implementing curriculum in each classroom in order to facilitate learners' L2 acquisition.

EAL Discourse Communities

In EAL discourse communities, English had been imposed during the colonial times, yet English still plays an important role as an official and educational language. One of the biggest issues in EAL contexts is that English is still functioning as a prestigious language over indigenous languages. Moreover, the access to English through education is not equal, depending on social and economic status, given that higher education is conducted through the medium of English. This unequal power distribution through English causes social immobility for those who are already socially and economically disadvantaged, maintaining the *status quo* (Ramanathan, 1999). Another significant issue is that English variants of EAL are often stigmatized as non-standard English or as fossilized forms that prevent native-speaker competence (Canagarajah, 1999b; Kachru, 1996). Therefore, Canagarajah (1999a, 1999b) and Kachru (1996) criticize the application of native norms and criteria to judge English features in EAL contexts which can, in turn, relegate their local English to a lower caliber of English.

Furthermore, Nayer (1997) argues that English teachers in EAL contexts have little training to teach anything but what they speak themselves. Textbooks and

teaching materials that are donated from native English-speaking countries are distant and unrealistic, and do not reflect contemporary culture and language because donated books are often outdated, and do not work well in EAL teaching contexts (Canagarajah, 1999b; Nayar, 1997).

EFL Discourse Communities

The major distinctive feature of EFL contexts is that English is taught as a subject in formal education settings and it seldom provides a natural setting for practicing conversational English. Ellis (1996) states, “EFL is a part of the school curriculum and therefore subject to contextual factors such as support from the principal and the local community, government policy, etc.”(p.215). For instance, the tremendous *Washback* effect of external paper exams that has been imposed and administered by government on some EFL discourse communities has been pointed out as being one of the biggest obstacles in developing the communicative ability of students. Large class size and the traditional role of teachers, as the authority of knowledge delivery, are also factors that hinder the creation of learning environments of communicative English in some EFL contexts (Gorsuch 2000; Li, 1998). In addition, most EFL teachers are non-native English speakers and they report that their English proficiency is not sufficient to conduct English classes, especially communicative language teaching. Furthermore, their pre-and in-service teacher

training puts an emphasis on linguistics and theoretical aspects in spite of the fact that those pre- and in-service teachers primarily wish to develop their language proficiency (Cullen, 1994; Medgyes, 1999; Murdoch, 1994; Unyakiat, 1991; Woo, 2000).

EFL discourse communities have different contexts (e.g., non-native environment and NNES teachers) and different educational cultures and traditions. Yet, EFL discourse communities tend to follow ESL discourse community practices in a number of aspects (i.e., curriculum, instructional materials, and in teacher education). As a result, EFL countries not only become consumers of native English speaker expertise but also have the dilemma of dealing with the conflicts and confusion between western-imposed practices and their traditional educational cultures (Nayar, 1997; Pennycook, 1994).

Context-Specific TESOL Theories/Practices

In spite of the different contexts, concerns and issues that each TESOL discourse community has, an ELT discourse community tends to follow a Center ESL discourse community as a model or norm. (Canagarajah, 1999b; Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992). Pennycook (1989) is concerned with the discrepancies of the context and the adequacy of Center TESOL teacher education.

Teachers who have studied in the prestigious institutions in the West and have imbibed TESOL orthodoxies, are faced, on their return, with the serious problem of the contradiction between the need to validate themselves and their newly gained knowledge, and the feeling that it is nevertheless largely inappropriate. (p.611)

Holliday (1994), who investigated a periphery EFL country, claims that a Periphery academic culture (nonnative-English speaking countries) has a different academic culture from Center (native-English speaking countries) culture and illustrates why some of the teaching theories and practices that have been successful in NES (Native-English Speaking) countries are not successful in NNES (Nonnative-English Speaking) countries. For example, in the professional-academic culture of a NNES teacher group, there is a strong connection between the disciplines of literature or linguistics and teacher groups. As such, NNES teacher groups often follow the practices of the disciplines where they were trained. In addition, hard-earned knowledge in linguistics or literature is more valued than language skills. Therefore, in teacher training, English language teaching methodology is often taught as a highly formalized content subject, which may offer practical methods of language teaching (e.g., demonstration). For this different culture, pedagogical features such as the learner-centered, skill-based, discovery problem-solving, and holistic approaches to

learning are not as successful in NNEs countries as they are in NES countries. Hickey and Williams (1996) claim that these kinds of pedagogical features, typical of CLT, are difficult if not impossible to implement in EFL contexts, because CLT can be best learned experientially, through meaning-oriented use, and through such programs as immersion and content-based instructional programs in native English environments.

CLT, however, has been exported to peripheral contexts and promoted as an innovative language teaching method without much consideration of applicability and appropriateness. Sun and Cheng (2002), through their ethnographic study in a Chinese university, argue that “context assessment” (p.83) is necessary before designing a curriculum because, “there exists huge diversity in values, traditions, cultures, political regimes, and educational structures in EFL countries”(p.68). They, therefore, argue that if CLT or other such methods are to be tried out in EFL contexts, it is of great importance to appropriately adapt and tailor those methods to the context. Similarly, Holliday (1994) argues that teaching theories and practices need to be developed based on local specific culture and context. What is crucial is a careful examination of individual, social, and cultural contexts in which language teaching and learning occur. In addition to these kinds of promotion of context-and cultural-specific TESOL theories and practices, a number of studies have discussed ELT teacher education from critical perspectives.

Critical Approach to TESOL Education

With regard to TESOL education, Pennycook (1999, 2001) proposes a critical approach to TESOL by first locating aspects of TESOL within a broader, critical view of social and political relations, and then, including a means of transformation.

Kumaravadivelu (2001) suggests conceptualizing pedagogy of *particularity*, *practicality* and *possibility* in L2 learning/ teaching and L2 teacher education. The pedagogy of *practicality* promotes a teacher-generated theory of practice, while the pedagogy of *possibility* advocates equal power relationships inside and outside the education system. The pedagogy of *particularity* highlights context-specific and location-specific pedagogy considering the particularity of a group of teachers, learners, goals, in their specific institutional context and sociocultural surroundings. In L2 teacher education, he suggests that teacher educators should incorporate prospective teachers' experiences, voices, and visions into the curriculum through dialogues.

Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999), who investigated the critical perspective of NNES student teachers in a TESOL program, maintain that current TESOL practices tend to silence international TESOLers. Although international students are valuable resources to bring their experience and values to TESOL discourse communities, the researchers report that international students do not see themselves

as active, contributing members in the field. Furthermore, they argue that TESOL teacher education needs to reexamine international students' experiences and to explore how their goals and values contribute to the TESOL field, thereby allowing L2 teacher education program's goals to include a diversity of international contexts, and keep a balance between ESL and EFL/EAL contexts.

Ramanathan (2002) encourages teachers to reflect critically in regard to the issues of the discipline's social practices, and their individual participation in these practices in *Politics of TESOL Education*. She suggests that prospective teachers should be encouraged to be aware of their socializing process into their respective discourse communities through active reflection and the questioning of the discipline's practices and norms. In so doing, they can be aware of how their program shapes their thoughts, how their larger profession functions, and how they can transform discourse communities.

According to these researchers, it is imperative that teacher educators in TESOL education aid prospective teachers in raising critical awareness, engaging dialogues, and acting as an agent of change and transformation. Since those students in TESOL education are the ones who will teach students in ESL, EFL/EAL communities upon graduation, what they learn during their graduate study can have a great impact on their practice.

Yet, little has been explored about what international graduate students from other TESOL discourse communities are critically aware of, and how they engage themselves in their U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities. The above-mentioned researchers/teacher educators question if graduate students are critically aware of the practices of their discourse communities and textual knowledge. This has become one of the main research inquiries for this study—international graduate students’ perceptions of their discourse community, particularly their graduate program. The next section of this literature review will establish the rationale for why graduate students’ learning can be viewed as participation in their discourse communities and how they participate in them.

Situated Learning and Academic Socialization

The Sociocultural Approach to Learning

The central theme of sociocultural or sociohistorical theory of learning is that learning happens through social activity as well as individual activity. This sociocultural approach posits that learning is not an individual act of receiving knowledge; it is a social, relational, and dynamic act between individuals and communities of practice. Therefore, it shifts the focus from individual behavior (e.g., behaviorism) and individual mind (e.g., cognitivism) to social and cultural

interactions (Cole, 1985). This movement has occurred in education and social sciences during the last several decades (Gee, 2000).

One of the widely cited concepts of social learning theory is Vygotsky's *zone of proximal development*, which suggests that learners' higher cognitive learning processes can occur through scaffolded and assisted interactions with more experienced people. The zone of proximal development "...is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (as cited in Lantolf & Appel, 1994, p.10). That is, novices who are incapable of performing the task by themselves can complete it with the assistance of or collaboration with experienced peers or masters. They then eventually internalize the learning and perform the task independently and autonomously. Therefore, social interactions are as significant as individual cognitive activities for successful learning.

In conjunction with the Vygotsky's *zone of proximal development* concept, Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998) have developed an apprenticeship model in which apprentices (newcomers) learn their communities of practices (discourse community) through observation, interaction and participation in the practices of the community. Newcomers increase their engagements more over time until they

participate fully in the communities of practice and become experts. The core concept of *situated learning* that Lave and Wenger argue for is that learning takes places as “an integral and inseparable aspect of social practice” (p.31), and through participation at multiple levels. Moreover, it is important to note that novices are not simply replicating transmitted knowledge and culture of their discourse communities; they are transforming the communities of practices through critical reflection and active engagement. However, their learning process is not always open and easy because old members can restrict the new members’ access to information through selection and control. Therefore, the dynamics of power relationships is one of the inherent characteristics of every discourse community.

Prior (1998) conceptualizes graduate education by adopting Lave and Wenger’s (1991) notion that learning happens through participation in discourse communities such as working on research projects, writing research papers, and interacting with peers and professors. He further argues that students’ learning takes place in the process of complex and multiple ways of disciplinary socialization rather than through clear and unified forms of receiving knowledge, skills and language of their disciplines. If so, how does NNES graduate students’ learning happen? And how do NNES graduate students participate in their discourse communities? More importantly, how are they positioned in the system and how does their subjectivity

make things different within a particular system? These questions suggest the second main research inquiry of this study—international graduate students’ academic socialization modes in their TESOL discourse communities.

Issues on International Graduate Students’ Disciplinary Socialization

Prior (1998) asserts that dominant cultural representations of academic work should not be taken for granted as “rational, asocial, impersonal, and disembodied” activities (p.19). Rather, graduate students’ disciplinary socialization processes are contextual, social, political, and personal, and involve numerous issues inside and outside their graduate discourse communities (Casanave, 2002; Prior, 1991, 1998). Schneider and Fujishima’s (1995) and Casanave’s (1995) respective case studies reveal the significant roles of the social, contextual, and personal dimension in graduate students’ discourse enculturation processes. Morita (2000, 2004) discusses discourse socialization issues of a group of international graduate students, particularly, their oral participation in their classroom discussions. According to her study, these discourse socialization processes involve students’ subjectivity to negotiate and transform their socially constructed identities. Similarly, Prior (1998) describes that NNES graduate students’ learning is not being a unilateral process of fitting themselves into the existing system by internalizing their discipline’s language,

rules and knowledge. Rather, graduate students' learning is a far more complicated process of negotiation and transformation.

The following sections attempt to present the issues that international graduate students might have in the process of academic socialization into the U.S.-based TESOL discourse community. These include taking courses, writing academic papers, participating orally in discussions and seminars, presenting their research, practicing what they learn through practicums and internships, or teaching assistantships, interacting with colleagues and professors, and working on research projects.

Coursework

Ramanathan (2002) notes that courses offered in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities have different features, in accordance with institutional and departmental history and culture. In addition, syllabi and course readings, depending on the existing culture and faculty's individual research and teaching interests, shape not only the culture of the program, but also students in the program (Ramanathan, Davies, & Schleppegrell, 2001). With a U.S.-based TESOL program that belongs to a linguistics department, such theoretical linguistics courses as phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics are emphasized. On the other hand, TESOL programs from English departments have a tendency to focus on teaching skills of composition, L2

writing issues, and rhetoric. Furthermore, when L2 education belongs to a school of education, the programs are initially focused on K-12 ESL education and pay more attention to educational issues, such as curriculum development, instructional practice, and evaluation, than on linguistic issues (Ramanathan, 2002).

In regard to general linguistics courses such as phonology, morphology, and syntax, students in a U.S.-based TESOL program questioned their value for pre-service teachers. However, Ramanathan (2002) reports that the faculty of the program perceived that a number of required courses in general linguistics is imperative because students need to know linguistics basics, which will aid their ultimate professional development. Liu's (1999) survey of international students in TESOL teacher preparation education in the USA, however, reports many international student participants' preference for learning language usage over advanced grammar, about which they already have a strong knowledge base. Govardhan, Nayar and Sheorey (1999) point out the inadequacy of offered courses in U.S. TESOL programs to prepare prospective applicants to teach abroad. They suggest that U.S. TESOL programs should consider courses that would develop awareness of language functions in different contexts, cross-linguistic aspects of language learning, socio-cultural aspects, besides the principles and practices of L2 pedagogy. Yet, little is known about what courses international students perceive to be useful and what

courses they do not appreciate or do not feel are useful when they want to implement teaching in their home countries.

Therefore, it is crucial to examine what courses are offered and how graduate students perceive the courses they are taking for their professional development.

International students from different backgrounds, especially those with different goals, may perceive their coursework from different perspectives than their domestic American counterparts.

Academic Writing

The academic writing of NNES students in postsecondary schools has been regarded as one of the most significant factors in students' academic success. Swales (1990) characterizes a discourse community as a socio-rhetorical group that has different ways of knowledge and ideas which are communicated. Therefore, it is imperative to learn discipline-specific and target audience-specific writing conventions for successful academic writing. This leads to extensive research and debate on the topics of non-native English speakers' socialization processes across the disciplines, including rhetorical issues (Atkinson, 1997; Biggs, Lai, Tang & Lavelle, 1999; Kubota, 1998, 1999; Matsuda, 1997; Prior, 1998).

In regard to academic socialization through academic writing tasks, Atkinson (1997) proposes a socio-cognitive approach to writing instruction, (i.e., a cognitive

apprenticeship model—*modeling, coaching and fading*). He proposes this model as an alternative way of teaching western critical thinking style to NNES students, under the assumption that critical thinking is a social practice that is not easy to define, and is taught in a reduced and decontextualized way. However, the apprenticeship model has been criticized as an imposition of particular Center writing conventions on NNES students. Kubota (1999) suggests that NNES students' academic writing has been stigmatized and marginalized through essentializing (i.e., stereotyping) their writing, (e.g., lack of critical thinking). Rhetoric skills, founded in NNES students' academic writing, are different depending on their education and level of consciousness about different writing styles (Matsuda, 1997).

Although issues of academic writing have been investigated and discussed extensively, the individual voices of international students in TESOL discourse communities, regarding their academic writing and its implications for their graduate study, have not been heard enough.

Academic Oral Participation

Oral academic participation through seminars, discussions, and presentations, constitutes a significant part of graduate students' school lives. However, while a large number of studies have scrutinized international students' academic writing, little research exists concerning their academic oral participation.

Morita (2000) examines discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program in Canada and reports three types of challenges that international students face in oral academic participation: linguistic, sociocultural, and psychological. International participants in the research study report a lack of confidence in English and background knowledge of the topic as well as different kinds of classroom interactions. To compensate for those challenges, they adopt a variety of strategies such as incorporating audiovisual aids, using their native cultural or linguistic resources, collaborating with others, and soliciting audience participation. She asserts that in spite of international students' language difficulties, many internationals were as successful as NESs in their oral academic participation in class by bringing their unique experiences and expertise to class.

In another similar Morita (2004) study on international graduate students' academic discourse socialization, particularly in classroom discussions, she claims that the participation of international graduate students in their academic communities is legitimate. They are not simply a marginalized group of students; rather they are negotiating and transforming their marginally positioned identities. Morita's studies (2000, 2004) are important in that her research sheds light on international students' academic oral participation. Yet, it has not been discussed sufficiently how

international graduate students are aware of their oral participation—if they have difficulty in oral participation, and what causes this difficulty.

Field Teaching Experience

Ramanathan, Davis, and Schleppegrell (2001) note that the practicum serves as a justification supporting the department, a training ground, and research site for graduate students in TESOL programs. Furthermore, it provides opportunities for students to practice what they learn throughout coursework, preparing themselves for work after graduation. The practicum can shape general coursework of the program, especially method courses, forming the focus of the program. The place of the practicum can be different, depending on the departmental focus hosting the TESOL programs. For example, student teachers' field experience can have a wide range of variety, including work in an English language training institute, a refugee center, a community college, and in K-12 schools (Ramanathan, 2002).

Kamhi-Stein (1999) argues that NNES practicum students, or professionals in TESOL, are challenged in other ways that their NES counterparts may not experience. She reports that “parental distrust on the basis of ethnicity and language status, a poor self-image, and a lack of role models in the TESOL profession” (p. 145) can challenge NNES teachers in the ESL context. Furthermore, NNES students perceive that their English proficiency is not sufficient to teach a higher level of students. Not

only their social perception but also their own low confidence about their non-native status challenges them as professionals in ESL discourse communities.

However, international graduate students who responded to a survey concerning how they perceive their non-native status in TESOL professionals, report that NNES teachers have advantages in that they are sensitive to students' needs and have a great efficiency in teaching in EFL contexts (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). Other studies (Medgyes, 1999; Roberts, 1998) point out NNES teachers' linguistic and cultural sensitivity, empathy for students' learning processes and difficulties as major strengths of NNES teachers, whereas, they lack native speaker intuition such as idiomatic expressions and culturally embedded information. The challenges that international graduate students face in their practicum experience have not fully been addressed yet, nor how those international graduate students in the practicum perceive their experience in ESL contexts, and how they interact with their mentoring teachers, school systems, students and parents.

Collaboration and Interaction

It is assumed that graduate students' learning takes place through participation in their discourse communities. That is, learning does not happen in a unified and visible way through the transmission of knowledge (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As earlier noted, scaffolded and assisted learning, through interaction and

cooperation, is essential for successful learning, especially for newcomers to the discourse community. Kamhi-Stein (1999) encourages international student teachers to engage in collaborative projects. Her assumption is that collaborative work allows NNES students to excel, compared with their NES peers, because they have a first-hand experience and understanding of linguistic and cultural needs. Leki's (2002) study, however, argues that group projects that NNES students are involved in with NES colleagues can be far more complicated than would be assumed because of power differentials that the system and the context inherently entail. She notes that the group projects in her study had a propensity to put NNES students into a powerless and helpless position, due to their non-native status and lack of social practices, even though those NNES students could make a significant contribution to the project by providing different perspectives. Similarly, Prior's (1998) research on a group project of NES and NNES graduate students reports that a NNES graduate student's participation in a research project was severely limited due to his lack of language proficiency and background knowledge of the practices of the community.

In Dong's (1998) study, the NNES students in science departments perceived that they worked in isolation without appropriate social networks and support, compared with their NES counterparts in their research writing; this prevented them from participating fully in their disciplinary community. Dong feels that NNES

students' lack of interaction and supportive networks are due to the fact that both NNEs and NES are reluctant to engage in dialogue with each other. He reports that in their relationships with advisors, NNEs' students' expectations were different than NES' expectations. For example, Asian students want more help and want to be given more guidance than NES students. Dong states that in general, advisors believe they give more time and effort to help NNEs students, whereas NNEs students perceive themselves as getting less help than their NES counterparts. Furthermore, he argues that supervisors tend to encourage NES students more than NNEs students to submit their research for publication. This may hamper NNEs students' further participation in their academic discourse community, since the circulation of research through publication is a strong indication of full participation in the discourse community, and a recognized index of being a full-time member of the target discourse community.

Belcher's (1994) study on relationships between advisors and international doctoral students maintains that collaborative relationships underlie the success of students' induction into their academic discourse communities. Hence, she suggests that it is imperative for mentoring professors to trust, support and encourage students. Similarly, Krase's (2003) case study on ESL students' academic disciplinary socialization processes also shows how essential it is to construct good relationships between mentors and students, and to have an insider's support. Yet, little attention

has been paid to how international graduate students perceive their relationships with their mentors in TESOL academic graduate discourse communities.

Research Project

While graduate students are taking coursework, they are encouraged to conduct research as a class assignment, in addition to their thesis or dissertation at the end of their coursework. Previous studies on ESL academic writing focus heavily on their writing activities without considering research topics and interests of international graduate students. Although Flowerdew (1999a, 1999b, 2000) draws on the issues of NNES scholars' research writing for publication in mainstream journals, by examining NNES scholars' perceptions on their writing, challenges, and the publishing process, little has been shown on what their research interests are. As noted earlier, if there exists a significant underrepresentation of EFL/EAL discourse communities in TESOL research literature, it is crucial to investigate how international students utilize their learning/teaching experiences which stem from their native TESOL discourse communities for their research, and how their concerns and experiences are reflected in their research. For example, Prior's (1998) observation of two international graduate students in a research class exemplifies that those international students were using their native language and its relevant issues for their research. Thus, it is of great importance to shed light on what interests or

concerns international graduate students have and how they use them for their research projects.

Summary

This chapter presented a review of literature on different global TESOL discourse communities and the issues of academic socialization. Specifically, the discrepancies of EFL, EAL, and ESL discourse communities were discussed in the attempt to understand international students' perceptions of U.S.-based TESOL graduate discourse communities. For academic socialization processes of graduate students, the Vygotskian notion of social interactions of learning, such as *situated learning*, was illustrated (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In addition, academic activities such as coursework, academic writing, oral participation, and field teaching experience were addressed in this chapter. These activities also involved cooperation and interactions with peers and professors.

Based on the results of the published research presented in this chapter, it appears that international graduate students from different discourse communities may have more challenges in their academic socialization processes in U.S.-based TESOL (ESL) discourse communities than their NES counterparts.

Chapter III will outline the methodology of the present study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methodology in this study, consisting of data collection and data analysis procedures. A description of the study's research design is followed by research paradigm, data collection methods, and the role of researcher. Next, the sampling method, background information of research participants, their TESOL graduate programs, and research instrumentation are presented. Finally, the procedures for data analysis are discussed.

Research Design

This section presents the Research Paradigm, the Role of the Researcher, and the Data Collection Methods of this study.

Research Paradigm

In order to investigate how international graduate students perceive their graduate discourse communities, and how they socialize in their respective ESL graduate discourse communities, the ideal research type is a qualitative study. Qualitative research is an “inquiry that helps us understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena” (Merriam, 1998, p.5). According to Denzin and Lincoln (2000),

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the

world visible . . . Qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (p.3)

Due to the interpretive, naturalistic and holistic nature of qualitative research, it is vital to address the ontological and epistemological research paradigm at the outset of research (Hatch, 2002). While ontology is the way of viewing the nature of reality, epistemology defines the relationship of the knower (researcher) to the known (researched) (Creswell, 1994).

An underlying paradigm of this research is the critical/feminist research perspective. In terms of the ontology of this research, a critical/feminist research paradigm considers “reality shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender values” (Lincoln and Guba, 2000, p. 165). The epistemology of this research embraces the notion that the knower (researcher) cannot be separated from the known (researched) and knowledge is always subjective and value-laden (Olesen, 2000).

Therefore, the role of the researcher is not just as a tool to gather data and analyze it with mechanical objectivity. Rather, the researcher plays various active roles in constructing meaning throughout the research process (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

This study also considers adopting feminist research tactics such as constructing

collaborative participatory relationships between the researcher and the researched (Fontana & Frey, 2000).

Role of the Researcher

Due to the nature of qualitative research as being interactive and interpretive (Creswell, 1994), the researcher's bias (i.e., researcher's worldview, assumptions, and theoretical orientation) affects the overall research design, data collection, and analysis and interpretation of the data. From the traditional positivist perspective, a researcher's bias in qualitative research has been questioned as a barrier that should be removed to increase the validity of the research. This validity is a matter of truth; and many constructivist researchers agree that in qualitative research, there exist multiple truths (Shank, 2002). These truths are constructed through the researcher's perspective. As a result, Merriam (1998) and Shank (2002) argue that it is critical that the researcher's worldview or "bias" or "basis for creating reality" should be revealed explicitly at the beginning of the study (Shank, 2002, p. 92-93). In so doing, readers can know how the researcher's values influence the conduct and conclusions of the study.

Furthermore, postmodern thoughts and feminist qualitative research theories reject the claims of the positivist view that good science should be "free of individual bias and subjectivity" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p.10). Harding's (1996) call for self-

critical examination of the researcher and Haraway's (1988) *situated knowledges* are seminal works about the importance of the researcher's reflexive subjectivity, which increases the trustworthiness of the knowledge presented. Haraway urges that the researcher's position be grounded in a historical, cultural and social context. Thus, the researcher's partial and imperfect views are not only legitimate but also ethical in that the researcher takes full responsibility for the knowledge presented—that is, *situated knowledges*.

Hence, espousing the feminist notion of researchers' *situated knowledges*, the researcher of this study (hereafter, I) locates herself. In this way, this research can become embodied and situated, which includes how my location as a researcher can shape this research from the design to the interpretation of the findings.

I am a non-native English-speaking graduate student who is pursuing a doctoral degree in an ESL education program in a major university in the U.S. Before I came to the U.S. for graduate study, I was an English teacher in secondary schools in Korea for a decade. Although I have 10 years of English learning experience and almost 10 years of teaching experience, my adjustment to the U.S.-based TESOL discourse community has been challenging, not only because of a lack of academic language proficiency, but also because of a lack of background knowledge of the ESL discourse community. I feel that my experience has found few outlets for expression,

and I could not find an academic space for myself in this new discourse community.

My experience as an international graduate student in an ESL discourse community initiated this research and sets up the inquiries of this study—how other international graduate students perceive their discourse communities, how they engage themselves in them, and where and how they find their own academic space during their graduate studies.

Data Collection Methods

From a variety of strategies of conducting qualitative research, this study utilizes interview studies in order to explore the international graduate students' perceptions of their respective TESOL academic discourse communities and the process of their academic socialization. The most widely-used data collection methods for a qualitative study are interviewing, observing, and documenting. Among those, Merriam (1998) notes that the interview is the preferred method in qualitative research in that it allows data collection on a small budget. Similarly, McCracken (1988) claims that an interview is valuable as a means of inquiry due to two factors, "time scarcity and concern for privacy"(p.11). In addition to the merits of the interview method as a means of data collection in terms of time, cost, and privacy, Merriam (1998) maintains that interviewing is necessary when researchers cannot observe feelings, thoughts, intentions, and perceptions, and it is an especially

important tool when researchers examine their participants' past experiences. Thus, for this study, the aim of which is to investigate international graduate students' perceptions and their experiences, the interview is an appropriate tactic as a primary method of collecting data. Furthermore, documentation gathered from online and offline sources is used as a second means of collecting data.

In order to investigate relationships and relevant issues that are highly individual and contextual, case study is a proper approach. However, due to the challenges of time management and accessibility to different institutional programs, this research study did not adopt a case study approach *per se*, the latter of which requires gathering data for a sustained period of time (Merriam, 1998). Furthermore, since the main purpose of this research is to hear international graduate students' voices, in particular, their own perceptions of their TESOL graduate programs and their participation in them, interviewing is the most legitimate way of hearing their voices.

Qualitative research also promotes such techniques as *thick description* and *member checks* to increase the validity of the data (Merriam, 1998). According to Merriam (1998), *thick description* describes all the relevant background information of the research context, the researched, and the relationship between the researcher and the researched, in great detail. *Member checks* entail taking data and provisional

interpretation back to the research participants and asking them if the results are reasonable. Thus, to increase the validity (trustworthiness) of this study, *thick description* and *member checks* were employed.

Data Collection

This section presents Sampling Method, Data Collection Procedures, Research Participants, and Participants' TESOL Graduate Programs.

Sampling Method

Since generalization in a statistical sense is not a goal of qualitative research, and the purpose of qualitative research is to explore the implications and relationships of occurrences, nonprobability sampling/purposeful sampling is an appropriate method of sampling (Merriam, 1998). The most common method of purposeful sampling is *network (chain or snowball)* sampling. This sampling strategy involves asking each participant or a group of people to refer the researcher to other eligible participants. In doing so, researchers can obtain pertinent participants who can give relevant information.

Setting criteria is essential in purposeful sampling in order to elicit rich and pertinent information cases. Therefore, the criteria for selecting the participants of this study were that they be: non-native English-speaking international graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL programs, whose stay in the program is more than one year;

who earned their bachelor's degree in their home countries; and who came from East Asia EFL countries. The reason for selecting only graduate students is that not only are many TESOL programs offered in graduate courses, but also undergraduate study is not quite discipline-specific, at least in the first two years. Graduate study is more likely to develop disciplinary characteristics through participation in graduate seminars, working on research projects or papers, and cooperation with peers and professors. Prior's (1998) work on disciplinary enculturation focuses on only graduate students in that regard. The reason for specifying the participants' stay as being more than one year is that it is assumed that it takes time for them to reflect upon their graduate study and their participation modes. Newly arrived students are less likely to be aware of their discourse communities since they have not taken classes and have not often interacted with people within their discourse communities. The reason for limiting participants to students from East Asia EFL contexts is that data can be too complex to analyze if both groups from EAL and EFL contexts are mixed; EAL and EFL contexts may have different agendas and concerns. As a result, those potential research participants' perceptions, concerns, and participation modes can be different, which is more likely to complicate the analysis of data.

With regard to the number of participants in this type of qualitative research, Merriam (1998) claims that there is not a right answer for the question. McCracken

(1988) suggests eight participants as being sufficient for interview studies. For this study, nine research participants were recruited through the following procedures.

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection procedures of this research occurred in the following chronological order. First, the research project was approved by the institutional research review board in May 2004. A small-scale pilot study was conducted to test the interview guide questions in May 2004. Next, the research participants were recruited from June through October, and over the same period of time the interviews with each participant were conducted. Finally, E-mails and phone contacts with follow-up questions were made from November through January as the research progressed.

In conducting this study, the following issues were considered as well: research ethics for maintaining the participants' confidentiality and sampling criteria. Concerning the confidentiality issues of the research participants, the researcher took proper procedures to protect the confidentiality of the research participants. In order to obtain permission to conduct this research, an application form for conducting research involving human subjects (Form B) was submitted to the IRB (Institutional Review Board) at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The research began upon the receipt of the permission from the IRB. The researcher tried to maintain

confidentiality of the participants throughout the research. Therefore, their names appeared as pseudonyms, and the universities that they were attending also were given other names. The collected data were only accessible to the researcher and the committee members for this research study. The data also would be destroyed upon the completion of the research.

Before conducting interviews for the present study, the researcher conducted a pilot study to test interview guide questions. In so doing, not only did the researcher practice interview techniques, but also she was able to recognize unclear questions that need rewording and identify useless questions that needed to be removed. Two international graduate students in ESL education at The University of Tennessee were asked to participate in the pilot study: one participant was a student in a master's degree program in ESL education, and the other participant was a student in a Ph. D degree program in ESL education. The criteria for selecting the participants for the pilot study were the same as that for the actual research. The pilot study was conducted while the researcher was awaiting the IRB approval from the university. After each interview, the researcher asked the participant of the pilot study which questions were not clear enough to understand and what suggestions he/she had. In addition, while listening to the interviews repeatedly, the researcher identified some

questions which needed rearticulating. Through this process, the final interview protocol was developed (see Appendix A).

The final nine selected research participants were enrolled in four TESOL graduate programs located in four different states. Each university's TESOL program is called, Alpha, Beta, Delta, and Gamma throughout this research. Although each research participant's TESOL graduate program had a different department name (i.e., ESL, Applied Linguistics, and TESOL), an umbrella term, TESOL, was used for confidentiality and consistency issues.

Nine research participants were recruited through different network channels. Three participants were enrolled in the Alpha university program. I met two of them at a regional TESOL conference and another participant in the same program was introduced to me later by one of them. Three research participants who were enrolled in the Beta university program were recruited through their department. I contacted the department head and obtained a list of international graduate students' E-mails. Potential research participants were randomly selected and E-mails were sent out. Three out of six potential participants who received the E-mails agreed to participate in this study. Two participants who were enrolled in the Delta university program were introduced by a senior scholar and agreed to participate in this study. Another

research participant who was enrolled in the Gamma university program agreed to participate in this study during an international TESOL conference in 2004.

With 5 research participants, face-to-face interviews were conducted, while phone interviews occurred with four of them. However, I met 8 participants in person to ask their permission to participate in an actual interview. In the case of phone interviews, I sent a copy of the interview protocol via E-mails before the interview was conducted to facilitate the actual interviews. Each interview took approximately 1 hour or 1 and 1/2 hours each. Following the interview, *member checks* and further questions that need to be investigated were asked through E-mail correspondence (see Table 1).

In conducting interviews, a feminist interview technique was adopted. I tried to engage in a real conversation by using “give-and-take and shared empathic understanding” (Fontana & Frey, 2000, p.660). However, I did not impose my opinions on them or lead them into certain directions. I tried to create a safe environment so that they could feel comfortable enough to share their thoughts and experiences with me. In addition, I am also an international graduate student like my research participants; it constructed a balanced power relationship between the interviewer and the interviewees, making it easy to create rapport.

Table 1

Interview Information

	Interview Type	Interview Time (Mins.)	Recruitment Channel	Interviews (2004)	Member-checks & Follow-up questions
Tomo	Phone	60	Conference	Oct. 16	11/22, 12/15
Young-Ju	Face-to-face	80	Department	June 22	11/24, 12/6
Su-Mi	Phone	60	Conference	Oct. 9	11/24, 12/29
In-Su	Phone	80	Su-Mi	Oct. 21	11/24
Yuka	Phone	90	Conference	Aug. 8	12/21, 2/9
Mei	Face-to-face	80	Department	June 22	11/22
Ling	Face-to-face	70	Conference	July 31	11/27, 11/29
Bo	Face-to-face	80	Department	June 22	11/26, 12/29
Min	Face-to-face	80	Conference	June 31	11/28, 1/2

Research Participants

The background information of the 9 research participants (see Tables 2 and 3), including how and where I met and interviewed them, how the interview went, and what impressions I received while each interview was taking place, follow.

Tomo

I met Tomo at a regional TESOL conference. Tomo was a co-presenter at a session where I attended as an audience member. He is a 25-year old native Japanese student, working on his master's degree at the Alpha University TESOL program. He was in his 3rd semester in the program when the interview occurred. Prior to joining the program, he had been in another part of U.S. for 6 months, taking an international study course at another university. His undergraduate major was English Language and Literature, and he worked at a *juku* school in Japan for a year. The *juku* is a private institution designed to prepare students for the college entrance exam. For this reason, his job was to teach grammar.

During the interview, he spoke slowly and took time to express his opinions. Nevertheless, he was very enthusiastic and cooperative throughout the interview and our following interactions. Although I do not know the result of the interview if we spoke in his native language, he was quite understandable in English, our common language.

Table 2				
<i>Background Information of Master's Students</i>				
	Tomo	Young-Ju	Su-Mi	In-Su
Gender	Male	Female	Female	Male
Nationality	Japan	Korea	Korea	Korea
Native Language	Japanese	Korean	Korean	Korean
Age	25	33	25	41
Current Program	Alpha	Beta	Alpha	Alpha
Semesters in the Program	3 rd semester	3 rd semester	3 rd semester	4 th semester
Yrs in the NES Countries	2	7	2.5	2
Undergraduate Degree	English Language & Literature	Food & Nutrition	Biology	English Education
Work Experience	1 yr. at a <i>juku</i> school in Japan	3 yrs. at an airline in Korea		11 yrs. in high schools in Korea

Table 3

Background Information of Doctoral Students

	Yuka	Ling	Min	Mei	Bo
Gender	Female	Female	Male	Female	Male
Nationality	Japan	Taiwan	China	China	China
Native Language	Japanese	Mandarin	Hakka	Mandarin	Mandarin
Age	32	38	31	29	37
Current Program	Gamma	Delta	Delta	Beta	Beta
Yrs. in the Program	4th year	4th year	4 th year	2 nd year	3rd year
Yrs. in the NES Countries	7	7	4	3	3
Master's Degree	TESOL in the USA	Education in the USA	English Education in China	TESOL in New Zealand	ELT in UK
Undergraduate Degree	English Language & Literature	History	Teaching Language & Literature		
Work Experience	Private language institutions	3 yrs. at a university in Taiwan	2 yrs. at a University in China	2 yrs. at a university in China	10 yrs. at a university in China

Young-Ju

I met Young-Ju at her university's main library. We exchanged a few E-mails to arrange the interview schedule before I traveled to interview her. The interview took place in Korean. She is a native Korean student who is in her 3rd semester in the Beta University TESOL program. She was 33 years old and married with a 5 year-old son. She has been in the U.S. for 7 years due to her husband's study. However, she had not worked or studied in the U.S. until she began her master's degree in the program 2 years ago. Her undergraduate major was Food and Nutrition, and she had worked for an airline in Korea for 3 years. Although she had had 2 years of English tutoring experience, she did not have teaching experience in formal school settings and did not have any type of formal training experience in the TESOL area. She was, however, a graduate assistant in the university ESL testing center. In addition to this, she was teaching Korean at a Korean community language school once a week.

Su-Mi

Su-mi was at my session at a regional TESOL conference, where I presented a paper. After my presentation, I introduced myself to her and asked her to be a research participant. It was her first attendance at a TESOL-related conference. Su-mi was a 25 year-old native Korean student and was enrolled in the TESOL master's program at Alpha University. She had been in the program 1 and 1/2 years and had

one semester left to finish her degree. Her undergraduate major was Biology, and she was initially admitted into the Biology department at the same university. After 1 year in the Biology department, she decided to change her major to TESOL education. Her strong interest in English and her experiences at the university ESL program led her to change her major. She had a good command of spoken English due to her early exposure to English through private language institutions, videotapes, and audiotapes in Korea. She began to learn English at 9 years of age, which is different from other participants whose first exposure to English began at 13 years old through formal school education. This helped her to have more confidence about her oral English while she was studying in the university and later affected her decision to change her major to TESOL. Our interview took place in Korean over the phone, although she expressed that she would not mind being interviewed in English.

In-Su

In-su is the only participant that I have not met in person. Another research participant, Sumi, introduced him to me. After the initial E-mail contact to arrange the interview schedule, the interview took place over the phone. Although I had not met In-su, the interview went smoothly, and he seemed to be comfortable enough to ask me the same questions that I had asked him. The reason for his degree of comfort may be that he and I had similar teaching experiences in Korea and in similar school

settings. Therefore, there was already a common ground on which to build rapport. He was a native Korean, 41 year-old, married with two children. His undergraduate major was English (EFL Education), and he taught English in high schools in Korea for 11 years. He lives with his two children and his wife who is working on her master's degree in the same program. He has been in the U.S. almost 2 years and was in his last semester in the master's program at the time of the interview.

Yuka

I met Yuka at the 2003 international TESOL conference for the first time. I was attending her session where she presented her research with her colleagues. After the session, I introduced myself to her. The next year, 2004, at the same conference in another city, we were staying at the same hotel. At the conference, I told her about my dissertation research, and she agreed to be a research participant. The interview with her was conducted over the phone.

Yuka was a Japanese student, working on her Ph.D. in the TESOL program at Gamma University. When the interview occurred, she had finished her coursework and was working on her dissertation. She is 32 years old and married, however, her husband was living in a different location due to his work. Her undergraduate degree was English Language and Literature in Japan. Her master's in TESOL degree was obtained at Gamma University, but in a different department. She pursued her Ph.D.

degree in another department because her master's program did not have a doctoral program. She has been in the states for 7 years. In addition, she had studied in the U.S. for 3 weeks during high school and 1 year during her junior year of college as an exchange student. She taught adult-level students at private institutes in Japan for about 5 years before attending the Gamma university program for her master's degree.

Ling

Ling was working on her dissertation at Delta University when I met her at a conference. However, a scholar in the field introduced us to each other through E-mails before the conference. Our interview took place in an empty room at the university where the conference was being held. She was from Taiwan and had 3 years of teaching experience at a university in Taiwan. Ling had been in the states for 7 years and received her master's degree in Education from another university in the U.S. Her undergraduate major was earned in History in Taiwan. She was 38 years old, and a mother of a five year-old daughter. After finishing her preliminary exam for her Ph.D., she left school for a personal reason and returned in 2003 to work on her dissertation. Therefore, there was a 2-year hiatus between her coursework completion and her dissertation.

Min

Min was a native Chinese student, working on his dissertation in the TESOL program at Delta University. I met him at a conference where he was presenting his research. A scholar in the TESOL field introduced me to him before the conference. The interview took place in an empty room at the university where the conference was being held. I found him to be confident, relaxed, and humorous. Min was 31 years old, and had been in the states for 4 years working on his Ph.D. When he entered the program, he had 2 years of teaching experience at a university in China. He earned his bachelor's degree in English Education, and his master's degree in English Language and Linguistics in China.

Mei

Mei was from China and was working on her Ph.D. at Beta university. She had been in the states for 2 years, including 1 year as a visiting scholar's wife. At the time of the interview, she had just finished her first year of Ph.D. study in the program. However, her study experience in a foreign country was not new. In New Zealand, she earned her master's degree in TESOL in 1 year. With 2 years of teaching at a university in China, she joined the Ph.D. program. Mei was 29 years old and married. Her husband was on a sabbatical year and he was staying with her in the U.S. The interview took place in the break room at the IEP (Intensive English Program)

where she was working as a teaching assistant. Throughout the interview, she was very attentive. Although she seemed to be relaxed, most of her responses were not long and extensive. Thus, I had to probe further questions to elicit more responses. However, her relaxed and friendly attitude made our interview smooth and very enjoyable.

Bo

Bo was a 37 year-old Chinese male. He had just finished his 2nd year of Ph.D. study at the Beta University when the interview occurred. He was one of the respondents to my random E-mails soliciting research participating. When he entered the program, he already had 10 years of teaching experience at a university in China. He earned his master's degree in English Language Teaching in the United Kingdom and his bachelor's degree in Teaching Language and Literature in China. He was married, but his wife remained in China because of her work there. During the interview, which took place in the break room of IEP where he was working as a teaching assistant, he was quite relaxed and communicative.

Participants' TESOL Graduate Programs

Nine participants in this research study were attending four different graduate programs in four different states. Each program has different attributes such as an ESL community in the region, academic community, history, faculty, and department

specialty. It is imperative to examine students' respective programs in order to understand them in the proper context. I was able to obtain information including courses offered through online sources and the websites for each individual program. However, I intentionally do not reveal web sources either in the text or in the reference list for this study in order to protect participants' identities. I only note the date I retrieved the information alongside each program's pseudonym.

Alpha University TESOL Program

Alpha university is a small state school located in a small college town in the South. According to the websites from Alpha University, retrieved on November 05, 2004, it has 10,100 students enrolled. The Master of Arts degree in TESOL (Teaching English to the Speakers of Other Languages) is offered in the department of English and Philosophy. However, there is no PhD program offered in the university's TESOL program. To be admitted to this TESOL program, international students should have a TOEFL score of 235 (575 on the paper-based test) or higher. Those students who score 195-234 (525- 574 on the paper-based test), but meet all other conditions, may be conditionally admitted. These TOEFL scores are higher than the scores that are required in the general admission of the university. For graduation, 34 course credit hours are required for the non-thesis track. Moreover, an hour oral exit examination is required along with the submission of students' portfolios. This

program has a state endorsement program to teach K-12 ESL for those who already hold a teaching certificate at elementary, middle, and secondary levels.

Beta University TESOL Program

Beta University is located in an urban area in the capital city of a southern state. The region where Beta University is located is one of the fastest-growing cities in the U.S., with a recent increase in the immigration population. The following information was retrieved from the school and the department websites on September 26, 2004. Not only is the university large, with about 30,000 students enrolled, but also a large number of students are matriculating their master's degrees in the university's TESOL program. In addition, the TESOL department developed a Ph.D. program in recent years. The well-informed website of the TESOL program contains a number of TESOL related organizations, announcements of conferences, papers and publications of faculty and students, and M.A. and Ph.D. program handbooks.

This website also presents the mission of the TESOL program, which is to serve and support those who are interested in Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second or Foreign language. The department is engaged in preparing ESL undergraduate and graduate students for U.S. colleges through English courses, teaching ESL to international students and residents of the region, testing the English proficiency of ESL students, workshops and programs, and pre-service and in-service

training. However, this program does not endorse nor license students to teach K-12 in the state.

To earn a master's degree, 36 credit hours are required. The Ph.D. program requirement is 30 credit hours of coursework, 21 dissertation hours, a qualifying paper, a comprehensive exam, and a dissertation. However, those students whose master's degrees are not earned in Applied Linguistics or the equivalent, prerequisite courses may be required. While there was no specific mention of a minimum TOEFL score for admittance into the master's program, to be admitted to the Ph.D. program, students must score a minimum of 600 (250 computer-based test) and a score of at least 5 on the Written test.

Delta University TESOL Program

Delta University is located in the capital city of a mid-western state. The following information was retrieved from the school and department websites on October 26, 2004. The campus has 27,000 students enrolled. This university has two different ESL-related programs. One is offered in the English department, with a concentration in preparing teachers for the adult and post-secondary level of ESL or EFL teaching. The other program prepares K-12 ESL teachers. This program belongs to the school of Education and supports state licensure or endorsement for K-12 ESL teaching.

Since two participants of this study were attending in the English department with an ESL concentration, I will here focus on the ESL graduate program in the English department. According to the website of the department, the TESOL M.A. program is integrated in the English department. An undergraduate degree in English is expected, with an exception being competency in academic English for graduate study. In addition, for international students, TOEFL and GRE scores are required. This department, however, did not specify the minimum TOEFL score. The only available information is a general TOEFL score required for admission to the university, which is 550 (213 computer-based test) or higher.

This program is involved in providing Academic writing courses either for international students or for American students. Furthermore, with its strong background in English composition, this program has a solid second language-writing component.

Gamma University TESOL Program

Gamma University is located in the capital city of a mid-western state. The following information was retrieved from the school and the department websites on November 05, 2004. The campus has 25,000 students enrolled. The Gamma TESOL graduate program offers M.A., M.Ed., and Ph.D. programs. The M.A. program is research-and theory-based and belongs to the school of Humanities, while the M.Ed

program, offered in the school of Education, is a pre-service or in-service teacher development program, and offers a initial licensure in K-12 ESL. However, the Ph.D. program is only offered in the school of Education.

The website states that the curriculum covers a wide range of second language programs and target populations, such as bilingual, immersion, and foreign (world) language education in both K-12 and post-secondary levels, and both in the U.S. and abroad. Although the program addresses the issues common to the adult and post-secondary level, the focus of the program is in a K-12 teaching context. The Second Language graduate program benefits from the surrounding metropolitan area where a large number of language minority learners reside. The program is also closely tied with such programs as immersion schools of Spanish and French and foreign (world) language education in elementary schools. Furthermore, a research Center of Language Acquisition within the university provides graduate assistantship opportunities, and faculty and graduate students are involved in various projects of addressing diverse issues of second language and culture education. The minimum TOEFL score to be accepted at this university is 213 (computer-based test). However, there is no TOEFL score specified for admission to this particular department.

Instrumentation

This section presents the main data collection techniques of this study:

Interview and Documentation.

Interview

The interview technique for this study was a semi-structured interview, which, according to Merriam (1998), is between highly structured (e.g., oral form of a survey) and unstructured interviews (e.g., flexible and exploratory conversation). She claims that a semi-structured interview has the following characteristics:

The largest part of the interview is guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored, and neither the exact wording nor the order of the questions is determined ahead of time. This format allows the researcher to respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic. (p.74)

By employing a type of semi-structured interview, I was able to investigate specific inquiries efficiently and with less time and effort than structured and open interviews.

A set of pre-established interview guide questions were constructed, based on inquiries raised through the review of literature concerning the issues of international graduate students' disciplinary socialization in U.S.-based TESOL discourse

communities (see Appendix A). The following was considered in constructing research questions.

The first set of interview guide questions about the participants' perceptions of their discourse communities was constructed based on critical TESOL education issues suggested by such researchers as Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999), Kumaravadivelu (2001), Pennycook (1999), and Ramanathan (2002). These questions: Are international graduate students aware of the practices of their discourse community and social context? More importantly, are they critically aware of them?

The second set of questions regarding graduate students' participation modes in discourse communities was built based on the notion of Lave and Wenger (1991)'s *situated learning*. Specifically, a series of guide questions explore how international graduate students in TESOL discourse communities engage themselves in taking courses, working on research projects, writing papers, participating orally, teaching in the field, and interacting with colleagues and professors. Through these interview questions, this study extends its discussion to issues concerning the relationships between the individual international graduate students and the contexts in which they are situated—how they are positioned in the context of U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities, and how their subjectivity may make a difference.

To discover answers to the above inquiries, a set of semi-structured interview guide questions were asked of the participants in this study. Although I had a set of interview questions, I tried not to interrupt or lead the participants' responses. As a result, the questions were not asked in sequence and each participant had his or her own concern and emphasis that took him or her more time to respond to particular questions than others.

Documentation

The purpose of collecting relevant documents for topics of inquiry is to enrich or enhance the credibility of the study (Merriam, 1998). Some of these documents are used to verify, supplement or contradict the arguments that are made by the participants. In order to understand the contexts where the participants of this study were matriculating, information of their respective university and TESOL graduate programs were collected through online sources. The collected information includes general information about university and department, admission policies, mission statements, and coursework guidelines.

Data Analysis Procedures

This research employs inductive analysis as a major means of analyzing the interview data, combined with an interpretive analysis. This inductive data analysis is a search for meanings and explanations of the phenomena under study by examining

and analyzing patterns from the raw data (Merriam, 1998; Shank, 2002). Furthermore, Shank (2002) argues that hypotheses in qualitative research are used as a filtering tool for the collected data. Although data analysis of the current study did not test the research hypothesis *per se*, hypotheses drawn from previous studies were used as a means of opening up the discussion of the topics under examination. The interpretation of researchers in qualitative research is inevitable to some extent since researchers play active roles in explaining and give meaning to data (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Denzin, & Lincoln, 2000). Thus, aside from inductive analysis, interpretive analysis was also utilized in reporting the findings of this research. The following describes the procedures how the interview data were analyzed.

Interviews were transcribed verbatim, and then each transcribed interview was inductively analyzed through rereading and reexamining the transcripts. For the analysis of the interview data, this study followed the Strauss and Corbin (1998) model with the assistance of the qualitative data analysis software NUD*IST.

Although using the computer-assisted qualitative analysis can be beneficial in categorizing the data and retrieving it, Coffey and Atkinson (1996) argue that the researcher's value is embedded in coding and categorizing processes. It is the process of decision-making in which researchers are deeply involved because the researchers decide which data are tagged with codes and with what degrees of details. Coffey and

Atkinson further contend “Essentially, the codes and categories you have selected should be used to make pathways through the data....As you chose and selected them, so you can abandon, change, re-sort, rename, and so on” (p.46).

Strauss and Corbin (1998) propose a practical guideline how raw data can be developed into theory by understanding the systematic use of coding data. This process includes a sequence of *microscopic examination of the data, open coding, axial coding, selective coding process, coding for process, the creation of the conditional/consequential matrix* (as cited in Shank, 2002).

Firstly, a *microscopic examination of the data* involves the close line-by-line analysis to create initial categories. In this step, all the transcripts were imported into the NUD*IST software database to facilitate the construction of initial categories of the data. The patterns that I identified, while reading the data, were noted and labeled with language codes. These codes included: expectation, goal, experience, difference, application, EFL context, CLT (Communicative Language Teaching), CBI (Content Based Instruction), challenge, course, sociolinguistics, non-native, oral participation, teaching, support, interaction, presentation, publication, writing, and research.

Secondly, the core of the *open coding* process consists of comparisons—comparing similarities and differences among categories. Thirdly, the next stage of *axial coding* is an act of relating categories “It looks at how categories crosscut and

link” (p. 124) within and between domains. In this step, I tried to identify commonalities and differences not only within each participant’s data, but also cross the data of all participants. This process also involved linking and connecting the data. I wrote a draft summary for member checking and then reviewed temporary interpretations with my research participants. I sent each participant his/her summary through E-mails. This *member-check* is recommended to increase the validity of the data in qualitative research (Merriam, 1998). In addition, postpositivists (e.g., Constructivists) and postmodernists (e.g., critical/feminists) advocate the concept of co-construction of meaning with research participants (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). In that respect, it is vital to invite research participants to give feedback on interpretations (Hatch, 2002). Hence, I asked each participant not only to check if the interpretation was right but also to add or clarify any information that he/she desired to.

The last three steps of *selective coding process*, *coding for process* and *conditional/consequential matrix* entail the process of selection, interpretation, and theory generation from the data. *Selective coding process* is also called an integrative process. It involves the selection of a central category from the data and the integration of existing categories. Fifth, *coding for process* is an outline of emerging theories. This process implies understanding of emerging configuration of the phenomenon in question. Finally, *the creation of the conditional/consequential matrix*

is a device to analyze “the relationships between macro and micro conditions/consequences both to each other and to process” (p.181).

Following this, I tried to refine the domains supported by the data that do not fit with or run counter to the relationships in the domains. This is called “negative cases, cases which do not confirm the current formulation” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p 47). In qualitative research, it is important not to leave out those unfitted data simply because they do not fit into the domains that have been discovered.

Overall, the process of analyzing data involves close and careful reading and reexamining the raw data. Although the analysis of the data for this study follows the above guidelines of Strauss and Corbin (1998), this researcher’s involvement in this process should not be underestimated. Throughout this process, researchers play an important part in each step of analysis with or without the use of a computer-assisted software program for data analysis (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

Summary

In this chapter, information about the methodology of this research—a qualitative interview study—and the data analysis procedures were discussed. Interviews were a major means of collecting data, and documents collected through on and offline resources were an additional method. Nine participants were recruited

through the *network sampling* method, and face-to-face or phone interviews were conducted for 1 hour to 1 and 1/2 hours each.

The interview data were transcribed and analyzed through inductive analysis in conjunction with interpretive analysis and with assistance from NUD*IST software. In order to increase validity of the study, *thick description* and *member checks* were adopted. Furthermore, each participant was treated as a co-constructor of this study by inviting him/her to give feedback on tentative interpretation of the data. The researcher was involved from initial coding to discovering themes throughout the data analysis process.

Chapter IV will present the findings of this present interview study.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of this research. It is divided into two major sections according to main research inquiries: how the participants of this study perceive their respective TESOL graduate discourse communities, and how their academic socialization is evolving in each TESOL graduate discourse community. Although these two inquiries have been guidelines throughout this research in reporting the results, I did not limit the scope of exploration into these issues to pre-established questions.

As Coffey and Atkinson (1996) argue, analysis is not simply categorizing and identifying patterns out of data; rather, “Most fundamentally, analysis is about the representation or reconstruction of social phenomena” (p.108). Therefore, analysis implies choice and representation, and the researcher is inseparable from this process. Having stated this, however, in this chapter, I strove to depict the data faithfully—as close as possible to the reality presented by each research participant, assigning more interpretive discussions to Chapter V, Discussion.

While working on the issues of perceptions of research participants’ graduate programs and forms of academic socialization, I observed that each participant’s background should be the very nucleus in understanding the findings. For instance,

each participant's personal location, such as past experience and future vision, were the most notable influences on his/her perceptions and socialization processes along with his/her social and intellectual dimensions. Therefore, it is of great importance to understand each participant as a whole human being, living on the continuum of time and space. Based on this conception, I draw out the findings of this research.

Perceptions of TESOL Graduate Discourse Communities

This section reports the findings in relation to the first inquiry of this study:

How do international graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities perceive (or how are they critically aware of) practices of their graduate programs and textual knowledge?

Research participants' perceptions of their TESOL graduate programs were particularly divided into two categories—their general perceptions of their programs and textual knowledge gained through courses. It appeared that the participants' perceptions of their graduate programs varied depending on availability of support, and opportunities within their graduate discourse communities. Furthermore, past personal experiences, background knowledge about TESOL, and future career goals were the most significant factors to affect research participants' perceptions of textual knowledge that they were gaining through coursework.

Availability of Support and Opportunities

Although each of 9 participants had different reasons for entering his/her TESOL graduate programs with different expectations, most of the participants perceived their graduate communities differently depending on availability of appropriate support and opportunities in their discourse communities. Most participants in this study had little knowledge about their TESOL graduate communities before they started their respective academic programs of study. More than half of the participants came to know their TESOL graduate programs through an Internet search (e.g., In-su, Mei, Min, Yuka). When they chose a TESOL graduate program, such factors as assistantship, cost, safety, and/or spousal circumstances were considered first, rather than a particular curriculum or specialty focus of the program. This lack of knowledge about their graduate discourse communities, however, was not a major factor to affect their perceptions. Rather, their graduate communities' supportive environments such as proper support, assistance, and opportunities were a primary factor to determine their perceptions of their discourse communities.

Yuka found the Gamma University MA TESOL program 6 years ago. While on the Internet, her attention has drawn to the information from the Gamma university MA TESOL program's website, which claimed, "an exceptional amount of supervising and teaching." Because she thought she wanted to improve her teaching,

she chose the Gamma University program. Although her undergraduate major was English, she had not previously had opportunities to learn how to teach English as a second language in a systematized way. While she was teaching in various private institutions in Japan, she observed that native English teachers approached teaching differently from the way she did. This made her ponder what good teaching was like. This was her primary motivation to start her graduate study in the TESOL field in the U.S.

As advertised, the Gamma University MA program offered her good support and opportunities to learn and practice to teach. This satisfying experience with her M.A. program also affected her decision when she later chose her doctoral program. After her master's study, she was admitted to another school (Omega university) where her husband was studying. However, after one semester in the Omega University TESOL program, she decided to leave that school and to return to the Gamma University where she earned her M.A. TESOL degree. The Omega TESOL program, where she studied for one semester, was a renowned program attracting a large number of graduate students. Because of the large program with a large number of students, each professor is in charge of supervising a fairly substantial number of students. As a result, she could not get proper one-on-one support from her supervisor. Moreover, assistantship opportunities were very limited, and she would

have had financial troubles without a graduate assistantship. Given that her M.A. TESOL program satisfied her with a good supervision and teaching opportunities, it was quite disappointing for her to study in the Omega community. This led her to leave the Omega University and to return to Gamma University where she earned her M.A. degree, in spite of the fact that she had to live apart from her husband. The only concern that she had was that the TESOL Ph.D. program at Gamma University offered in the school of Education has a strong background in K-12 ESL education, in which she has little experience and interest. Nevertheless, supportive environments of the Gamma University M.A. TESOL program led her to decide to pursue her Ph.D. at the same university. This Gamma University TESOL program offered assistantships throughout her graduate years, once as a teaching assistant, another time as a research assistant. For her, these opportunities were very important not only because they gave her financial security, but also because they gave her opportunities to learn. In that regard, assistantship opportunities appear to be valuable resource for students to learn the practices of their communities.

She perceived that her experience in the Gamma University M.A. and Ph.D. programs was very positive in general. As a research assistant, she had to perform numerous tasks and sometimes, she knew more details about ongoing research projects than her supervisor. Nonetheless, she maintains that she was treated very fair;

her name appeared on papers to be published, and even her supervisor sometimes insisted she should be a first author. She particularly appreciated the collegial relationships between professors and students. She stated, “I have lots of mentors who have mentored me and who have supported me and worked with me. They always treated me like a colleague, not really like a student....They respected my work.” She remarked that this feeling of being respected helped her build high self-esteem and grow academically.

Similarly, Min in the Delta University TESOL community, who already had a number of publications and presentations, and a smooth dissertation process, expressed his satisfaction about his overall graduate program. It is noteworthy what made him feel satisfied with his program:

I have been happy about the program. I think I’m happy with the program because I have done quite a bit by this point... I’m happy with the program because I do get help when I need help. I do get freedom when I need freedom.

Min, particularly, was active in conducting research, and he appreciated his professors’ insights into his research and their pertinent advice.

In contrast, Ling, who was in the same Delta program as Min, had a different opinion about the program. Her goals were to earn a Ph.D. as soon as possible and to

gain high English proficiency. She, however, said that none of her goals had been achieved:

You know, first of all, I haven't gotten a degree yet. But I'm getting close to it. Then, second, you know, we entered the classroom and take the class. After the class, we just went home. So there are not many chances for me to interact with other students and native speakers. Most of my friends are Chinese. So we are still using Chinese to communicate [with] each other.

During her dissertation writing phase of her doctoral program, she also had struggled to find a dissertation topic, as she described it, "I was so bothered by looking for a dissertation topic. I tried to find a topic for almost one year. I tried to search around and fumble around." This made her believe it was very important to create interactive environments such as peer discussions. Although she admitted that her personal situation as a mother, and her shy personality contributed to her lack of interactions to some extent, she did not perceive her department to have a cooperative and supportive environment. She stated, "In my department, I don't see too much happening around students....you know, people are working on their own dissertation alone."

Likewise, In-Su at the Alpha University TESOL program was undergoing isolation without many interactions with people in his discourse community. As a former high school teacher in Korea, In-Su expected to improve his "authentic"

English expressions while he was studying in the U.S. In addition, he wanted to learn new TESOL theories and practices. However, after almost 2 years in the U.S., he did not see his English had improved, nor did he gain new knowledge. He realized that that the curriculum of the program is designed for ESL teachers, not EFL teachers. He stated, “The program here does not prepare EFL teachers.... for ESL teachers, for example, preparing native ESL teachers to teach non-native students.” In addition, his practicum and internship experiences were not satisfying (which will be discussed later in his socialization process). He had a difficult time finding an internship, and he attributed it to his non-native status, as he put it, “If I were a native-speaker, it wouldn’t be a problem [finding an internship].” Moreover, during his internship at a local middle school, he worked in isolation without interactions with people inside the school system. As a consequence, a lack of a supportive system and opportunities contributed to In-Su’s dissatisfaction with his TESOL discourse community.

It is, however, important to note that all the participants from the Alpha University TESOL community appreciated a particular course because of the professor’s feedback on students’ multiple drafts and availability for help. Tomo remarked, “We turned in every step and she gave us feedback individually and then write again, write again. It was very helpful, and she checked only final paper for grade.”

Thus, all of the participants' perceptions of their TESOL graduate discourse communities are closely linked with availability of support and help from people in their discourse communities and opportunities to learn. This includes equal access to resources such as assistantship and internship opportunities, which is one of key factors to entering particular discourse communities. The availability of these resources had a significant effect on their perceptions of their programs as well as on their academic socialization processes. The latter will be discussed later.

Textual Knowledge

The participants' perceptions of courses that they have taken were varied, being conditioned upon usability and benefits of the textual knowledge that they have gained through courses. Most of all, future teaching careers, background knowledge about TESOL discourses, and personal experiences of the participants affected their perceptions of what they have learned in their respective graduate discourse communities.

Relevance of Future Teaching

At the Alpha university program, In-Su expressed a reservation about the courses of Culture and Language and Intercultural Communication. These courses introduced the relationship of cultures and languages in association with cultural and linguistic differences of ESL learners. For In-Su, the courses are more likely to

prepare ESL teachers for teaching students with diverse language and cultural backgrounds rather than prepare EFL teachers who will teach a linguistically and culturally homogenous group of students. Furthermore, most of the English teachers in Korea are Koreans like their students, and there are already basic common understandings of language and culture between them. Hence, he could not find the courses relevant to teaching English in Korea. This led him to perceive that the culture-related courses were not helpful for him since he would be teaching students with homogeneous characteristics. Besides, he was skeptical about application of CLT (Communicative Language Teaching), which has been the most popular language teaching practice in ESL discourse communities, in Korean classroom settings. Some of the reasons that he enumerated are a nationally administered reading-oriented college entrance exam that brings the *washback* effect of testing into English classrooms, lack of teachers' autonomy on grading, large class size, and the limited language proficiency of both teachers and students.

Interestingly, doctoral students in this study who planned to teach in a university setting after graduation, perceived that most of their coursework was potentially useful. The following are Bo's, Yuka's, and Min's comments on the courses they have taken:

Bo: All of them are very helpful....Who knows?, what I will do in my future.

Maybe, I will be asked to teach the course like Psycholinguistics. Who knows? If I am asked to teach that kind of course, I think the courses that I will learn will be useful....when I'm studying in this program, I'm trying to accumulate knowledge, I don't know which is more useful or less useful.

Yuka: All the courses are potentially very good. I think in terms of curriculum.

Min: If you have a certain vision, if you look toward the future, everything will be potentially useful.

Due to the likelihood that they will teach content-based courses rather than general English in university settings, it seems that the above doctoral students perceived the courses that they took to be potential sources for their future teaching. Thus, where and what level of students these research participants plan to teach turned out to be one of the most important elements to impact their perceptions of their graduate courses.

Background Knowledge

The participants' perception of their graduate courses was also closely related to their background knowledge about TESOL. Those participants, Young-Ju, Su-Mi, Tomo, and Ling, who had not learned TESOL education through formal education,

and who did not have background knowledge of it, evaluated basic TESOL-related introductory and methodology courses as being helpful and useful. Young-Ju's, Su-Mi's and Ling's undergraduate majors were not relevant to teaching English.

Similarly, although Tomo's undergraduate major was English, and he taught at a *Juku* school in Japan, he had not learned TESOL theories and practices before he joined the Alpha University TESOL program. Therefore, Tomo, Su-Mi, and Ling appreciated some of the courses that could help them understand TESOL discourse communities.

They remarked how the courses were helpful:

Tomo: This program helps me teach professionally. Everything, like need analysis, selecting materials, planning, designing syllabus, and reflecting teaching, etc.

Su-Mi: You know, my undergraduate major was not education. I didn't know how to teach and how to approach. So it [basic methodology course] was helpful.

Ling: You know, when I entered this program, I had nothing. I had no knowledge about it. I think that the course [Foundation of teaching English as a second language] was really helpful to search for the focus of my research and that helped me a lot and helped me to get a general idea of whole thing of ESL and it triggered really my interest.

Conversely, In-Su, who already had that knowledge through his pre-service and in-service teacher training, noted that the TESOL relevant introductory courses were repetitious of what he had already learned in Korea. He also noticed that the same textbooks written by the same authors were used both in Korea and in his U.S. TESOL programs. Likewise, other participants who were already familiar with introductory courses of TESOL theories and practices through their master's programs did not mention that they were useful. Therefore, the participants' existing knowledge about the TESOL field influenced their perceptions of their TESOL graduate courses.

Relevance of Personal Experiences

When students could relate their own experiences to the knowledge that they learned through courses, they appreciated those courses more. This not only facilitated their participation in classroom discussions, but also affected their perceptions of the knowledge they gained through coursework.

Sociolinguistics courses, in particular, were mentioned by four participants and their comments on those courses reveal that they had different perceptions about the classes, depending on their individual experiences. For instance, Ling and Min were enrolled in the same program but had a different perspective of the Sociolinguistics course. For Ling, although she thought that it could be beneficial to

learn about social groups and different language use that the Sociolinguistics class addressed, she could not find herself interested in the class. She explained it:

Most of students in that class are making arguments but no point. Because there's no answer there, it's social phenomena. It's a cultural thing. Everybody talks about their experiences or talking about their personal experiences...everything that I got from the class was common sense.

However, interestingly enough, Min, even though he was in the same program stated that he enjoyed the course and could relate his experience to the course content. When the class discussed dialects, for example, he could share his own experience. He described it:

I can talk about my first language, which is *Hakka* and official language is Mandarin. And the *Hakka* speaker, what I experienced in my hometown, in my area, what I experienced in X city [where he studied for his master's degree], which is about 2000 km, I was away from my hometown, so I talked about those things.

Whereas Min's personal experience made the Sociolinguistics courses more meaningful to him, Ling was not able to find any value in the course beyond it being "common sense."

Mei, in the Beta university TESOL program, showed her passion for sociolinguistics: “It [Sociolinguistics] was really fascinating. Now I’m writing my qualifying paper in that area. So Sociolinguistics might be a wonderful area in the future.” Her interest stemmed from her own observations and experiences in China. Her criticism is poignant:

Everything American or British is considered to be good like if, uh, if a person is from like we have an expert from Canada and he got his PhD in Education in Canada, he is considered to be higher than all the other PhDs and professors....If you read an article and you write these theories developed by American expert, people think it’s so advanced and it’s so modern. If you write an article about theory which has [was] developed by a Chinese scholar and when we read about it, it’s not.

For Mei, the Sociolinguistics course helped her become critically aware of the issues that she had already felt unfair, and provided a theoretical ground to advance her experience analytically.

Therefore, when students could relate their personal experiences to textual knowledge, their learning appears to be more meaningful and transferable for use. It is also noteworthy that personal experiences allow those students to more actively

participate in class discussions, making a positive impact on their discourse socialization processes, which will be presented in the next section.

Academic Socialization

This section reports the findings in relation to the second inquiry of this study: How do international graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities participate in the practices of their TESOL graduate discourse communities?

What shapes the participants' academic socialization and how it takes place turned out to be a complex, multi-layered, and dynamic process. The participants' TESOL graduate programs not only affect their academic socialization processes, but their personal situations also play a significant role in these processes. Based on each participant's description about how he/she participates in various academic activities, I was able to obtain a broad picture of each student's academic socialization process. Each student's academic socialization was revolving around major academic activities such as oral participation, writing papers, doing research, and teaching. However, the sphere of their academic socialization is not limited to their graduate discourse communities. Some students in this study, particularly in the last phase of their doctoral study, were entering into a professional TESOL community by presenting and publishing their research in that community.

Although the same interview guide questions were asked of each participant, each account of the participants' academic socialization takes a different shape. Each participant's academic socialization process was complex, contextual, and individual, such that unilateral patterns could not be applied. Thus, I approach this issue by recounting each participant's account of his/her academic socialization process in his/her particular graduate discourse communities. I drew out central issues of the participants' academic socialization processes rather than enumerating all the issues brought up by them.

First, I examined the individual students' academic socialization processes in order to shed light on the lives of non-native graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities. I divided these nine students into three groups according to the major themes of their academic socialization processes presented. Following each section, I drew out common features that appeared in each group. Next, I laid out challenges the participants faced and strategies they utilized in their academic socialization process.

Alpha University TESOL Program: Oral participation and Teaching Opportunities

I interviewed three master's students enrolled in Alpha university TESOL program: Tomo, In-su, and Su-mi. I could identify particular common issues in these three students' accounts of their academic socialization processes: oral participation

and practicum/internship. Tomo and In-Su rarely participated in class discussions for various reasons, some of which were a self-perceived limited oral proficiency and an influence of their native cultures. The practicum and internship courses in the Alpha University TESOL M.A. program have unusual features that contribute to creating an isolated working situation of these international graduate students. This is my focus as I relate Tomo, Insu, and Sumi's respective experiences in the same system. First, I will recount each student's experience regarding his/her academic socialization processes and then, will explain the limited teaching opportunities of the Alpha University TESOL program.

Tomo: "If I couldn't catch the first part, I couldn't follow the next."

Tomo, a Japanese master's student in the Alpha University TESOL program, was in his 3rd semester when the interview was conducted. He taught English at a *Juku* school in Japan for a year before he joined the program. He, however, had not had formal training for teaching English to speakers of other languages. His relatively short stay in the U.S., and little field experience and formal training in the TESOL area, positioned him as a novice in his TESOL discourse community.

Tomo experienced particular difficulties in oral participation in class discussions. He explained as follows:

English, I have such kind of problem a lot before last semester and first semester. If I don't catch up the first part, I couldn't follow because like, if I couldn't catch the first part, I couldn't follow the next. I couldn't follow the next. I couldn't follow the next....I worried about. I have a lot of questions. I wanted to respond. But I'm afraid that like, what I wanted to ask, something I wanted to ask, they already talked about it before. That's what I missed.

His apprehension of revealing the fact that he could not follow the class discussions made his oral participation in the classroom more difficult. Furthermore, he pointed out the influence of his native Japanese culture as a factor of his lack of participation in class discussions. He is not accustomed to ask questions during class, out of respect for professors. Language anxiety and his concern of interrupting the flow of his professors' teaching led him to ask questions after class or through individual visits to his professors' offices, instead of raising questions and expressing his opinions in class.

In addition, his more frequent interactions with his international colleagues made him feel more comfortable to share his opinions with international students than with American colleagues. For him, another advantage of speaking with international colleagues was the rate of their speech, as he put it, "And I have more time to

organize my idea before speak, before speaking. Because like, in international classroom, everything goes slower.”

Although Tomo struggled with his limited oral proficiency in class discussions in the beginning, he stated that he could participate more when he was asked to give presentations in front of the class for course requirements. Furthermore, his presentation experience, with a colleague of his at a local conference, exemplifies his growing confidence in his English as well as his knowledge about a TESOL discourse community. In this way, Tomo was displaying his slow but yet gradual progress in his academic discourse socialization process.

In-Su: “I haven’t felt good about myself every time after class.”

In-Su, a 41 year-old former EFL high school teacher in Korea, was enrolled in the Alpha University TESOL master’s program. When the interview occurred, he was in his last semester and close to graduation. His account of his academic socialization centered on his lack of participation in class discussions and lack of interactions with colleagues in the program. As mentioned earlier, his primary goal of studying in the U.S. was to improve “authentic English expressions” in a native English context. In spite of his strong wish for the improvement of his oral English, his oral English had not progressed over time. He described his lack of participation:

I'm in the master's program and it is academic-oriented. We usually read articles and participate in discussions. I don't speak English very well. I just come back home with miserable feelings....I don't participate in class discussions at all. If I was called on, I say something or I keep silent. It's so difficult because of the English.

Similar to Tomo in the same program, In-Su also pointed out his native Korean culture that emphasizes correctness as a part of the reason for his lack of participation in class discussions. His relatively old age compared with his other colleagues, is another factor that impedes his taking a risk because he fears "losing face." In his native Korean culture, senior people are supposed to be wiser and more knowledgeable than young people. He expressed that his age and losing face in front of young people made his speaking even worse. His inner struggle is notable, "I shouldn't think that way. There are always conflicts in my mind. I ask myself, 'what am I doing here?' I haven't felt good about myself every time after class."

When he was engaged in a group project with other native and non-native English-speaking colleagues, it was not easy to communicate fully in English: "I tried to tell my idea. But there were some subtle things that I couldn't express well. I was frustrated and I made the other people also frustrated. So we just did it roughly." He, however, found group work helpful: "Working together, and working together with a

native speaker, they brought things that I didn't see, I was stuck with one thought, they had a new idea, I hadn't thought about it. It was good to share." Since he had infrequent interactions with other students outside the class, group work was beneficial to him. Yet, his self-perceived limited English seems to prevent him from participating and working closely with other students in a group.

Other than improving his oral proficiency, he also expected to learn new TESOL theories and practices that he could implement in a Korean setting. His earlier experience in a graduate TESOL program in Korea is noteworthy. He quit the school after having an argument with one of his professors in Korea. He was not satisfied with the professor's theory-oriented lectures, and, therefore he asked how the theories could be implemented in classroom settings. The professor's response made him upset. He quoted the professor's comment, "It's your responsibility, not my job." This led him to seek solutions to his frustrations in an U.S. TESOL graduate program.

However, it did not take long for him to realize that the curriculum of the Alpha university TESOL program is designed for ESL teachers in the U.S., not for EFL teachers. He stated, "TESOL in the U.S. is not for EFL setting. So you will lose your identity if you follow U.S. TESOL." Not only was he dissatisfied with his ESL-oriented program, but he also refused to be part of the TESOL graduate community. Thus, In-Su's strong EFL professional identity, his disappointments of the program,

and his lack of interactions with people in his department, contributed to his unsuccessful academic socialization in the Alpha TESOL discourse community.

Su-Mi: “I get brave when speaking in English.”

Su-mi came to Alpha University 2 ½ years ago to study Biology. After 1 year in the Biology department, she transferred to the TESOL M.A. program in the same university. She was in her 3rd semester in the M.A. TESOL program at the time of the interview. Su-mi did not have any TESOL background in terms of formal training and teaching experience other than a 5-year English tutoring experience. Unlike Tomo and In-Su in the same program, she was confident about her oral English due to her early exposure to English and continuous study of conversational English. This seemed to make a difference in her academic socialization process, particularly participation in discussions. She expressed it:

I don't have any trouble in raising questions and speaking out my opinions...there are many presentations, group works and discussions, almost in every courses. Sometimes I have to do presentations every time, at least 5 or 10 minutes. I don't have any difficulty. I'm used to it because I have to speak everyday.

She further remarked that she sometimes felt more comfortable speaking in English than in Korean. She could ask questions more often and speak her opinions more

explicitly, as she put it, “I get brave when speaking in English. I can speak explicitly what I want to say.” Her opinion about speaking English differed from two other students, Tomo and In-Su, in the program. Interestingly, Tomo and In-Su expressed how their native cultures hindered them to express themselves in English, whereas Su-mi explained how English gave her freedom to express herself. Since she had not had field experience and formal training in the TESOL area, I asked her whether or not her lack of background knowledge about TESOL affected her participation in discussions. The following response of Su-Mi’s revealed an interesting dynamic between knowledge and language:

Well, we have two Japanese students. Both of them were English teachers in Japan, and they have teaching experience. They seemed to have lots of ideas. But they couldn’t express them. For me, I share my small group teaching experience, or I can tell my experience [as a ESL learner], or I can ask some questions from books or I can share my opinions about readings.

The above comment suggests the fact that oral competence may override students’ knowledge and experiences, at least their participation in class discussions.

Overall, Su-Mi seemed to adjust to the Alpha University TESOL discourse community without much problem. In terms of interactions with people in the department, she did not feel any particular difficulty. She could even enjoy more the

social environment of the TESOL department than that of the biology department where she previously had been. According to her, she did not observe many social interactions happening in the biology department. Her confidence in her oral English and her ESL learner experiences seemed to make her transition from biology to TESOL smoother.

Limited Teaching Opportunities

The Alpha university TESOL program offers two courses for the purpose of giving opportunities to practice teaching—Practicum and Internship. Tomo, In-Su, and Su-mi finished their respective practicum at the University intensive language program. During their practicum, they spent 64 hours observing their mentoring teachers' teaching and keeping reflection journals; they also did a 15-minute microteaching at the end of the practicum. While the practicum is more for observations and reflections, internships offer students actual teaching opportunities. Most students in the program choose one out of three types of internships: the University intensive language program, Sunday community school, and local K-12 schools.

Tomo and Su-mi, who had little teaching experience in the TESOL area, seemed to be satisfied with their practicum experiences, which mostly consisted of observations and keeping reflection journals. But, In-Su who had a fair amount of

teaching experience, did not feel that his practicum was helpful. He chose to observe Reading and Grammar classes for this reason: “I was curious how they teach grammar. We teach English grammar in Korean. But what is it like to teach in English? That’s why I did the practicum.” However, he expressed that he did not learn many new things during the practicum. He stated, “Oh, no! there’s no answer.” Rather, he even raised a question about his mentoring teacher’s reading class: “For example, ‘what is a main idea?’ The teacher asked students. But the [English] level of students is at a [one] sentence-level. How can they find out a main idea? It’s difficult.” He also had some criticism about his mentoring teacher’s grammar class. He felt that his grammar class was poorly prepared and did not integrate various activities into the curriculum. Although he was critical, he never voiced out his critical observation to his mentoring teacher. His mentoring teacher was a graduate student in the same TESOL program and their relationship was friendly. Interestingly, although In-su displayed more expertise in teaching, he deferred to his mentoring teacher because of his mentoring teacher’s native status. He said, “Anyway, he is a native English speaker, while I don’t speak English well.”

Following the practicum, In-Su was doing his Internship at a local middle school at the time of the interview. Since he was going to church on Sundays, he could not teach at the Sunday community class as other NNES students did. His

professor found an internship for him at a local middle school. The reason that In-Su had difficulty finding an internship was that the area where his university was located was provincial where few members of the ESL population resided. Furthermore, he indicated his non-native status as a reason: "It was not easy for me to find an internship. If I were a native speaker, it wouldn't be a problem though." He described his internship experience as more tutoring. He pulled out a Korean 5th grader from his ESL class and gave him individual instruction. As a consequence, he seldom interacted with his mentoring teacher in the school, let alone with other teachers and students. He was working in isolation without any significant interactions within the school system.

It is notable that NNES students teach in the Sunday community class, while NES counterparts have a part-time and full-time job and do their internship at the intensive language program. Su-Mi was doing her internship at the Sunday community class when the interview was conducted. She described why she did her internship there: "I'm doing the internship in the Sunday community class. The internship depends on where we can get it. I applied for the ESL program but I couldn't get it. So I'm doing it at the Sunday community class." She could not get an internship at the University intensive language program in spite of her relatively high level of oral English proficiency.

Regarding her non-native status as an ESL teacher, Su-Mi did not seem to be concerned. She stated, “I don’t think my students care about my non-native status. It is a free class. They just come and learn without any obligation.” While the university intensive language program is a regular and formal program, where a number of international students of the university study, the Sunday community classes are free, informal, and open to anybody. Therefore, it is less likely for students to be concerned about their teachers’ native status or their English proficiency.

Tomo also was planning to apply for the Sunday community class for his internship in the next semester. The next excerpt explains the reason:

Interviewer: Is there any reason that you picked up the Sunday community class? As far as I know there are other options available, for instance, the ESL program.

Tomo: ESL, I don’t think. (pause) I can apply, but I don’t think I can get it.

Interviewer: Why?

Tomo: Because already. (pause)

Interviewer: A lot of people applied?

Tomo: And many teachers, no, most of teachers are native teachers. So
(pause)

Interviewer: You mean, native speakers applied for that ESL program?

Tomo: But graduate native speakers. I have some of before Japanese students applied and they didn't get [it].

From his colleagues' experiences, he reached the conclusion that he would not be able to get the internship in the intensive language program. He further explained the likely reason that non-native speakers could not get the internship:

Also ESL teachers get paid for so it's difficult. But Sunday community class, whoever attends can attend without paying anything. Like, they don't care who is teaching, especially they are created mainly for TESOL purpose. It is easy. It's easier for me. So [I apply for it].

It is, however, of great importance to note his following comment. It reveals his conflicts between the institutional reality and his personal wish. He explained it:

If it is not responsibility, like I want to teach class which has many ESL students because it will be more helpful for me. In the Sunday community class, there are not many like a few [students]. Some students sleep and some students quit. So there's no consistency. It's not the best to reflect our teaching.

Importantly, he was aware that the Sunday community was not a good place where he could practice what he learned in a systematic and consistent way. Thereby, the students in the Alpha program were given only limited teaching opportunities.

Beta University Program: Struggling with New Multi-roles

Three students, Young-Ju, Mei, and Bo were matriculating in the Beta University TESOL program. Mei and Bo just finished their respective first and second year of doctoral study. Young-Ju was in her 3rd semester in the M.A. program. One of the characteristics that these students displayed was their newcomer status, and, therefore, many practices of their new discourse community were unfamiliar. As a consequence, they were struggling with unfamiliar and new tasks. In their discourse socialization processes, adopting new practices and negotiating their new roles emerged as salient features of this particular group. I will describe each student's socialization process first and then, will explain the adoption and negotiation processes of each student in this group.

Young-Ju: "I have only 24 hours but I have too many things..."

When I interviewed Young-Ju, she had just finished her first year in the program. Her undergraduate major was Food and Nutrition in Korea and she had not been in a school system for many years until she entered the program. However, two ESL courses that she took as a non-degree student before she entered the program seemed to make her transition less difficult. Nevertheless, she was juggling different roles at school and at home. She was a mother of a young child, and her husband was working on his Ph.D. in the same university. Therefore, she not only was struggling

with a new graduate student's role but also with the roles of mother and wife. In addition, she was working as an ESL testing coordinator for her assistantship, and she was involved in teaching Korean language in a Korean community. She described her busy life:

How to manage time is the most challenging. It's important to get a degree, but at the same time, I'm a mother. That is of the most priority to me, and I came here because of my husband's study. It's so tough. It's really tough. I have only 24 hours, but I have too many things to read and also I want to read all but I couldn't. And English, English barrier. Because of all these things, it's tough.

Due to her little experience in teaching and formal training in the TESOL area, she perceived that all of the courses were very helpful. She, however, expressed she could not enjoy them: "I don't think I'm enjoying them. I can't enjoy. It's tough. I've been thinking that if I studied it in Korea, I could do better. Well, everybody thinks that way. Yeah, I learn. But I can't that luxury to enjoy them." It took her more time to read and write in English. In addition, her inexperience in graduate-level work seemed to cause her a lot of anxiety.

Nonetheless, her adjustment into a new graduate study seems to be successful due to her supportive groups of friends. One group of friends was two American ESL

instructors at the University intensive language program, and the other group of friends was two American graduate students in the same TESOL program. She felt comfortable enough to discuss her problems, including academic questions, with the two instructors at the University intensive language program. She stated, "They are ESL teachers and understand me very well. I can be very communicative with them."

Another friend of hers, in the same program, was interested in learning Korean. In return for teaching Korean to her, she received proofreading assistance for her papers. She said, "I got a lot of help. She is so nice. I depend on her a lot. What is more, she helped me with my papers before I submitted them." Her friend also had a young child, and they shared their parental experiences and information, as Young-Ju put it, "She is my supporter." In this regard, she believed that she was very fortunate to have a supportive network on both an academic and a personal level. Furthermore, her husband, who had been studying for a few years in U.S. universities, gave her advice on how to participate in discussions and to develop research ideas. This seems to have made her transition easier, making her adjustments to her new discourse community less difficult.

Mei: "If you're just empty, you can not ask any questions."

Mei just finished her first PhD year at the Beta University TESOL program when the interview occurred. Her first year was challenging in many aspects. She was

struggling to keep the balance between her roles as a graduate student, as a teaching assistant, and a research assistant. She had two assistantships—one was teaching work at the University intensive language program, and the other was assisting with her supervisor's research. Each was a 10-hour assistantship. When teaching at the university intensive language program was assigned shortly after she arrived in the U.S., she was overwhelmed. She expressed how frustrated she was:

They are the whole way of doing lessons and preparing lessons so different from what I did in China. In China, we like uh, if I [were] going to teach next week, I just prepare all the lessons for next week. Nothing more. But here, at the very beginning of the semester, you need to have the whole schedule for the whole semester. I don't know. It was the first time I have a look at that. How can I know where I actually start, where I should give grade, where I should give a test. It was just so frustrating.

Although there were coordinators available to help her, Mei did not even know what to ask: "Because my mind is just blank, if you're just empty, you cannot ask any questions."

As a student, she was very disappointed during her first few weeks because she could not feel that she was learning. She explained it:

The teacher arranged their classroom into a small circle and students sitting in a circle. The teachers didn't give any lectures, just their students' participation, discussions, questions and answers, all by the students. I was thinking 'what I'm doing here, totally waste my time, I couldn't learn anything here.' So disappointed. At that time, I was thinking about changing, applying to another university.

When she discussed her disappointment with her husband, he gave her advice to be patient. Later, she stated that she found a student-centered and discussion-oriented type of class could be conducive to learning: "you'll find people from different cultural backgrounds will have such a different perspective on the same topic. So it's pretty interesting."

Although she perceived that discussions are important, she was still not adopting the practice of her new discourse community. Nonetheless, she was still not quite comfortable with participating in class discussions herself. In a large class, where more than 20 students study, she tended not to participate. However, if participation was a requirement of the course, she tried to participate. Therefore, her participation in class discussions was still not voluntary.

Mei was also learning qualitative research by assisting her professor. While her supervisor was doing her qualitative study, her work was to transcribe all the interview data. She described her new experience of qualitative research:

Before I came to this university, I didn't know anything about qualitative research. In China, it seems to me almost all the people there are doing quantitative research. I just have no idea while I was transcribing these tapes. I got an idea what qualitative research is like and all the difficulties that PhD students might face. I'm kind of prepared for that.

Like this, helping her professor in conducting qualitative research allowed her to learn qualitative research, which she had not learned before.

Her academic socialization process was quite vivid compared with other participants, given that she has been in the U.S. just for a year. Her awareness of different discourse communities between China and the U.S. was revealed through her frequent comparison of both discourse communities. Nevertheless, she was gradually entering into her new discourse community by adopting new cultural practices of the Beta University TESOL graduate community.

Bo: “Today, I’m very happy because of my teaching. Today, I’m very sad because of my teaching.”

Bo finished his second year of PhD study when I interviewed him. Unlike other participants’ uncertainty about their future, he was sure to go back to China after graduation. The university where he used to work for a number of years gave him an opportunity to go abroad and study as a reward for his dedication to teaching. His undergraduate degree was also earned in the same institution. For these reasons, he felt a special connection to the university. Furthermore, his wife was also a professor at the university in China. For these reasons, he perceived that his stay in the U.S. was just for his Ph.D. degree.

Bo, like Mei, had two assistantships—teaching at the university intensive language program, and assisting with doing research for 10 hours each. What challenged him the most was to keep balance between three types of works—taking courses, teaching, and assisting with research. Although he remarked that his main task was to study as a graduate student and to finish his degree as early as possible, his life seemed to be more affected by his teaching. He expressed, “If students can actively participate, I feel very excited and I feel very cheering [sic] something like that....Today, I’m very happy because of my teaching. Today I’m very sad because of my teaching.” In addition, he showed his strong responsibility for his teaching: “You

know, in class, you have 20-30 students, in first semester, I had 35 students in class. If my teaching is not so good, I mean, their future will be affected. I'm responsible for 35 students that way. So that's why teaching to me is very important."

His account of his academic socialization issues centered on his teaching and its challenges. As a teaching assistant, he was teaching an EAP (English for Academic Purposes) course at the university intensive language program and an introductory Linguistics course in his department. The former course was to prepare international students for their mainstream courses, while the latter was a regular course for undergraduate students in his department. He expressed that both courses challenged him a great deal due to different reasons. For the EAP course, he was assigned to teach Psychology which he did not have any background knowledge about. He stated, "How can I express myself in the field of psychology in English?" The introductory linguistics course consisted mostly of American undergraduate students and these students' spontaneous questions were challenging to him. Although he prepared his class thoroughly, he felt nervous when he faced students' unexpected questions. This is how teaching was ruling Bo's life in his new discourse community.

Like Mei from China, Bo did not know how to conduct qualitative research until he helped with his professor's qualitative research as his research assistant and took a qualitative research course. Most of the research he conducted in China was

either quantitative research or literature work. However, after conducting a qualitative research study himself, he realized that he could not be a good qualitative researcher. He found it difficult to analyze the data. He stated that he would rather do quantitative research than qualitative research for his dissertation study.

As a graduate student who was still taking courses, his participation in class discussions was not always easy. However, his teaching experience helped him to participate actively to impress teachers. Although Bo's new multi-roles, especially teaching, challenged him, he was adopting and negotiating some of the practices that his new discourse community has.

Delta and Gamma University Programs: Supportive Networks and Introduction into Professional Communities

Three doctoral students, Min, Ling, and Yuka, were writing their dissertations when the interviews were conducted. Min and Ling were matriculating in the Delta University TESOL program, while Yuka was in the Gamma University TESOL program. Although they were in different programs, all of them were undergoing similar processes in the light of developing their dissertation research and advanced knowledge about their specific fields. Furthermore, their attempt to create networks inside and outside their graduate TESOL communities was a distinguishable characteristic of this particular group of students. In the final phase of their graduate

study, they were introducing themselves into a professional TESOL discourse community by presenting and publishing. In this section, I will describe these three students' respective socialization processes and then their inductive processes into professional TESOL communities.

Min: "I'm happy with the program because I do get help when I need help."

Min came from China four years ago for his PhD study in the Delta University TESOL program. When I met him, he was presenting a part of his dissertation research at a conference. In spite of his relatively short stay in the U.S., he already had a number of publications (in press or accepted) in journals and presentations at conferences. He had been teaching first-year composition courses as a teaching assistant. In the earlier years of his doctoral study in the U.S., he experienced difficulties in class participation and also in teaching like other participants in this study. However, his account of his academic socialization process revolved around his research interests, vision, and his dissertation progress, leading most of our conversation.

As previously stated, he was satisfied with his program and with what he had achieved. He mentioned that his research ideas usually stemmed from readings, reflections, conferences, classes, discussions and conversations with professors, colleagues, and other scholars in the same field. If he had a research idea, he checked

his idea with his professors. Their insights in the field helped him guide his research in the right direction.

Min's working relationship with his professors' is noteworthy. He explained it: "I'm working in this American way. There is no such thing, close or distant.

Professors, they are just professors. They teach you and they help you when you need them academically." He also perceived professors to be very approachable and kind, as he put, "They are just human beings." His view of professors and relationships with them appears to be practical, borrowing his word "American." This approach seemed to allow him to discuss his questions and to get appropriate help for his research.

In addition, through bi-weekly gatherings of his colleagues and professors at a local bar, he could feel a sense of an ESL community, which allowed him to belong to the community. He stated, "There was a, ESL program, there was a sense of community there, ESL community there." Students and sometimes professors came and talked over a couple of drinks. Their conversation topics varied from personal matters to academic issues. This type of interaction helped him create supportive networks as well as a sense of belonging within his discourse community.

In regard to his dissertation research, he was making considerable progress. His early start with a focus on a research topic benefited him, allowing him to turn some of his dissertation chapters into publishable and presentable papers.

Furthermore, he organized panels for conferences, encouraging other students' participation. His vision and cogent research agenda showed that his voice was no longer that of a graduate student. He found his research niche, which lacked an existing research body. He also had a vision to generate new EFL writing theories:

I hope, myself by doing this [historical study in ESL writing in China], oh, I can do this a similar study. I can examine things in Korea and in Japan or in the Philippines. I'm trying to develop different models, different theories about EFL writing. I'm trying to argue EFL writing is different from ESL writing because it has a different agenda.

His specific research agenda reveals not only his active engagement in a professional conversation but also his academic identity in relation to the Delta TESOL discourse community, where second language writing is its specialty.

Ling: "There were no other people told me and taught me how to do that."

Ling was in her 4th year of PhD study at the Delta University, writing her dissertation. Ling finished her doctoral coursework 2 years ago and left the school for a personal reason, and then returned in the beginning of 2004 to finish her dissertation. Therefore, there was a 2-year break between her coursework and dissertation. She was teaching first-year composition courses like Min at the Gamma University. Teaching composition courses was challenging. For her, the irony of

teaching composition courses was that, she, herself was not a good writer, not to mention the fact that she was teaching it in English. Although she believed that her class is organized and prepared compared with her NES counterparts because she did not know how to “chit-chat,” she was faced with comments on her non-native status. She expressed her frustrations:

Since I observed some other native speaker TAs, that’s, you know, if I don’t have that accent, you know, to be honest with you, I don’t think my teaching is worse than native speakers. But unfortunately, the accent, you know, can never be changed. That’s the fact that I have to accept. I can’t speak English like native speakers.

Other than her teaching experience, her account centered on the issues of interacting with people and of creating supportive networks during the interview.

Her strong argument for peer interactions stemmed from her experience of writing her dissertation in isolation. She initially wanted to write about contrastive rhetoric, which she thought would be the easiest way to finish her dissertation because she could take advantage of being a native Chinese. However, she quickly realized that the topic could be too problematic and too controversial for her to handle. It took her a year to find a research topic. She said, “There were no other people [who] told me and taught me how to do that. You know, I totally had no sense at all and I

searched everything by myself.” After one year of struggling with finding an appropriate topic, she started to do interdisciplinary research on the neuro-linguistics and psycholinguistics approach to the ESL writing process. Yet, due to the interdisciplinary characteristics of her research, no faculty in her program specialized in that area. Undergoing difficulties in finding her research topic and writing her dissertation without proper support, she realized how critical it is to have supportive discussion groups. She stressed that peer interactions can be beneficial in graduate study:

You know, that really helps to make discussions each other. Because I think doing graduate study, you can learn very little from your professors actually. Most of time, what you learn is from your personal reading. But when you read, you have questions. Who can you discuss it? Professors are always busy and they are always overloaded. So basically to help you understand and to acquire and to have more inspiration about the research focus that you’re interested in is to make discussions with your peers or colleagues. I think that’s very important.

Her advocacy of peer group discussions was also caused by her little communication with her supervisor. Although her supervisor was lenient about her research topic and method, and has been supportive of her extending and enhancing her research, the

problem was that she did not know what to ask when her research idea was still immature.

Ling, unlike Min who has a number of publications and presentations, had no publications. She remarked that her 2-year break between her coursework and dissertation made it difficult for her to work on publishable papers. Furthermore, her isolated situation, due to various reasons (which will be discussed later), made her academic socialization processes difficult. Even so, her dissertation showed progress, and she believed that her new research could make a contribution to the TESOL field. Moreover, her experiences that made her strongly advocate peer group interactions, led her to help her junior colleagues by sharing her experiences and ideas.

Yuka: “They respected my work and they treated me almost like a colleague.”

Yuka was working on her dissertation in the Gamma TESOL program. Although she was nostalgic about her early years of her M.A. study, her concern about research and her dissertation process led our conversation. She has been a research assistant for the past 3 years and has been involved in numerous research projects. She described her research assistant work:

He [Her supervisor] has five projects at that time. So he really can’t tell me what to do and what next to do. So I planned research. I actually know much better about the research than he does. He proposed the study. So he designed

the study and he has the power and he has the authority to make ultimate decision about everything. But I have details. I work, yeah, I move, I go somewhere if I need. I collect the data and I analyze the data. And I report that to him.

Her supervisor gave her suggestions and feedback on her work both in content and in language when she finished each research project. She stated, “So in a way, I feel like I do a lot more work, which is ok, which is job of research assistant.” Nevertheless, she felt that he treated her fairly and gave her enough credit for her work. Her name appeared as a second author on many of his papers to be published. She said, “So I feel [he was] very very fair.”

She had a large number of publications and presentations in hand. Her husband, who had been aggressive about presenting and publishing as a graduate student, was a good motivational factor in her early start. She stated, “My colleagues in the university didn’t do it. But I didn’t care. And I thought, well, I should start as early as possible.”

Her early start, her quick learning of how to publish and present in formal academic venues, and her research assistantship, helped her be more productive. Although it took more time and extra effort to produce a quality of work as good as that of her native counterparts, she believed that her bilingual and bicultural

experience gave her an advantage. She explained, “Instead, I have a very unique perspective as a non-native speaker and language learner.... just like my bi/multi-lingual and cultural colleagues who are native and nonnative speaker of English.”

She was writing her dissertation in one of the Applied Linguistics areas and there was no one in her education department who specialized in that area. Although she had been working as a research assistant with a professor in another department, she could not include him on her dissertation committee for a political reason. She expressed she was not comfortable to discuss this issue any more. In addition, she adopted an alternative type of dissertation study, which no one had done in her department. For these reasons, she expected that her dissertation supervisor’s support would be very critical, as she explained it:

I chose my advisor because she was, she had the trusting personality. And I totally trusted her. I thought I was going to have lots of problems. But I thought she was always going to be on your side. So I wanted her as my advisor. She has always helped me in that way because I have been actually, I have been working on alternative form of dissertation.

As she expected, her dissertation supervisor has been very supportive, giving her enough research freedom and helping her to communicate better with other dissertation committee members.

Her experience in the program was very positive in general, and she perceived herself as being a successful learner. She believed that supportive and respectful environments of her M.A. and Ph.D. programs enabled her to improve and grow academically. She remarked, “Yeah, I’m really anxious person. I don’t have enough confidence about my language and my research ability and all that. But when I’m so concerned, that trust that I get from other people helps me so much.”

As a senior graduate student, she was also trying to help her colleagues by reading their papers and giving them suggestions. She also passed around her successful research abstracts to other students. She mentioned that what she was doing for them was not special because she had also benefited from her mentors’ and colleagues’ support and help. In this way, she was playing a role of a more experienced peer helping other students in her TESOL discourse community.

Introduction into Professional TESOL Communities: Presenting and Publishing

The doctoral students, in their last phase of graduate study, displayed their introduction processes into professional TESOL discourse communities. As noted earlier, Min and Yuka had already entered professional TESOL communities by publishing and presenting their respective research, whereas Ling’s process was slow and rough. Nonetheless, all of them showed their gradual advancement into a

professional community. In this process, attending conferences and creating networks inside and outside their graduate TESOL communities appeared to be pivotal.

Particularly, conference experiences of these doctoral students were educational milestones in their professional TESOL discourse communities. Min had developed his dissertation after the first year of his PhD coursework when he attended a conference. After the conference, he got engaged in a conversation with one senior scholar in the field and his professor. He described the moment:

We all were walking out and he asked me, ‘Oh, you can write about English in China. He is interested in World Englishes stuff. I thought, ‘No, I don’t want to write about English in China. It’s a big topic.’ I didn’t. I don’t know. I just don’t like the idea. And then, but if I can do something, I can write about English writing in China maybe. Probably I can do that. That was just an idea and I came back and talked with Ling [another research participant in the same program]. I told her, she said ‘wonderful.’

His conference attendance and discussion with his colleague formed his dissertation research idea.

He stated that he likes to organize panels for conferences. This is how he formed a panel for the World Englishes (WE) conference. He was taking a World Englishes course in the spring semester. As a course requirement, all of the students

were asked to write papers. When the professor announced a call for papers for the WE conference in the following fall, he came up with an idea: “.... wonderful! We can form a panel.” In the conference, about 10 students from the program discussed English in China based on their course papers. He was planning to form another panel for an upcoming conference.

Ling’s and Yuka’s conference attendance also became a learning experience. Ling first attended a conference when her colleagues presented their papers at the conference. It was an eye-opening experience for her:

Then, in the actual conference and they are talking about how to deliver the papers or propose for next conferences. So I just got idea, oh!, oh!, that how things work. Otherwise, nobody told me that how can I be a researcher and presenter. Getting into the field, I was always feeling that I was an outsider.

Later, she was invited to a conference as a panelist by a Chinese professor whom she met at the conference. In another instance, she presented her research in a symposium, which was being hosted by her supervisor. She said that she could take advantage of being a student of his.

Yuka’s experience is similar to Ling’s in that the former learned what to present and how by attending conference sessions. She described how her first presentation at the conference was initiated. In her first year of her MA study, she had

an opportunity to attend a conference for free. She explained her first conference experience: “I was so so fascinated about so many presentations, active atmosphere there. You know, some presentations are not overwhelming, they were just sharing their ideas. So I thought, maybe I can do it.”

Her induction into a publishing community is also noteworthy. Her first published paper was developed from her course paper during her MA study. She explained how it was initiated:

When my teaching lesson was in draft, I took it to one professor. She thought ‘This is great’, ‘This is more for conference.’ I thought maybe I could take it to a conference someday. Then, after that, another professor forwarded email message. That was a call for, call for papers.

She received feedback from her professor about her English, but not about the content. That gave her confidence about her paper and her paper was published in a journal later. Thus, her professor’s encouragement was imperative in her first attempt to publish her work.

In the inductive process for the participant into a professional TESOL discourse community, participating in conferences turned out to be of great importance. Not only were they able to learn what to present and how, but also they learned how to extend their networks beyond their graduate discourse communities.

Professors' encouragement to publish students' term papers and announcements of call for papers or presentations facilitated this inductive process into a professional TESOL community.

Challenges and Strategies

Unfamiliar Practices and Oral Proficiency

Most participants in this study have been challenged by their unfamiliarity of ESL discourse communities where students' participation is valued. They expressed that they were not comfortable enough to participate in class discussions, particularly in their early years of study. This is caused not only by their self-perceived limited proficiency, but also by their unfamiliarity of the practices of their new discourse communities.

As noted earlier, Mei's experience about student-centered and discussion-oriented class culture was very frustrating for the first few weeks. She did not feel she was learning and even considered transferring to another school. Because she was not familiar with this type of interaction in classroom discussions, she could not participate in discussions. In China, she was used to listening to professors' lectures and taking notes. Her lack of knowledge of U.S. culture and its academic system also seemed to hinder her participation. She gave an example: "In a Sociolinguistics class,

they were talking about southern accent. I was [had been there for] just a few weeks and I just had no idea what they were talking about.”

Bo also strove to participate in class discussions, even though his teaching experience helped him realize that participation was of importance to impress teachers and it could often affect his grades. His participation in class discussions was not always easy. He also figured that his little participation in discussions was related to his English proficiency and his native Chinese culture, as he explained it:

If I know about that field, I can talk, or I'll keep silent. I mean, before I speak out, I have something in mind... not like, I'm not sure, I think it's a kind of traditional Asian students. When they began to talk, they have everything in mind. I mean they have everything ready before they began to talk. You know why. Also because of language proficiency.

Likewise, In-Su expressed his apprehension to express his opinions in classes, which was influenced by his native Korean culture:

[For] We Koreans, you know, there are always correct answers. If you don't answer correctly, you will feel ashamed. You care too much what other people think about you. So you don't want to argue your opinion. So do I If I don't know an exact answer, I keep silent.

Although he was aware that discussions do not have correct answers, he stated that he was not used to arguing with people.

Tomo, who also expressed difficulty in following discussions due to his self-perceived lack of English proficiency, mentioned his unfamiliarity to raise questions during class. He said, “For me, to ask questions during class is rude because if you ask questions in classroom, it will disturb teaching.” In addition, differences of communication styles between Americans and Japanese also seemed to affect his lack of engagements in class discussions.

In Japan, I am familiar like to be asked and to ask, like in a small group, I ask my friends, ‘What do you think?’ ‘Do you think something?’ Like a closed question so that each people have an equal opportunity to speak. If I found somebody who is not speaking, I will ask him...but not here, it’s different.

Most importantly, students in this study in their early stages in the U.S., tended to be silent in oral discussions partly because of their lack of confidence of their English and partly because of their unfamiliarity of expressing their opinions. However, it is important to note that their native cultures, which emphasize only giving “correct answers,” affect their self-perceptions of their English proficiency. This prevents them from taking the risk of making mistakes, which subsequently deters them from

sharing their opinions in class. In Therefore, their lack of participation in class discussions appeared to be far more complex than would be expected.

Lack of Interactions: Seeking Out Help and Resistance

Out of all participants of this research, In-Su at the Alpha program and Ling at the Delta program were particularly struggling with a lack of interactions in their discourse communities. Although their experiences and situations were different, their feelings of isolation were strikingly similar.

In-Su felt he needed interactions with native English speakers in order to improve his English. Yet, it was not easy for him to make connections with people in his department. One of the reasons was his age, as he put it, “I’m in my 40’s. It’s just so awkward to hang out with students on campus.” In-Su was living with his wife and two children. This was another reason that he rarely interacted with people in his department. He said, “Once home, it is Korea. Korean families interact often with Korean families. Students in the program are singles and I don’t hang out with them.” As his effort to interact with native English speakers, he went to church where a lot of senior citizens gathered, and he attended a Bible study regularly.

As earlier noted, In-Su was dissatisfied with his TESOL program in terms of its curriculum that was designed for ESL teachers, not for EFL teachers. His practicum and internship experiences were also disappointing. During his internship,

he tutored a student without many interactions inside the school system. Therefore, a lack of supportive environments in his TESOL program contributed to his isolated situation, as he put it, “I feel like I was treated like an outsider.”

Similarly, Ling, a doctoral student in the Gamma TESOL program, expressed her feelings of isolation: “I was always feeling that I was an outsider.” Specifically, Ling began to realize her isolated situation more than before during her dissertation process. Ling had difficulty finding her dissertation topic. While she was struggling with her research idea, she was not able to ask for help from her supervisor. She stated, “He is very organized....You have to let him know in advance that you have a problem. You have to let him know what kind of problem [there is, and] be very very specific to [with] him.” Furthermore, both and her supervisor had shy personalities. For these reasons, she did not often communicate with her supervisor. Because of this, she realized that peer group interactions are imperative, particularly, for novice researchers in order to exchange research ideas, critiques, and experiences. She, however, did not think her department had supportive networks among colleagues. She stated, “In my department, I don’t see too much happening around students....You know, people are working on their own dissertation alone.”

Interestingly, her sense of lack of supportive peer group networks differed from Min’s sense of community he felt through informal social gatherings in their

Gamma TESOL discourse community. Perhaps, Ling's personal situation of being a mother gave her little opportunities for socializing. She explained her situation:

I have to go home and take care of my baby. At that time, she was just born. I was a foreign student as well as a mother. That really, you know, constrain the other opportunities for me to, you know, if there's any kind of parties, whatever meeting I usually escape I didn't have a chance to participate.

Furthermore, she described herself as being "pretty anti-social." As a result, it was difficult for her to engage in social events through which she could have perhaps created supportive networks inside her discourse community.

Although Ling and In-Su felt their isolation and their status as outsiders in a similar way, it is important to note that their responses to their isolated situation were different. While In-Su gave up being a member of his ESL discourse community, Ling tried to seek out help. In-Su showed his strong EFL professional identity by stating, "TESOL in the U.S. is not for EFL setting. So you will lose your identity if you follow U.S. TESOL." Furthermore, his resistance to his ESL discourse community is noteworthy: "I don't have anything to contribute here." Ling, however, showed her effort to engage in a professional conversation by attending conferences and presenting her research, as mentioned earlier. She also became a good supporter

of her colleagues by sharing her experiences with them so they would not experience the same kind of isolation that she felt.

Adopting and Negotiating in Teaching

The students in the Beta University TESOL program were challenged by unfamiliar practices as both students and teaching assistants. Particularly, the adoption of the practices of the new discourse community and negotiation processes which occurred when teaching. During the first semester, Mei's teaching experience was overwhelming because she herself was very new to the U.S. education system and practices, but yet she had to teach students using U.S. educational practices. It was not easy for her to create engaging activities and to encourage her students to do group and peer work in the beginning. She compared her native Chinese educational culture with that of the U.S.:

In China, we give lectures to students so students sit there and listen and they do their exercises and teachers correct their exercises. But here I realize that I have to make things more interesting for students. I need to invent exercises for students to involve them. And also I need to encourage group work and peer work.

One of the suggestions that her professor gave her, after observing her teaching, was to integrate more group activities. Her professor explained the reason for the

importance of group activities. Because those ESL students she was teaching were going to study in an American classroom, where students' group work and participation are appreciated and valued, she should prepare her students accordingly. She took her supervisor's advice and tried to integrate more student-centered activities and group work. After the second observation, her supervisor said to her, "O.K., you have improved." Mei was very encouraged by her professor's positive feedback.

Like Mei from China, Bo was aware of the different teaching and learning cultures between China and the U.S. He stated, "I have to do something different from what I did back in China. For example, here in this culture, students' participation is emphasized. So I have to do something to encourage them to participate in my teaching." He mentioned that his ELT education in Britain also helped him to believe that students' participation is essential in language education.

He also mentioned his lack of knowledge and inexperience about American classroom systems and practices. He described how he was challenged:

In terms of my teaching, student background I have to know. But I don't know. This is one challenge, right? Another example is that what kind of American classroom is like. I have no idea. Right? I have never been to

America. So I have to learn base just because you know, when I first got here,

I was asked to teach. All of these going together become a challenge to me.

His candid account revealed his inner conflicts between what he knew he should do and what he was actually doing. Through a Teaching Education course, he learned that teachers should admit when they do not know the answer, but it was not easy for him to admit the fact that he did not know an answer. He attributed this to his native Chinese cultural influence:

They [Chinese] say ‘face’ is important. They say, if you don’t know the thing, you’re not qualified to be a teacher. So still I’m still influenced by that kind of culture thing. So I know that it’s not good thing. If I haven’t gotten very clear understanding of students’ questions, but still I pretend to understand it and I can answer it anyway. If I don’t understand it, it becomes worse.

It is notable that he adopted and negotiated practices of his discourse community in his teaching. He described how he handled students’ questions that he could not answer: “Sometimes I just imitate or follow American teacher’s way. ‘Oh!, this is a good question’.” In addition, one of the activities that he has not implemented in his class was students’ presentations. He explained the reason: “They speak fast. And I can’t follow them, how do I respond to that? So I think mainly because of language proficiency.” For this reason, he gave quizzes and exams instead to his students. Thus,

Bo's adoption as well as avoidance of some practices of his discourse community evidence his active negotiation processes. However, he believed that his many years of teaching experience in China were very helpful in terms of how to manage a classroom, how to build a good teacher and student relationship, and how to motivate students to learn.

Min also experienced difficulty teaching composition courses in the beginning. He could not understand when his American undergraduate students talked to each other for a particular reason, as he described it, "Because they talk about movies, they talk about TV show. I couldn't because I couldn't get a chance to watch it." However, over time, he not only could understand his students more, but also learned how to engage his students. He explained it: "[Now] I know about American culture. In the class, I can relate, make jokes, things I talked more easily, related to things that students themselves are interested in or familiar with."

Young-Ju, a master's student at Beta University, did her practicum at the university intensive English program for a semester. She observed her "cooperating teacher" (mentoring teacher) and wrote reflections. At the end of her practicum, she did microteaching four or five times with the cooperation and assistance of her mentoring teacher. She followed her cooperating teacher's syllabus and course design. Before she implemented each lesson plan, she checked with her cooperating teacher.

In particular, she asked her to check her pronunciation when she planned to teach vocabulary. In this way, her practicum consisted of observing and partial teaching under the supervision of her mentoring teacher. Therefore, her role as a practicum student was limited to following the rules of her mentoring teacher and the system.

However, those students who conducted their own classes and received evaluations at the end of the semester had somewhat different experiences. In the case of Mei, who taught international students in the university intensive English program, some students' written comments on her teaching at the end of the semester were quite disheartening. She described it:

Some of them mentioned that I'm not experienced enough which I think...that's my first year. And some of them, just one student, that's the evaluation, that I got last year. I guess that the student has some prejudice against me. He said that my accent is bad and my teaching is bad, everything is bad.

Thus, although Mei's new role as a teaching assistant in a new discourse environment challenged her, her negotiation process was noteworthy. In spite of a few students' negative comments, she was not traumatized because she accepted her inexperience in her new discourse community. As for the criticism about her non-nativeness including her foreign accent, she also ascribed it to the students' bias rather than taking it

personally. She mentioned that the rest of her students gave her positive feedback:

“They said that I’m really caring about them and easygoing, this kind of thing.”

Yuka also received her teaching evaluation and one of them was a very heartbreaking experience for her. The particular student wrote he did not want to take her class anymore. From this experience, she realized she could not satisfy all students. She stated, “Some students come with bias, I learned the bias, they change their mind and they change their perceptions about non-native teachers. But some don’t. That’s what I learned.”

Ling’s experience about students’ bias against her non-native status was similar. In spite of her effort to make her English understandable, and her class more organized, she received negative feedback on her accent. The following revealed her frustrations about being a non-native teacher:

I feel that being non-native speaking TA in the United States very challenging because you can never change your skin color and change language tongue. That’s always blamable. Right, because there are always students who do not want to learn and if they fail, they’re gonna blame, ‘That’s all your fault because you cannot speak English well. I don’t understand. I don’t know what you’re talking about’. That’s really disappointing, actually.

All the participants of this study taught through a practicum/internship or teaching assistantship; all experienced challenges. Some of challenges resulted from their unfamiliarity with educational practices or biases of students against non-native teachers. In spite of those challenges, the students in this study were actively negotiating these experiences. For instance, Yuka and Ling suspected that the students blamed their poor performance on their non-native speaking teacher's English. As Ling put it, "Those students who skip classes and who they don't turn in papers." Mei, Bo, and Min admitted their inexperience in the U.S. classroom setting in the beginning, and adopted some practices common in U.S. classes as engaging students in their teaching. Therefore, these adoption and negotiation processes seemed to give them time and space to gain confidence to teach in their new discourse communities over time.

Utilizing ESL Learner Experience and Insider's Knowledge about EFL Contexts

Academic socialization processes were taking place with the participants of this study through academic activities such as writing papers, oral participation in class discussions, conducting research, teaching, and presenting and publishing. In these multi-dimensional processes, one of the most salient strategies they utilized was to use their experience as ESL learners themselves, and to make the most of their knowledge about their native EFL context and culture. Although they did not seem to

use those strategies consciously, they perceived their ESL learning experiences and their native EFL knowledge as a source from which they could make a contribution to classes, and further to TESOL professional discourse communities.

Research. While Young-Ju, a master's student in the Beta University TEOSL program, was taking courses, she was taking advantage of being a native Korean, and an ESL learner. For her individual study, she proposed a research agenda on social phenomena and social background of early English education in Korea. For another class, her course paper was to prepare a pronunciation workshop for non-native English teachers whose native language is Korean. Based on her experience, she knew in which areas Koreans had particular trouble in making correct English sounds such as r/l and g (j)/z. Even in a group project in which she cooperated with a native colleague, she suggested the research idea of an intercultural activity which aims to prepare students from other countries. More specifically, the activity involved Korean/Asian students who plan to study in the U.S. for the types of teaching/learning styles they would encounter in a U.S. classroom.

Since Tomo seldom participated in class discussions, he did not perceive that he was making a contribution to class *per se*. Yet, he believed that he could still make a contribution when he had opportunities to present his papers in class. The fact that he presented his course paper with one of his colleagues at a regional TESOL

conference was a good example of what he could offer to the TESOL field. The paper presented at the conference revealed how he and his colleagues' experiences in a new U.S. environment were used as a base for their research. Their presentation concerned how to utilize authentic materials to help newly-arrived international students survive in the U.S.

In a similar vein, Mei's strong interest in socio-linguistic issues is related to her experience as a non-native teacher with a foreign accent. The topic she was working on for her doctoral qualifying paper concerned how people's foreign language learning experience could affect their discriminative attitude against foreign accents.

Yuka, at Gamma University, took advantage of being a bilingual and bicultural student, who has learned and experienced two cultures and languages. She explained, "For example, I study what it means for someone to learn a second language and about the culture as an adult, and my experience, having done that myself, helps to interpret what I hear from my informants." Likewise, in her research on second language learners' identity and subjectivity, she studied Japanese learners of English, but also included English learners of Japanese—how both groups could be resistant to certain aspects of their target culture. She approached the issues from both perspectives of Japanese learners of English or English learners of Japanese.

Bo, in the Beta University PhD program, made the most of being a native Chinese in his research papers, while he was taking courses. For instance, one of his studies was to examine Chinese students' perceptions on peer review, and the research idea stemmed from his own experience and knowledge about Chinese culture and language. Another course paper that his professor described as a publishable one was an analysis of Chinese applicants' letters and American applicants' letters for a job opening. He was on the search committee while he was working at a university in China and he could have access to this. He became interested in this research when he took a rhetoric course.

Min, at the Delta University, had been vigorously engaged in research along with presenting and publishing his papers. Throughout his research, he made the most use of his knowledge about a Chinese EFL context, particularly language and history. Another motivation to make him pursue this particular topic of Chinese English writing originated in his realization of a lack of "foreign voice" in readings for ESL writing courses. He explained:

Readings started from 1945 to all the way to now, there is no even one piece written by Chinese, addressing ESL writing issues in china, EFL writing issues in China, in foreign country other than U.S. I was very unhappy with that.

He not only shed light on Chinese writing through his research, but also developed a long-term project of establishing EFL writing theories. He stated, “My project is to introduce, to draw attention to EFL writing.” In this way, the participants in this study used their native knowledge about EFL contexts and their ESL learner experiences in their research by making contributions to their TESOL graduate communities, and by extension, to professional TESOL discourse communities.

Participation in Class Discussions. In the beginning of Young-Ju’s graduate study in TESOL, she thought that she was only at a disadvantage because she had to study in her second language, English. However, while she was writing her autobiography as a language teacher for a class, she realized that her experience as an ESL learner could be used as a resource. Moreover, she noticed that other NES colleagues showed interest when she shared her own learning experience. Her NES friend in the program also expressed how much she enjoyed and appreciated international students’ perspectives in classes.

Interestingly, Min claimed that his learning experience could be a testimony to SL theories:

In ESL, always in theory and practices are very closely related. Any theories, you can talk about theory based on your experience...like my teaching experience, my experience of learning a language. When I was taking a ESL

theory, I can talk about whatever about the theory. My experience told me whether this is good, this is true or not, how accurate the theory is.

Mei, a relatively new PhD student in the Beta university TESOL program, perceived that she could make a contribution in that she could help other people understand cross-cultural issues by providing her own insider's experience and knowledge about Chinese/Asian culture. Thus, their ESL learner experiences and native knowledge about EFL contexts were being used in class participation.

Teaching. In research, class participation as well as in teaching, the participants' experiences as ESL learners and their knowledge about their own native contexts were of use in their teaching. In Young-Ju's practicum at the University intensive language program, she also made use of her ESL learning experience.

I told them I am also an ESL learner and took this language course. For example, when I teach a book, There are many words that I don't know like you. But you cannot look up the dictionary whenever you run into a new word because it takes too much time. It is a skill to find a meaning in the context."

In this way, Young-Ju, was making the most use of her experience as an ESL learner in her teaching.

The other master's students in the Alpha university TESOL program, Tomo and Su-Mi, also pointed out how their ESL learning experience could be positively

used in teaching ESL learners. First, they perceived that they had a better understanding of ESL students, particularly students from the same cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Su-Mi remarked, “But if Korean people teach, if he/she has good knowledge, good instructional skills, they then can deal with teaching better and more effectively [than American teachers].” Tomo also had a similar idea about being a non-native English teacher. He stated, “I know what is good for students, what is good for students, I think.” He expressed that he could be more patient, giving more waiting time for students’ responses: “I think teachers should be patient eventually...some people wait but some people don’t do it.”

Yuka, at Delta University, did a practicum at the university intensive English program during her master’s study. During her practicum, she stated that she helped students in a way that might have been difficult for native English speaking teachers:

Sometimes, actually, young Asian women, uh, students, Chinese, Korean, Taiwanese students seem to be, seem to think that I’m very approachable. So they opened up their mouth more easily with me. Maybe, just my impression. I don’t know. They approached me very easily and asked questions. And the whole class, I think, a little more participating because I was very patient with students. I could wait until students said something.

It is important that she also mentioned that she is more patient with her students. The participants' ESL learning experiences seemed to enable them to be more patient, and to have a positive impact on their teaching.

Bo also utilized his knowledge about Chinese language while he was teaching Linguistics course in order to help students understand language varieties. He perceived that his knowledge about Chinese contexts and Chinese language could be used as a resource.

All the participants of this study made the most use of their experience and knowledge as a valuable resource in their academic socialization processes. Importantly, they perceived that their unique perspectives and experiences could contribute to their classes and further to professional TESOL discourse communities.

Summary

In this chapter, the findings of this study were presented according to the main inquiries about the international graduate students' perceptions of their graduate discourse communities and their academic socialization processes. The participants' perceptions of their discourse communities were categorized into two sections: practices of discourse communities and textual knowledge. The former involved the availability of help and support, and equal opportunities, while the latter comprised

relevance of students' past experiences, background knowledge, and their future teaching careers.

With regard to the academic discourse socialization processes, each student's account of his/her experience was followed by the challenges and strategies of the participants. Their self-perceived limited oral proficiency, unfamiliarity with U.S. education cultures, and the lack of interactions and feelings of isolation were some of the challenges of the participants. Yet, their strategies to utilize their native EFL contexts, and ESL learner experiences allowed them to contribute to their TESOL discourse communities and further professional communities.

Chapter V will offer discussions of this study based on the findings.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the findings of this research in relation to relevant previous studies in order to shed light on some of the issues raised by this study. As frameworks to interpret the findings, critical discourse perspectives (Canagarajah, 1999a, 1999b; Fairclough, 1992; Pennycook, 1994, 1999, 2001; Tollefson, 1995), and the Vygotskyian notion of learning (1986) presented in *Situated learning* (Lave & Wenger, 1991) were adopted.

The critical discourse perspective particularly where the applied linguistics area is concerned, “not merely...[relates] language contexts to social contexts but rather does so from a point of view that views social relations as problematic” (Pennycook, 2001, p.6). Hence, critical awareness proposes the awareness of power equality in social relations. Based on this notion, I examined the participants’ academic socialization issues and their critical awareness of the practices of their graduate communities, and textual knowledge that they have gained.

The notion of Lave and Wenger’s (1991) *situated learning*—learning by participating in communities of practices, is a way to capture complex, changing, and multi-dimensional characteristics of the academic socialization processes of graduate students. Lave and Wenger’s notion of Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP)

provides the frame of learning processes of the students in this study in that their participation in their TESOL graduate discourse communities is peripheral, but yet legitimate. Furthermore, their participation in their discourse communities has increased over time from being peripheral toward having more full engagements. In this LPP frame, however, it is important to note that tradition, culture, and practices of community can guide newcomers to maintain the *status quo* but also newcomers can transform the existing practices of communities.

Becoming Critical

Gee (1990) contends that those who are not in the mainstream become more consciously aware of social practices, when they encounter a situation that they may not be familiar with, and therefore, have difficulty to accommodate and adapt. Thus, those who are marginal in a discourse community can often develop insights and awareness that mainstreamers do not have. Gee perceives this critical awareness as power to “manipulate, to analyze, to resist while advancing” (p.148). In this regard, being situated in the periphery as international graduate students who are not familiar with practices and languages of communities, can be an advantage.

Undergoing the processes of repositioning in new ESL discourse communities, the participants of this study became increasingly aware of their discourse communities and their relational position. This process of self-repositioning

in a new discourse community was not easy, as Belcher and Braine (1995) argued. Specifically, this self-repositioning process occurred when the participants came across a situation to deal with which engaged their socially-constructed identity as non-native teachers. In their home countries, where the majority of TESOL teachers are non-native teachers, their non-native status never was in question. However, when they were relocated to a native English environment (i.e., ESL discourse communities) where the majority of TESOL teachers were native English-speaking teachers, all of a sudden, they found that they were positioned as *non-native* teachers, and their qualifications were questioned. On the other hand, their peripheral location in new discourse environments allowed them to question their TESOL communities and knowledge. Thereby, in the following sections, I will discuss the participants' critical awareness of their discourse communities and their struggles with socially-constructed identities through a critical lens.

Relocating TESOL Discourse Communities

When the students of this study were repositioned in new discourse environments, their awareness of ESL discourse communities, as well of their native EFL discourse communities, was heightened. Their awareness particularly involves questioning of power differentials and contextual differences.

In-Su's critical stance is particularly noticeable. As mentioned earlier, his strong EFL professional identity and peripheral position in an ESL discourse community led him to have a critical perspective regarding two discourse communities—Korean EFL and U.S.-ESL discourse communities.

It is noteworthy that In-Su perceived that M.A. TESOL programs in the U.S. are preparations for ESL teachers who would teach ESL learners in the ESL environments, not for EFL teachers who would teach in EFL contexts. In-Su searched in vain in the U.S. for a program with a more EFL focus. For instance, his particular dissatisfaction with Culture and Language courses reveals his awareness of contextual differences of ESL and Korean EFL contexts, and the need for having corresponding different courses. In ESL contexts, teachers should know students' different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, whereas, in Korean EFL contexts, teachers and students share the same culture and language. Furthermore, his insights on a Korean EFL context allowed him to discuss why particular teaching methodology such as CLT is difficult to apply in Korean EFL contexts. Despite his discontent of what he learned in his M.A. TESOL program, he did not feel that he had a right to suggest any changes for graduate students with EFL backgrounds and future career goals in EFL contexts. His particular comment revealed that he did not feel ownership of the program; he felt that he was an outsider: "They would say, 'if you don't like this program, you should

leave’.” Furthermore, he retained strong EFL professional identity: “ESL TESOL in the U.S. is not for an EFL setting. So you will lose your identity if you follow U.S. TESOL.”

Interestingly enough, In-Su’s lack of ownership and feeling of being an outsider in the U.S. ESL discourse community made him criticize Korea EFL discourse community more pointedly. He criticized the Korean scholars in the TESOL area because of their lack of interest in field experience and in the development of local- and context-specific theories and practices. The following comment discloses his critical perspective of the Korean TESOL discourse community: “What makes me so upset is Korean professors. There’s no theory. There’s no methodology suitable for Koreans. That bothers me. Korean professors have too many problems.... they import western-theories directly and teach.” His strong criticism seemed to derive partially from his negative experience with a professor while he was attending a TESOL graduate program in Korea for a short period time as noted earlier. This reason and his goal to improve his English brought him to the U.S. TESOL discourse community. Yet, he found the program was not for EFL teachers. Therefore, neither of the Korean EFL, nor the U.S. ESL program satisfactorily served his needs as an EFL teacher.

His critique of the lack of context and cultural specific theories and practices in Korea resonates with some researchers’ (Canagarajah, 1999b; Holliday, 1994;

Pennycook 1989, 1994, 1999, 2001) apprehension that western-imported ELT theories and practices dominate EFL local contexts, ultimately causing clashes with local educational cultures. Mei's critical awareness of the practices that she noticed in China was also noteworthy. She observed that Chinese scholars and students opted for western-earned degrees over Chinese-earned degrees, and articles written by western-scholars over articles written by Chinese scholars. In her case, her graduate study in the area of Sociolinguistics allowed her to organize her sense of equality and to articulate it. Her strong interest in sociolinguistics led her to write her paper for her doctoral qualifying exam. Her paper concerned the relationship of people's perceptions of foreign accents and their foreign language learning experiences. This is another way of expressing her critical awareness of being a non-native teacher in the U.S. with a foreign accent. Therefore, her experiences, readings, and discussions in the sociolinguistics course empowered her to tackle the socially-related linguistic issues. Although she had sensed unfairness even before she took the course of Sociolinguistics, her thoughts were not built on critical theories. However, the course became a vehicle for her to transfer her sense of injustice into more visible forms (in her case, research). Furthermore, her comment, "Asian ways of learning language" is another way of learning language, (which is not inefficient and backward),

particularly discloses her critical awareness of language learning in relation to western ways of learning languages.

Likewise, Min, at the Delta TESOL program, showed his critical awareness in regard to issues of ESL writing. Taking ESL writing relevant courses, he noticed an underrepresentation of EFL scholars as well as a lack of research on EFL writing. He could not find any articles written on EFL writing and written by EFL scholars in the course reading list. His awareness of a lack of a “foreign voice” in ESL writing courses led him to decide to devote himself to establishing EFL writing research agenda.

Therefore, Min’s case shows that learning in an ESL discourse community as an international student, helped him find a research niche where he found a lack of representation of EFL discourse communities in relation to ESL discourse communities. Furthermore, In-Su and Mei questioned certain practices of their native EFL discourse communities where western-related articles and degrees are considered superior to their domestic ones. Similarly, the participants’ peripheral position in new discourse environments allowed them to question and problematize practices of TESOL discourse communities. According to Pennycook (1999), this kind of noticing power differentials and raising questions is “an initial step in the process of change” in TESOL education (p. 336).

Being “Non-native” Teachers

One of the most salient themes of this study emerged in the issues related to teaching. Each teaching setting, learners’ levels, and courses that the participants taught were varied. Regardless, the realm of teaching turned out to be the most problematic in that teaching is under more institutional control compared with other areas such as conducting research, writing, and participating in class discussions where students can use their subjectivity to some extent. As a result, the students in this study were challenged most while they were teaching. Furthermore, they had to confront their socially-constructed identity as non-native English teachers.

Although NNES teachers are at an advantage because of their cultural and linguistic sensitivity and empathy to students’ learning processes (Medgyes, 1999; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999), the *native speaker fallacy* places more power in NES teachers over NNES teachers, regardless of their qualifications (Canagarajah, 1999a; Phillipson, 1992). The idea of *native speaker fallacy* claims that the ideal English teacher is a native speaker, in spite of the fact that a NNES teacher, who has undergone the laborious process of acquiring English, can be a qualified teacher (Phillipson, 1992). Likewise, NNES teachers are construed as being less competent teachers (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Rampton, 1990) in this scheme, even though *what they know* is more important than *who they are*.

Related to the issues of internships and practicum, it is important to note the practices of the Alpha University TESOL program. The Alpha TESOL graduate program, as noted earlier, offers two courses on practicum and internships for teaching practice. The practicum consists of observations and reflections along with a 10-15 minute microteaching at the end of the practicum. Three students, Tomo, Su-Mi and In-Su in this study, finished their practicum in their university intensive language program. However, when it came to the internships where more teaching practices were involved, they were disadvantaged. Even if students were able to find an internship in three different settings—the University intensive language program, the Sunday community class, and the K-12 schools, none of the three students in the program could find an internship in their university intensive language program. The latter is where English is being taught to university's international students as formal and regular courses. Consequently the participants in the study could not compare their internship experiences, taking place outside of a formal university setting, with the experiences of those graduate students who were allowed to their internship within a formal university setting.

Tomo wanted to find an internship in the university intensive language program but had to give up his wish because none of the non-native speakers were able to do their internship in the language program. In contrast, their NES

counterparts enjoyed their practicum and/or internship in the university intensive language program, working part-time or full-time. Tomo's individual wish to work in the more formal and regular settings, where he could practice teaching, was surrendered to the institutional reality, which did not provide non-native speakers internship opportunities. Su-mi, who is a fairly proficient English speaker, also applied for the internship in the University ESL program in vain, she ended up doing her internship at the Sunday community class. Furthermore, while they were doing their internship, little supervision or assistance was provided for the NNES students. Although it was not known if it were a university policy not to offer NNES students an internship in a formal university language program, it is noteworthy that some international students in the Alpha TESOL program applied for their internships in the University intensive language program and were not accepted.

In the same Alpha program, In-Su had difficulty finding his internship. He could not teach at the Sunday community class for religious reasons and he could not find an internship in the university intensive language program. In the end, his professor found an internship for him at a local middle school. His work was to help a new Korean student who had just arrived. Because he pulled out the student from the ESL class, he did not have opportunities to interact with his mentoring teacher and other students. Therefore, he perceived his teaching experience as more of a tutoring

experience. Although In-Su was not a novice in terms of teaching English, having had a number of years of teaching experience in Korea, he was considered as being a novice in his ESL discourse community. Yet, he was not given an opportunity to interact with people within the school system. Kamhi-stein's (1999) study on NNES students' practicum experiences, reports the bias and prejudice of students, administrators, and parents who make NNES students' practicum challenging. In this study, In-Su, however, simply worked in isolation without any interactive opportunities, whether positive or negative. This is a type of *benign neglect* of the community, according to Lave and Wenger's (1991) LPP concept. Lave and Wenger's LPP model presents that resources are imperative for newcomers to participate in their discourse communities. However, none of the students in the Alpha university program had full access to practice their teaching due to their non-native status.

Four doctoral students in this study had a different type of teaching opportunity, which was a teaching assistantship. With regard to international TAs (teaching assistants), most published studies underline issues of communicative competence of international TAs. They analyze their classroom discourses and interactions, compared with their native counterparts (Tyler, 1992) and suggest strategies and programs to help international TAs (Williams, 1992). What is lacking

in those studies, however, are international TAs' voices and specific social contexts where teaching occurs. In this regard, this study reveals that the challenges that the international TAs were undergoing was not a mere matter of their communicative competence, but also due to their unfamiliarity with American educational practices, American student culture, and new course content, particularly during their first year of teaching.

Bo and Ling in the Delta Ph.D. program were teaching composition courses, while Min and Mei in the Beta program were teaching academic English at the university intensive language program. Bo additionally was teaching a linguistics course. Although all of them had teaching experiences at universities before they entered their respective programs in the U.S., they had not previously taught the types of courses they were assigned to teach for their teaching assistantships. As a result, the content that they had to teach was new to them. For instance, Min was asked to teach Academic English in Psychology, in which he did not have any background. Ling was uneasy about her writing, but yet had to teach a writing course. This study revealed that international TAs' English proficiency should not be the only focus of issues related to international TAs.

In addition, when Mei and Bo had to teach, their unfamiliarity about American education practices, due to their inexperience in the U.S. classroom, made

their teaching more challenging. Mei, in particular, was frustrated by having to plan a syllabus which she did not know how to do. Without knowing students' levels, what to teach, and what to grade, it was not an easy task for her to design a syllabus for the entire course. Furthermore, without experiencing how American classrooms function, she had to teach a pre-matriculated course for international students. It is important to note that Mei was not able to ask for help even when the program coordinators were available. When the new task was given, which she had not experienced nor observed, she did not know in what area she needed help. She not being able to ask for help for the first few weeks, is similar to Krase's (2004) account of another international student (Hanna) in a similar situation. Even when her (Hanna) professor offered help, she could not take advantage of it because she did not know what to ask. Her inexperience impeded her from asking for help, which might have been an important key for her to adjust to a new academic discourse environment.

Even if the challenges of the participants of this study as teachers in ESL discourse communities did not solely originate from their English language proficiency, the reality of teaching in an ESL discourse community reminded them of their non-native status. Particularly, students' evaluation of their teaching always included their non-native English accents and then its unintelligibility to some.

In Ling's case, although she perceived that her well-prepared class could be conducive to her students' learning, her foreign accent, (which she did not believe that she could change), was a negative point in her students' evaluation of her teaching. She received negative comments on her accent. Some expressed their difficulty in understanding her. She was critical about the TA evaluation survey item: "Do you clearly understand instructors' teaching?" She thought this could mislead students to judge NNES teachers' speaking ability including their accents. She realized that no matter how hard she tried to make her class more understandable, there were always students complaining about her foreign accent. These experiences led her to believe that some students are biased and they often blame their failure on international TAs' communication ability.

Similarly, Yuka also experienced a few students complaining about having difficulty understanding her. As for students' responses to Yuka's teaching during her practicum in the university language program, she observed some students coming to class being prejudiced against non-native English teachers. Some of them changed their minds later, but some never did. When one of her students wrote in a teaching evaluation that he would not want to take her class anymore, she was very hurt. She did suspect, however, that this student was the one who had failed the class a couple

of times and he was blaming her for his failure. This experience made her realize that she could not please all students.

Although their socially-constructed identities as NNES teachers challenged them, none of the participants were traumatized by their students' comments about their foreign accents, and their seemingly unintelligibility. Rather, they perceived those comments as their students' failure rather than their (teachers') failure that could happen in any educational context with both NNES and NES teachers. Furthermore, they made a lot of effort to make their classes more prepared and organized than other teachers. This signifies that they are not passive receivers of their socially-constructed identity (i.e., a non-native teacher), but, they are active negotiators with the social imposition on their accents and foreign identities.

Learning by Participating and Interacting

Academic socialization of the participants in this study in their TESOL graduate programs, was revolving around oral participation, writing papers, teaching, and conducting research on the basis of coursework. These academic activities, however, did not have unilateral and isolated features. Rather, each component of the academic activities was interlinked, influencing and shaping the other types of academic activities. In addition, social interactions within and outside of the graduate

discourse communities turned out to be a very significant factor to affect the international students' academic socialization process.

The academic socialization process of the TESOL graduate students in this study took the shape of the apprenticeship model, proposed by Lave & Wenger's (1991). In this model, newcomers are less engaged in their communities of practices, whereas those who are close to graduation, are more engaged in their discourse communities. In particular, new students need specific guidance and assistance (e.g., Mei), while senior graduate students play a role of experienced colleagues in helping newcomers (e.g., Yuka). Secondly, students develop the language of TESOL over time, in particular, those doctoral students writing their dissertations display their insights on the TESOL discourse and develop their academic identities. In addition, their academic identities have a tendency to correspond to the specialized area of their graduate TESOL discourse communities. Min's comment on his research topics illustrated this: "I come from Delta [university], somehow I represent what we have as a resource." In this regard, the graduate TESOL discourse communities of the participants in this study maintain the characteristics, culture, and customs of their discourse communities, which is a hub of apprenticeship according to Lave and Wenger (1991).

The level and types of involvement of each participant in TESOL discourse communities varies, depending on where they are in their graduate study. Those students who are in their first or second year of graduate study, with little or no field experience and/or formal training in the TESOL area, particularly strive to understand conversation of TESOL discourse communities. The students who are writing their dissertations introduce themselves into professional TEOSL discourse communities. Their academic discourse socialization extends into professional TESOL communities. This involves presenting at conferences and publishing in journals. Furthermore, their insights into their research area and the level of confidence about their knowledge are no longer of those students who just entered into a TESOL graduate discourse community.

At the surface level, although most academic activities seem to consist of individual intellectual activities, the underlying infrastructure that may facilitate or hamper the students' academic socialization process is a supportive system with available help and opportunities inside their discourse communities. This affected not only students' academic socialization processes but also provides a gradual induction into a professional TESOL discourse community. In the following sections, two different phases of academic socialization processes will be discussed: newcomers and senior students.

Newcomers: Outsider or Legitimate Peripheral Participation?

Granted that newcomers in general struggle to learn new practices of the community in a new environment, their participation in their communities of practices is legitimate as Lave and Wenger (1991) claimed. Not all of the newcomers in this study, however, perceived that their participation is legitimate in their relatively new TEOSL graduate discourse communities. For instance, In-Su's case is noteworthy in that he did not try to become a member of his U.S. TESOL graduate discourse community

According to Casanave's (2002) definition, disciplinary enculturation means that people may feel like outsiders in the beginning and later feel at home in their field. In-Su's disciplinary enculturation into his ESL discourse community did not occur, he still felt like an outsider in the last semester of his master's study. In-Su simply accepted his being an outsider in an ESL graduate discourse community instead of trying to become a member of the ESL community, as he said, "I don't have anything to contribute here or suggestions to change." Although his experience in an ESL context made him more critical about the Korean EFL discourse community, he did not perceive that his study in the U.S. was successful or satisfying. For instance, his participation in class discussion was rare, and his internship took place in an isolated context.

In-Su's isolation and little motivation to be a member of his ESL discourse community is reminiscent of Schneider and Fujishima's (1995) case study. Schneider and Fujishima's study reported that an international graduate student (Zhang) in International Policy Studies at a U.S. institution failed to enculturate into his discourse community. Although there were many possible reasons for his unsuccessful disciplinary enculturation, one of the interesting points that the authors made was that he left campus as soon as his classes were over, and rarely interacted with people in his field. As Casanave (2002) pointed out, Zhang's case was not as simple as it looked on the surface. There might be more complicated issues involved in his case, such as social, motivational, and political issues. Nonetheless, Schneider and Fujishima's (1995) case raised the question what would have happened if he had received proper institutional support to engage him in his discourse community. In a similar kind of study that dealt with a Sociology Ph.D. student's disciplinary enculturation process, Casanave (2002) claims that the student (Virginia)'s decision to quit the school after a year means she was resistant to her discourse community. Therefore, it was her decision not to follow the *games* of her discourse community. Yet, In-Su's case does not fit into either one of the other cases. Rather, his case shows more complexity. It is intermingled with personal, social, and political issues. Moreover, his strong EFL professional identity should be considered in his less flexibility in his academic

socialization process in the ESL discourse community. Nonetheless, the lack of support in his ESL discourse community, contributed to his outsider status, causing him to not be a legitimate member of that ESL discourse community during his 2 years of his master's study.

What makes a student an outsider or a legitimate peripheral participant is his/her accessibility to resources, and scaffolded assistance of more experienced people in the communities of practices, as the Lave and Wenger's model presented. While In-Su felt he was an outsider in his ESL graduate discourse community, Young-Ju, Bo, and Mei, who were also relatively newcomers to U.S. TESOL communities, made their way through with the assistance of coordinators, colleagues, and professors. Their cases can be a good contrast to In-Su's case in that regard.

For Mei and Bo, preparing international students for mainstream classrooms was a challenge because they did not know how the U.S. classroom functioned. For Mei's case, in spite of her frustration as a TA, and dissatisfaction with discussion-oriented and student-centered courses as a student in the beginning, she gradually became familiar with those practices. Coordinators in the intensive language program and her supervisor's feedback on her teaching helped her realize some important activities in the U.S. classroom system, such as group activities and the importance of students' engagement. Her professor's comment on her improvement at the next

observation proved that she engaged herself gradually in the practices of ESL discourse community.

Not only was teaching in a new discourse community new to Bo and Mei, but also qualitative research was unfamiliar to them. They had never been exposed to qualitative research in China before they entered their graduate program, but yet, they had to assist their professors with transcribing or being a research participant, as a part of their research assistantship work. Through these assistantship activities, learning occurred. Thus, although their participation is peripheral in that they merely assisted their professors or sometimes they needed help, their participation in their discourse community is legitimate.

Increasing Engagement in a Professional Conversation

One of the salient characteristics that the doctoral students displayed in their academic discourse socialization processes was their induction into a professional TESOL discourse community. Among five doctoral participants, Bo and Mei in the Beta university are considered as relative newcomers in their discourse communities in the sense that they needed assistance and collaboration with more experienced people, whereas, Yuka, Min, and Ling, who were writing their dissertations, can be seen as more experienced peers according to the Lave and Wenger's (1991) apprenticeship model. The latter group of students was more engaged not only inside

their own graduate discourse communities as more experienced members, but also in a professional TESOL discourse community. Their disciplinary socialization processes were taking place by writing dissertations, engaging in professional conversation through presentations and publications, and developing their academic identities or forms of membership. In this phase, it turned out to be significant to establish supportive networks and to interact with people in the TESOL field inside and outside their own graduate communities.

It is interesting to note how those three doctoral students who were writing their dissertations stepped into a TESOL professional community. Presenting at conferences and publishing in journals are some examples of how learning took place for them by participating in their professional discourse communities (Cho, 2004; Flowerdew, 2000). In addition, the participants' accounts proved that not only did publishing and presenting become learning processes, but also opportunities to make connections and introduce themselves into a professional TESOL community.

NNES scholars' publishing issues are well documented in previous published studies (Cho, 2004; Gosden, 1992, 1995, 1996; Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b, 2000), whereas the impact of conference presentation has not been addressed. Importantly, Yuka and Ling learned what and how to present by attending conferences. Yuka and Ling were studying in two different TESOL graduate programs, yet underwent similar

experiences in that their first conference attendance as members in the audience, became a learning opportunity. None of them learned how to write a proposal and how to present their research until they attended conferences and observed how it worked. This implies that participation can induce learning. Min's case also proved that conference attendance could make a significant difference in graduate students' academic discourse socialization processes. His research idea was inspired when he attended a conference after his first year of doctoral study. His professor introduced Min to another senior member of the conference community. When the senior scholar encouraged him to conduct research regarding English in China, it made him dwell on the topic. He discussed it with his colleague, and organized it into a dissertation topic. He quickly gained an understanding of the rules and games of presenting and publishing communities and has published and presented actively since then. Therefore, conference attendance plays an important role in graduate students' inductive process into their professional discourse communities.

In the students' induction process into their professional discourse communities, it appeared that the role of professors was also very crucial. In this study, professors introduced their graduate students into professional TESOL communities through announcing upcoming conferences and calls for papers, and encouraging their students to present their research at conferences. Some of the

participants could even benefit by presenting their research (e.g., Min & Ling) at the conferences hosted by their professors. Furthermore, as an insider who already knows the *game* of making one's research public through publishing and presenting, professors' feedback on their students' research paper was also vital, as Yuka's case exemplified. Although this study does not particularly show the cases of doctoral students who are excluded from presentation opportunities, it is important to note that institutional and faculty support can facilitate induction processes into professional discourse communities.

Inside their graduate TESOL communities, the doctoral students of this study were assisting, playing a role of more experienced peers to other students. For instance, Yuka passed along the abstracts of her published research papers and gave feedback on other students' papers. Min organized panels for conferences. Ling, who is a strong proponent of peer group discussions, also helped other international students by sharing her experiences. Their way of helping other students who are less experienced and relatively new in their discourse communities demonstrates a form of apprenticeship where more experienced peers help relative newcomers.

However, this process is not always easy and transparent. For instance, Ling experienced working in isolation. Admitting the fact that her situation might be intertwined with her personal situation as a mother of a young child, and by her shy

personality, the question still remains what she would have done if she had received proper help while she was struggling. Ling's experience is similar to Young-Li's case in Krase's (2004) study. On his study on ESL graduate students, the lack of communication between Young-Li and her thesis supervisor caused a waste of her time and money and eventually delayed her graduation.

Unlike Ling, Min in the same program, quickly gained the practices of the community regarding how to establish relationships with his professors. He did not perceive his professors as authority figures, and therefore, it was not difficult to approach them. As he mentioned, his approach was the "American way." Thus, his gaining the social practice allowed him to progress in his academic socialization process. In addition, through his regular attending of the informal gatherings in his department, he was able to feel the sense of membership. Min's quickness in creating supportive networks inside and outside his graduate community was a testimony to his successful academic enculturation during the relative short period of time.

Another successful doctoral student, Yuka, attributed one of the reasons of her relative success to her mentors' support and their collegial relationship throughout her graduate study. According to her, she was treated as a colleague and her work was also respected as other scholars.' This ultimately led her to believe that she was a valuable resource to and a contributor in a TESOL discourse community. Therefore,

behind Min's and Yuka's successful academic discourse socialization processes, there were constructive relationships between their professors and them. This is similar to Belcher's (1994) study on relationships between graduate students and their mentors, particularly, during the students' dissertation writing processes. According to her, "dialogic" and collaborative relationships allowed a student to successfully enter into her discourse community by writing successfully. Furthermore, Krase (2004) claimed that gaining insiders' support is essential in ESL graduate students' academic socialization processes. As this study and other studies showed, it is essential to make an avenue of communication between students and professors easy and accessible for students' successful academic discourse socialization. Although this is important in every phase of graduate study, this is particularly significant in students' induction into a professional discourse community.

Finding and Creating a Space

International graduate students in this study were not simply striving to fit themselves into U.S. TESOL communities. As Prior (1991, 1998) has claimed, the students' disciplinary enculturation process was not a simple, unilateral process of receiving the knowledge, culture and tradition of the communities of practices; their academic socialization processes are the processes of negotiation and transformation. Likewise, the notion of communities of practices, proposed by Lave and Wenger

(1991), explains the international graduate students in the TESOL discourse communities in the U.S. They characterize the dynamics of reproduction and transformation as a core of communities of practices. Thus, what keeps a community of practice is not only continuance of the culture, custom, and practices of the community, but also the changes that newcomers bring into the community. Without change, the communities will cease to exist.

The participants' elevated critical awareness when they become non-mainstreamers and the strategies they adopted, negotiated, and evolved illustrated that those international students were not simply a marginalized group of students. The students' experiences in two different contexts of EFL and ESL learners and/or teachers allowed them to raise their critical awareness of the practices and contexts of their discourse communities, and their relational positions in those communities. On the surface, the students are at a disadvantage not only because they perform academic activities in their second language, but also because U.S. TESOL communities have different practices that they did not experience in their home countries. However, this study shows that those students' subjectivity, which appeared mostly through utilization of their native EFL contexts and their ESL learning experiences at a variety of academic activities, has great potential for their

TESOL graduate discourse communities and their integration into further professional TESOL communities.

Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999) were concerned that current TESOL practices might silence international TESOLers. Most participants in the present study, however, perceived that they could play an important role in the TESOL field as contributing members of their TESOL discourse communities. In particular, taking a subject position, not object position as an ESL learner in the community, made a positive impact on their academic discourse socialization processes. For instance, In-Su's lack of ownership in his discourse community hindered his academic socialization process and isolated him more from it, while Min's and Yuka's feelings of membership in their discourse communities allowed them to thrive as novice scholars. However, in In-Su's case, his feeling of being an outsider in his discourse community in the U.S. allowed him to raise his critical awareness of the Korean native TESOL discourse community. In particular, he was able to relocate Korean contexts in relation to western TESOL discourse communities. His criticism of Korean TESOL community was harsh: "I don't understand what Korean English professors are doing. They only introduce all western theories without any clue of the reality of teaching field." It is, however, notable that his criticism was not just for the sake of criticism. His plan to collect and organize successful English teaching theories

and practices in Korea reveals his decision to make a change in Korean TESOL discourse communities.

Although Tomo expressed his struggles with his participation in class discussions, he mentioned that he could still make a contribution to TESOL field. In particular, his presentation at a local TESOL conference and his presentations in classes have illustrated this. Using class presentations instead of free participation in discussions may be helpful for those students who are not familiar or comfortable with student-initiated discussions.

Most of the participants made the most use of insiders' insight on EFL native contexts, and ESL learning experience when participating in class discussions, writing research papers, and teaching. Furthermore, having been in different cultures allowed them to find a research agenda that has not been fully discussed. For instance, Min's notice of the lack of research on EFL writing and his vision to establish EFL writing theories is such an example. Furthermore, Min's comment that different contexts need different approaches is noteworthy: "We can learn from U.S. ESL writing. But in China, we have own agenda.... We have different reasons from Americans, how to teach students, with methodology different, and what kind of English writing teaching." This signifies that the students who are learning in the U.S. TESOL discourse communities are simply not receivers of the knowledge of their discourse

communities. Their awareness and ability to discuss what they have learned from different perspectives demonstrates their subjectivity whereby they can make a change in their discourse communities.

Yuka attempted to conduct an alternative dissertation study, which no one had previously done in her department. Her pioneering research methodology is also one of her contributions to the TESOL field. Moreover, she was nominated as a featured student of the year in her program. Although Ling struggled in finding a dissertation topic and working in isolation without proper help, she believed that her research could make a contribution to the TESOL field in that little research has been conducted in that particular area.

One of the most visible contributions of the international students of this study to TESOL discourse communities took place through their presentations and publications. Through those activities in public domains, international graduate students not only bring their native EFL contexts into an ESL-dominated western TESOL discourse community, but also they bridge the gap between EFL and ESL discourse communities. Min's research on Chinese writing and further EFL writing, Yuka's study on bilingual and bicultural area are some examples.

As Canagarajah (1999 b) urges, students in this study were utilizing their subjectivity by shifting their position from objects of the discourse to the subject of

agency. Therefore, NNES students are neither simple objects of TESOL discourse communities, nor marginalized group of students in the U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities. They are, instead, contributing members of TESOL discourse communities by bringing their unique and critical perspectives and their knowledge about EFL native discourse communities to ESL-dominated TESOL discourse communities. This resonates with the Canagarajah's (1999 b) claim that those non-mainstream people's "subject position, outside identity, marginalized status and alternate cultural tradition can provide western-centered discourses with critical perspectives" (p.34). This should be the starting point where international graduate students in the U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities can find their own space. Furthermore, it is imperative to create supportive environments on the part of the TESOL discourse communities in the U.S. Hence, mutual effort to find and create a space for international students should be made in order to make western-dominant TESOL discourse communities a more egalitarian and open place of learning and exchanging scholarship.

Summary

This chapter extended the findings of this research study by discussing some of the issues raised by this study. The notion of *situated learning* and critical discourse perspectives framed the discussions. Some of the findings were related to

previous published studies in order to illustrate some issues in more depth. The participants' critical awareness and subjectivity were the most important points of discussions. The participants' critical awareness involved their relocating their discourse communities and repositioning themselves. Furthermore, the participants' subjectivity to find their space in their TESOL discourse communities is as important as supportive environments of their discourse communities for students' successful discourse socialization. Therefore, finding and creating a space signifies mutual efforts.

Chapter VI will present the conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research on the topic.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section reviews and summarizes the process of this research process: literature review, research design, data collection, and findings. The following section presents implications of this study. This involves what the findings of this study imply and suggest for those who are involved in the TESOL education and discourse communities. Finally, the limitations of this study along with unanswered questions through this research are addressed, followed by recommendation for further research on the topic.

Overview of the Research

With the global spread of English and influx of immigrants, U.S. TESOL programs attract a large number of international students who pursue their graduate degrees in the TESOL area in order to become teachers or teacher educators. These international students come from different discourse communities—EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and EAL (English as an Associate Language) discourse communities with different cultures, languages, and education systems. As a result, those students with different discourse backgrounds may face more challenges than their NES counterparts. Thus, the issues of international students' perceptions of their

discourse communities and socialization in them need particular attention. Therefore, this research study explored the international graduate students' perceptions of their U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities and their socialization processes in them.

This study was based on the frameworks of critical discourse perspectives and the notion that learning takes place through participation in communities of practices. The critical discourse perspective in TESOL education has been advocated by a number of scholars such as Canagarajah (1999a, 1999b), Kumaravadivelu (2001), Ramanathan (2002), and Pennycook (1999, 2001). In particular, Pennycook (1999) posits, "Critical approaches to TESOL, would do well to retain a constant skepticism, a constant questioning about the types of knowledge, theory, practice, or praxis they operate with.... (p. 345)" Furthermore, Kumaravadivelu (2001) promotes constructing equal relationships between prospective teachers and teacher educators, developing context-specific pedagogies, and incorporating students' voices and visions into curriculum. Related to international students in TESOL education, Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999) suggest including a diversity of international contexts such as EFL and EAL.

Lave and Wenger's (1991) notion of *Situated Learning* underlies the academic socialization processes of the participants of this study. The notion of situated learning proposes learning by participation in practices of communities, and therefore,

learning, is situational. In particular, the concept of *legitimate peripheral participation*, which studies how newcomers increase their participation over time, moving toward full participation, explains students' learning processes. In regard to academic socialization issues, Casanave (1995, 2002) and Prior (1991, 1999) describe the students' disciplinary enculturation processes as being historical, social, and situational as well as personal. Based on the findings of the literature, this study explored the issues of the students' academic socialization processes.

For the methodology of this study, a qualitative interview study was adopted. In particular, this research followed a critical/feminist research paradigm in terms of epistemology and ontology perspectives. Thereby, the research process was made transparent and the co-constructive relationships between the researcher and the researched were established. Revealing the researcher's stance and involvement in each step of research made it clear that this study was not completely objective, but situational and subjective. Furthermore, a critical viewpoint to examine power and relations guided this research particularly in analyzing and interpreting the data.

For the study, through a *network sampling* method, 9 international graduate students in four different TESOL graduate programs in the U.S. were interviewed. All of them were from East Asia countries such as China, Korea, Japan and Taiwan. While 4 of them were master's students, 5 were doctoral students. A primary means

of collecting data was interviewing. Along with the interviews, documentation through online and offline sources was adopted. The interview data were transcribed verbatim and analyzed through inductive and interpretive analysis with the assistance of a qualitative data analysis software program (NUD*IST).

Through the analysis, the following themes were identified. With regard to students' perceptions of their discourse communities, first, students in this study appreciated their TESOL graduate discourse communities when they could receive proper assistance and support. Furthermore, collegial relationships and equal opportunities were important factors affecting their perceptions of the practices of their discourse communities. Second, their perceptions of the textual knowledge they have gained through courses varied depending on the relevance of their personal experiences, their future teaching goals, and their background knowledge about the TESOL area.

Related to academic socialization processes, the findings reveal that learning occurred by participating in their discourse communities. These include such academic activities as oral partaking, writing papers, conducting research, and teaching. The discourse socialization processes, however, were complex, multidimensional, and contextual such that their personal and social locations played significant roles. These processes are divided into three stages—peripheral

participation, increasing participation, and induction into professional TESOL communities.

First, the challenges most of the participants faced were their limited language proficiency and unfamiliarity with educational practices in the U.S. at the beginning of their study in their discourse communities. This challenged them in their teaching as well as class participation. Therefore, their participation in their graduate discourse communities was peripheral in the early stage. However, they adopted the practices of their new discourse communities, particularly when teaching. For instance, when they taught, they created student-engaging activities and encouraged students' participation, which was perceived as being typical American classroom practices. This indicates that the participants observed and adopted practices of their communities.

In the final stage into, which the doctoral students writing their dissertations can be categorized, the induction process into a professional community occurred. Through making their research public through presenting and publishing, they were introducing themselves into professional TESOL discourse communities. In these processes, it turned out that professors' encouragement and feedback on their research was significant. In this phase, students started to display their academic identities, which were closely related to the specialty of their discourse community.

This academic discourse socialization, however, was not a one-way process in which only their graduate discourse communities shaped them. Rather, the process was reciprocal. These students were also influencing their discourse communities by engaging themselves in TESOL conversations in classrooms, conferences, and journals, with their insiders' knowledge about EFL contexts and culture, and ESL learner experiences. Their unique location as non-mainstreamers in the U.S., and experience of two different discourse communities allowed them to obtain critical perspectives and subsequently become contributing members of TESOL discourse communities.

Implications and Suggestions

The findings of this study suggest that mutual efforts on the parts of students and their TESOL discourse communities are pivotal in order to help international students' successful academic socialization and to increase their satisfaction with their programs. It is vital to create supportive environments in academic discourse socialization processes. Some students who felt isolation lacked interactions with people in the same discourse community (e.g., peers and professors). Although their personal issues were conducive to their isolation to some degree, their feelings of being outsiders were not solely their own individual responsibility. Conversely, those students who were successful in their discourse socialization displayed quick

acquisition of knowledge about practices of their communities. Furthermore, appropriate support from and interactions with people in the same discourse communities and easy access to resources appeared to be a key to international students' successful academic discourse socialization processes. This supportive environment also affects their perceptions of their discourse communities.

Based on the findings, this study offers specific suggestions that can be implemented in order to facilitate international graduate students' more active participation in their graduate discourse communities.

First, international students tend to have difficulties in participating in free discussions due to their unfamiliarity with cultural and linguistic differences of their discourse communities. However, when they are asked to give presentations as a part of course requirements, they can prepare themselves for the presentation beforehand; consequently, they can participate more and contribute to class than when they have free conversation-type discussions. Therefore, presentation-type discussions can be beneficial to those international students who are not familiar with free discussions.

Second, it is suggested that students' experiences and their visions should be integrated into the classroom and curriculum. In this study, when students could relate their personal experiences to what they were learning, and when they felt their learning would be useful for their future careers, they learned more, and participated

more in TESOL conversations. This implies that the curriculum of TESOL discourse communities should integrate international students' native context components, their experiences, and knowledge as valuable resources.

Third, as the role of professors turned out to be greatly important in graduate students' academic socialization processes, professors' support, trust, and encouragements are recommended. Furthermore, it is suggested that having a collegial relationship between students and professors is conducive to students' discourse socialization processes. For this, it is also important to make an avenue of communication easy and accessible.

Fourth, as it appears in this study, attending conferences can make a great impact on graduate students' discourse socialization processes. Hence, it is recommended to establish a supportive system of graduate students' conference attendance. Not only announcing upcoming conferences and calls for papers, but also offering financial support is critical for graduate students' attendance at conferences.

Fifth, establishing social gatherings in a formal or informal level inside a discourse community is suggested. Social gatherings can help students develop a sense of belonging, ultimately allowing the students to find their own academic space and to be contributing members of their discourse communities.

On the part of students, their negotiation and transformation processes are crucial in their academic socialization. They are not simply receivers of knowledge, nor carriers of NNEs identity that is imposed by society. It is crucial that students believe they are contributing members of their new discourse communities, as the participants in this study showed. This feeling of being contributors was particularly significant when international students faced their socially-imposed identities such as non-native English speakers or teachers. Specifically, this study suggests that students make the most use of their knowledge about their native EFL contexts, and their own ESL learner experiences in their discourse socialization processes. Also, it is suggested that international graduate students should seek out help and support more aggressively rather than simply accepting their outsider status.

In sum, this result implies that creating supportive and inclusive environments in the U.S.-based TESOL programs not only helps international students' successful learning but also facilitates exchanging scholarship and ideas in a global TESOL discourse community. Furthermore, raising students' awareness is the first step for change and improvement of the situation. International students as ESL learners, must realize that they are no longer objects of TESOL discourse communities. Therefore, students' subjective position should be a starting point to make a global TESOL discourse community a more egalitarian and open realm of exchanging scholarship.

Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research

Limitations

Although this study shed light on international graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities in terms of their perceptions and socialization successfully, this study has inherent limitations. First, this research is mostly based on the interviews with the 9 participants in this research. In similar types of research, where studies were conducted regarding academic socialization issues (Morita, 2002, 2004; Prior, 1998), the researchers adopted other data collection methods such as classroom observations. However, this study did not adopt observations due to its difficulty of access and time constraints, given that all the participants were geographically located in different states. In addition, this project occurred for a short period of time, which made it difficult to follow students' actual socialization processes over time. Although participants recalled and reflected on their past experiences, their memories could be incomplete, and there might be issues that were not fully addressed. In addition, this study revealed a broad sketch of international students' perceptions and their academic socialization processes. In other words, this study provides more of *woods* rather than *trees* in relation to the international graduate students' academic socialization processes in the U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities.

Secondly, the participants who participated in this study do not represent all international student populations in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities. The participants were recruited through a purposeful *networking* sampling method. Therefore, those participants who were willing to participate in this research study, and who were attending and presenting at conferences where I initially contacted them could be different from the majority of international graduate students. Yet, the focus of qualitative research is not representative of an entire population, rather, it is representative of the participants' worlds.

Thirdly, as a researcher who is deeply involved in the entire research process, I am solely responsible for selecting and analyzing data, and discussing it. Although it is my strength to have an insider's perspective and understanding of some of the issues that have been investigated, it is not fair to claim that this research is objective. However, as mentioned before in the Research Design section of this study, the researcher's bias in qualitative research is inevitable. Thus, findings are partial and situational but yet legitimate.

Unresolved Queries and Recommendations for Further Research

This study successfully answered the inquiries of this research, suggesting mutual efforts to create and to find a space for international students in U.S.-based TESOL discourse communities. However, there are questions that have not been fully

addressed, due to the difficulty interpreting some data. Furthermore, some questions emerged in the process of this research, some of which I leave open for further research.

Firstly, there might be differences between master's students and doctoral students in their participation modes. It is not fair to grasp the academic discourse socialization processes of master's and doctoral students in the same set. As Casanave (2002) argues, there is a small body of research which exists on master students' discourse enculturation, due to the fact of their indistinct status between being novices and specialists. This study also had a glimpse of these differences in terms of teaching, extending their participation into professional discourse communities, and developing their academic identities between master's students and doctoral students. However, this study did not discuss some of those issues separately, due to the difficulties deciding where to draw the line between two groups of students. Therefore, master's students' academic discourse socialization issues need further research.

Secondly, it was not answered what might be differences between two groups of students who have little or no backgrounds in the TESOL area versus students with strong backgrounds in terms of their academic socialization processes. Presumably, students with backgrounds in the TESOL area, along with teaching experiences,

should be at an advantage. However, In-Su's case in this study leads us to ponder if this is always the case. In spite of his background knowledge about TESOL area and expertise in teaching, his academic discourse socialization processes in the U.S. was not successful, whereas, Su-Mi with no backgrounds and experiences in the TESOL area, thrived. What makes students with little experience undergo fewer challenges and resistance, whereas students with experiences and expertise struggle with feelings of inadequacy and incapability? Although this study brings up the issues where people with strong identities in one discourse community could be less flexible when they are relocated in a new discourse community, what causes this ironical situation needs more investigation.

Thirdly, some participants have families to take care of. While exploring the issues related to the participants' academic discourse socialization processes, this study gained a hint of complexity that family issues could cause in students' discourse socialization processes. In particular, when students have children without proper support of other family members, it could affect their academic socialization processes significantly. Yet, due to its complexity and delicacy of the family related issues, this study did not delve into the situation, leaving it for future study.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, D. (1997). A critical approach to critical thinking in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 71-94.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 9-32.
- Belcher, D. (1994). The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate students and their mentors. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13, 23-34.
- Belcher, D., & Braine, G. (Eds.) (1995). *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*. NJ: Albex Publishing Corporation.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N., & Ackerman, J. (1988). Conventions, conversations, and the writer: Case study of a student in a rhetoric Ph. D. program. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 22, 9-43.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/ culture/ power*. NJ: Erlbaum.
- Benesch, S. (1993). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 705-717.
- Benesch, S. (2001). Critical pragmatism: A politics of L2 composition. In T. Silva, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 161-172). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Biggs, J., Lai, P., Tang, C., & Lavelle, E. (1999). Teaching writing to ESL graduate students: A model and an illustration. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 293-306.
- Brindley, G. (2001). Assessment. In R. Cater & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 137-143). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (1999). Revising the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 413-431.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999 a). Interrogating the “native speaker fallacy”: Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp.77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999 b). *Resisting linguistic imperialism*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (Eds.) (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Casanave, C. P. (1995). Local interactions: Constructing contexts for composing in a

- graduate sociology program. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 83-110). Norwood, NJ: Albex Publishing Corporation.
- Casanave, C. P. (2002) *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cho, S. (2004). Challenges of entering discourse communities through publishing in English: Perspectives of nonnative-speaking doctoral students in the United States of America. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3, 47-72.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cole, M. (1985). The zone of proximal development: Where culture and cognition create each other. In J.V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp.146-161). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Cresswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cullen, R. (1994). Incorporating a language improvement component in teacher training programmes. *ELT Journal*, 48, 162-172.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of

- qualitative research. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp.1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dong, Y. R. (1998). Non-native graduate students' thesis/dissertation writing in science: Self-reports by students and their advisors from two U.S. institutions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17, 369-390.
- Ellis, G. (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? *ELT Journal*, 50, 213-218.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. NY: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (Ed.). (1992). *Critical language awareness*. NY: Longman.
- Flowerdew, J. (1999 a). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 243-264.
- Flowerdew, J. (1999 b). Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 123-145.
- Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 127-150.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp.645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Garschick, E. (Ed.). (2002). *Directory of professional preparation programs in*

TESOL in the United States and Canada. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourse*. London:
The Falmer Press.

Gee, J. P. (2000). The new literacy studies: From 'socially situated' to the work of the
social. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated Literacies*
(p.180-196). NY: Routledge.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second
language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gosden, H. (1992). Research writing and NNSs: From the editors. *Journal of Second
Language Writing, 1*, 123-139.

Gosden, H. (1995). Success in research article writing and revision: A social-
constructionist perspective. *English for Specific Purpose, 14*, 37-57.

Gosden, H. (1996). Verbal reports of Japanese doctoral students. *Journal of Second
Language Writing, 5*, 109-128.

Gorsuch, G. J. (2000). EFL educational policies and educational cultures: Influences
on teachers' approval of communicative activities. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 675-
709.

Govardhan, A. K., Nayar, B., & Sheorey, R. (1999). Do U.S. MATESOL programs
prepare students to teach abroad? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 114-125.

Harding, S. (1996). Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is 'Strong Objectivity'?

In E.F. Keller & H.E. Longino (Eds.), *Feminism and Science* (pp. 235-248).

NY: Oxford University Press.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14, 575-599.

Hatch, A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hickey, T. & Williams, J (Eds.). (1996). *Language, education & society in a changing world*. Clevedon: IRAAL/Multilingual Matters LTD.

Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Jernudd, B. H. (1981). Planning language treatment: Linguistics for the third world. *Language in Society*, 10, 43-52.

Johnson, K. (2003, March). *Re/examining curricula in MA TESOL programs*.

Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Teaching English to the Speakers of Other Languages, Baltimore, Maryland.

Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes*, 9, 3-20.

- Kachru, Y. (1994). Monolingual bias in SLA Research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 795-800.
- Kachru, B. B. (1996). The paradigms of marginality. *World Englishes*, 3, 241-255.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. D. (1999). Preparing non-Native professionals in TESOL: Implications for teacher education program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 145-158). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Krase, E. (2003). *Socio-cultural interactions and ESL graduate student enculturation: A cross-sectional analysis*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture construed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 9-35.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 537- 560.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub. Corp.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, L. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook Publishers.

- Leki, L. (2001). "A narrow thinking system": Nonnative-English-Speaking students in group projects across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 39-73.
- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 677-703.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp.163-168). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Liu, D. (1999). Training non-Native TESOL students: Challenges for TESOL teacher education in the West. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non- native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 197-210). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Matsuda, P. K. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric in context: A dynamic model of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 45-60.
- McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Medgyes, P. (1999). Language training: A neglected area in teacher education. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp.177-195). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 279-310.
- Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 573-602.
- Murdoch, G. (1994). Language development provision in teacher training curricula. *ELT Journal*, 48, 253-265.
- Nayar, P. B. (1997). ESL/EFL dichotomy today: Language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 9-37.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Olesen, V. L. (2000). Feminisms and qualitative research at and into the millennium. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (2nd Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 215-256). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 589-613.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. NY: Longman.
- Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 329-348.

- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prior, P. (1991). Contextualizing writing and response in a graduate seminar. *Written communication*, 8, 267-310.
- Prior, P (1998). *Writing/Disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ramanathan, V. (1999). "English is here to stay": A critical look at institutional and educational practices in India. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 211-231.
- Ramanathan, V., Davies, C. E., & Schlepppegrell, M. J. (2001). A naturalistic inquiry into the cultures of two divergent MA-TESOL programs: Implications for TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 279-305
- Ramanathan, V. (2002). *The politics of TESOL education: Writing, knowledge, critical pedagogy*. NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Rampton, MBH. (1990). Displacing the 'native speaker': expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44, 97-101.
- Roberts, J. (1998). *Language teacher education*. NY: Arnold.
- Samimy, K.K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker:

- Perceptions of “Non-Native” students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non- native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127-144). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Santos, T. (2001). The place of politics in second language writing. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 173-190). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sarup, M. (1993). *An introductory guide to post-structuralism and postmodernism*. NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Schneider, M. L., & Fujishima, N. K. (1995). When practice doesn’t make perfect: The case of a graduate ESL student. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp.3-22). Norwood, NJ: Albex Publishing Corporation.
- Shank, G. D. (2002). *Qualitative research: A personal skills approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall
- Silva, T., Reichelt, M., & Lax-Farr, J. (1994). Writing instruction for ESL graduate students: Examining issues and raising questions. *ELT Journal*, 48, 197-204.
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 29-51.

Sridhar, S. N. (1994). A reality check for SLA theories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 , 800-805.

Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (2nd Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sun, G., & Cheng, L. (2002). From context to curriculum: A case study of communicative language teaching in China. *TESL Canada Journal*, 19, 67-86.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research setting*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Tollefson, J. W. (Ed.). (1995). *Power and inequality in language education*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Tyler, A. (1992). Discourse structure and the perception of incoherence in international teaching assistants' spoken discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 713-730.

- Unyakiat, P. (1991). A study of Thai secondary school EFL teachers' perceptions of their preparation to teach English (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 11A.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and Language* (Rev. ed.) (A. Kozuline Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiley, T., & Lukes, M. (1996). English-only and standard English ideologies in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 511-536.
- Williams, R. (1985). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society* (Rev. ed). NY: Oxford University Press.
- Willianms, J. (1992). Planning, discourse marking, and the comprehensibility of international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 693-712.
- Woo, K. (2000). Self-perceptions of EFL teachers in Korean elementary schools about their English proficiency and preservice education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 12A.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Interview Guide Questions

I. Demographic Questions

Could you tell me about yourself such as academic background and work experience?

Name:

Age:

Gender:

Nationality:

Native language:

Degree Sought:

Program Name:

Years in the program:

Undergraduate major:

Years in English-speaking countries:

Years of English learning experience in the home country:

Work experience (e.g. Years of teaching experience before entering the graduate program and what level of students`)

II. Perceptions of their TESOL graduate programs

1. How did you know about the program before you entered the program? Why did you choose it?
2. What were your expectations and needs?
3. How does your program meet these expectations and needs so far?
4. What are you learning that you did not expect?
5. What are your goals after graduation?
 - a. Has it changed over years? If so, why?
 - b. How have you discussed your degree goals with your faculty advisor?
6. What courses that you think are essential or helpful? Why?
7. What courses that you wish are to change or to improve? Why?
8. What types of things are you learning that you will likely to implement when you return home? Why?
9. What types of things are you learning that you will not use when you teach in your home country? Why?
10. Are there any things that you would like to suggest to your program?

III. Participation (Challenges & Strategies)

1. Tell me about a group project that you were involved in during your graduate studies.
 - a. What was the project about?
 - b. How was the work divided?
 - c. What kinds of roles did you play in the project?
 - d. What challenged you the most?
 - e. What did you like or enjoy the most?
 - f. How effective was the group project in helping you learn?
2. Tell me about your relationship with your professors (supervisors).
 - a. Under what circumstances do you interact with them?
 - b. How do they influence you?
3. Describe your participation in class discussions.
4. Can you tell me about a research project that you were really interested in and thought you finished it successfully?
 - a. How did you write it up?
5. Can you tell me about a research project that you were not interested in and thought you did it poorly?
 - a. How did you write it up?
6. Have you had any teaching experience in a practicum, internship, or teaching assistantship in your graduate program? Tell me about it.
 - a. What challenged you the most?
 - b. What did you enjoy the most?
 - c. How was your relationship with your students?
 - d. How about with your mentoring teacher(s)?
7. Have you had an opportunity to make a presentation at a conference? Tell me about it.
 - a. What was (were) the topic(s)?
 - b. Why did you choose the particular topic(s)?
 - c. What made you decide to present your research at the conference(s)?
8. Have you submitted any papers for publication?
 - a. Tell me what got you started?
 - b. What was it about?
 - c. How did it go?

9. If you plan to write a thesis/dissertation for your degree, what would you like to research? Why?
 - a. Are there any topics you are avoiding even though you are interested in them? Why?
 - b. If you don't plan to write a thesis for your degree, why not?
10. Has your personal experience/knowledge ever had an effect on someone else in the program or on a policy in the program?
11. In what way do you think you might make a contribution (or change) to the TESOL field?
12. Would there be any documents such as course syllabi reflecting on your programs to share with me? Would there be any research papers written for class assignments and/or for conference presentations and publications, which are relevant to your experiences that you have told me about?
13. Do you have anything else to talk about? Or add to what you have already told me?

Appendix B: Research Invitation Letter

Dear potential research participant:

I am writing to solicit you to be my research participant. I am currently writing a dissertation in FL/ESL education department at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. My study is to explore the issues of NNES graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL academic communities. Specifically I am interested in talking to NNES graduate students from East Asia (e.g., China, Korea, Japan and Taiwan), who finished their undergraduate degrees in their home countries, and whose study in their current graduate programs is more than one year.

You may fit the criteria of my ideal research participant. I would love to talk with you about your perceptions and experiences as a NNES graduate student in an U.S.-based TESOL academic community. Particularly, I am very interested in how you perceive your graduate program and how you participate in various academic activities in your program. I will pursue these inquiries mainly based on interviews with you.

If you think you have some time to meet me at your convenience, please contact me at scho@utk.edu or (865) 946-6914. I attach a copy of Informed Consent Form for your information. However, you don't have to agree or sign until we meet for an interview. My schedule is flexible, and I could travel at the time of your choosing. I anticipated our meeting taking about 50 minutes to one hour. I would greatly appreciate your help, and you would be doing a lot to help a fellow graduate student get through the PhD process. I am very much looking forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Seonhee Cho

Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Issues on NNES (Non-native English speaking) Graduate Students in the U.S.-based TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) Academic Communities

Dear Participant:

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to explore the issues of NNES graduate students in U.S.-based TESOL academic discourse communities. This includes how NNES graduate students perceive their U.S.-based TESOL graduate programs, what challenges they experience in their academic socialization, and what strategies they utilize to overcome those challenges.

INFORMATION

1. Your participation in this study includes one interview with the researcher in person. The interview will last approximately one hour. The interview will be audio-taped and transcribed for analysis. Once transcribing is completed for the analysis, the audio-tapes will be erased or destroyed.
2. Follow-up questions will be asked over the phone or through emails. Phone interviews will be audio-taped and transcribed. Then, the audio-tape will be erased or destroyed. Emails will be printed out with your oral permission for the analysis and then will be deleted and destroyed.
3. Documents such as course syllabi and/or research papers written for class assignments and/or for conference presentations and publications may be solicited from the participants to increase the credibility of the interview data.

RISKS

There are minimal risks involved in participating in this study. The information found in the study will be used as a doctoral dissertation. Furthermore, it may be published in research journals or may be presented at conferences. Any information provided that could reveal your identity, including your name, will remain confidential and anonymous in any published materials.

Participant's Initials _____

BENEFITS

The findings of this study can contribute to the body of knowledge about NNES graduate students' issues in TESOL discourse community. Furthermore, this study not only can be conducive to designing and implementing a curriculum for TESOL teacher education programs which house a large number of NNES graduate studies, but also can help NNES graduate students who may have difficulty in finding and creating a space in U.S.-based TESOL academic discourse communities. However, participant benefits are incidental.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The information in this study records will be kept confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to the persons conducting or directing the study unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link your identity to the study.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Seonhee Cho, at 1620 Melrose Ave. Knoxville, TN, 865-974-9323, and scho@utk.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, contact the Research Compliance Services section of the Office of Research in The University of Tennessee, Knoxville at 865-974-3466.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you agree to participate in the interviews described above. However, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

CONSENT

I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I have received a copy of this form.

Participant's name (Print) _____

Participant's signature _____

Date _____

Appendix D: A Sample of Written Data Summary

The following is a copy of the summary of the interview data that I shared with Bo for *member-checks*.

Note. The italicized parts in the brackets denote the researcher's questions for Bo.

Future Plan

He is planning to go back to the university where he used to work after graduation. Firstly, the university is one of the most prestigious universities and he likes to teach at the school. Secondly, he came to the states too late to adjust himself to this new environment. He feels that he is an outsider. Furthermore, his interest is in Teacher education, particularly EFL teacher education (EFL teachers' knowledge). Besides, his wife is teaching at the university. For these reasons, he wants to obtain his PhD as soon as possible and go back to China.

Teaching Assistant Experiences

As a TA, he has been teaching EAP (English for Academic Purpose). The course he taught was to prepare undergraduate international students who would take mainstream courses. What challenged him the most was to teach psychology in English. It became double challenges because psychology was not his major and he had never taught it before. In addition, he didn't know his students' backgrounds and didn't know what American classroom was like and how it worked, when he just arrived and was asked to teach the course.

An undergraduate course that he is currently teaching is an introductory linguistics course for American students. This is very different from teaching international students at the IEP [*Can you take specific examples of the differences that you felt between the IEP course and the Linguistics course? Which challenges you more?*] Although he learned linguistics before, his knowledge was only received knowledge ("passive knowledge") that had never been used for teaching, that is, as a type of "active knowledge." Thus, teaching the Linguistics course in English was not easy. He spends a lot of time in preparing for teaching the class.

While he is teaching the Linguistics course, the biggest challenge is to deal with students' spontaneous questions. Although he usually prepares the class thoroughly,

he feels nervous when he faces students' unexpected questions. It is difficult for him to simply admit that he doesn't know the answer and to tell them to find it out later. He thinks that it has something to do with his Chinese cultural background. In China, teachers are expected to know everything and otherwise, they would lose face. Even when he couldn't understand students' questions, he tried to answer the question and it sometimes aggravated the situation. Some written feedback about his teaching pointed out difficulty in communication. He thinks that this kind of comment is quite common in ITA's teaching evaluation.

Strategies

The strategy that he is sometimes using is to imitate or to follow American teachers by saying "That is a good question." His many years of teaching experience in China is also helpful [*In what way was your teaching experience in China helpful? Can you be more specific?*]

One of the activities that he hasn't implemented in his class is students' presentation. The reason is that he perceives his English proficiency is not high enough to follow students' presentations. Instead, he gives quizzes and exams to his students.

The biggest challenge to him is how to balance three types of works—taking courses, teaching and researching. Although he believes that his main task is to study as a graduate student, his teaching work often rules his life and his mood. The reason for this is his responsibility for his students because he believes that his teaching can affect his students' future. That's why teaching is so important to him.

The difference that he noticed between classes in China and in the states is that in the states, students are encouraged to participate more in discussions and in activities. His ELT education in Britain helped him to integrate the concept into his class and to believe that students' participation is essential in language education.

Research Assistantship & Qualitative Research

He is a research assistant of a professor, who is also his academic advisor. His professor is doing a research study and he is his research assistant and participant at the same time. He learned how to design and conduct qualitative research by working with him. Before this experience, he had never conducted qualitative research. He did

most of his research in China by adopting quantitative research methods or doing literature work. In spite of his exposure to qualitative research through a course and work as a research assistant, he still prefers to do quantitative research. His own qualitative research experience also made him believe that he is not a good qualitative researcher. He is better at quantitative research. He interviewed 4 Chinese students to examine how they perceive peer review or responses and found it was difficult to analyze the data. For these reasons, he is thinking about to employ a quantitative research type for his dissertation later on.

His research on Chinese students' perceptions on peer review stemmed from his native cultural knowledge and experience. In China context, peer review or responses are rarely appreciated or are used, whereas in American context, it is one of the most important academic activities. Therefore, those Chinese students studying in the states should somehow get used to it and this triggered his research interest.

Presentations & Publications

He presented a research paper at a regional conference. The paper was written while he was taking a course in Learner Autonomy in UK. He updated the paper and submitted it for the conference presentation [*Who initiated this presentation? How did you get to know this conference?*]

His professor also helped him to realize what he is supposed to do by asking him to fill out a form regarding his academic performance and progress. For example, the form asked the courses that he has taken, conferences attended, publications etc. This experience made him aware of what he is doing now and what he is supposed to do. This also allowed him to know he has to publish and publication is a requirement in the US academia. He has already 5-6 publications in Chinese and a short course paper published in UK. [*Is it important to publish to be a professor in China?*]

On one of his course papers, his professor commented that it is a publishable paper and encouraged him to develop it. The research he analyzed was the Chinese applicant's and American applicant's job application letters for a job opening in his university in China. While he was teaching in his university, he was on the search committee and he could get those letters. Although his professor encouraged him to submit it to a journal, he cannot find the time to work on that paper.

Class Participation

As a student, he is aware that it is essential to participate in discussions and he tries to. His teaching experience also helped him realize that participation is important to impress teachers and it often affects his grades. Nevertheless, his participation in class discussions is not easy. He wouldn't have participated much if he hadn't known that teachers appreciate students' participation. For instance, he was introvert and rarely spoke up in his class when he was an undergraduate student in China.

He also believes that his little participation in class is related with his English proficiency and also his native Chinese culture. Asian students do not begin to speak until everything is ready in their minds. Another reason is the cultural difference in china where students' participation is not appreciated as much as here.

However, based on his observations of his IEP international students, he believes that Asian students' little participation in discussions has changed. Asian students are getting more engaged in discussions and become more expressive over time. He thinks that the reason being, those students realize that they wouldn't get good grades otherwise.

Writing

He doesn't get proofreading assistance from native speakers when he writes papers for courses but papers for conferences and journals. *[Is that simply because you do not enough time to get your papers proofread?]* He likes to get feedback in both language and content. Without it, he wouldn't know where he needs more improvement and how.

Group Projects

While he was working on a group project with a non-native speaker, he did a lot work such as designing, programming, and analyzing the research using computer software, whilst his partner (another international student) did the literature review. *[What was the most difficult while you were working with the student? Or how helpful was it?]*

Perceptions of Courses

He believes that all the courses he has taken are potentially useful and helpful because he does not know what he will be supposed to teach in the future.

Suggestions to the Program

He has never thought about his program and policies. Therefore, he does not know what to suggest or in what area the program needs to be improved. However, he has a research agenda, which originated in his experience as a student teacher. His colleagues also mentioned the same issue. They don't like to be observed while they are teaching. He wonders that this is a necessary practice. This may be a very formal and administrative practice, which may not be helpful to student teachers. However, he did not suggest or share his thought. He thinks that he is not in the position of suggesting it and he is not responsible for that kind of change. *[It was not clear to me a little bit. Did you talk about this to your advisor? Did he say that it was not good to bring it up? Or did it just occur to your mind?]*

Contribution

He thinks that he has an insider's knowledge about Chinese context, Chinese students' culture, and learning styles, whereas his native counterparts have strength in target language. He takes Chinese language related examples from time to time while he is teaching a linguistics course to help his students understand linguistic varieties.

VITA

Seonhee Cho earned a bachelor's degree in English Language and Literature from Chungnam National University, South Korea in 1990 and a master's degree in English Education from Korea National University of Education in 1999. Meanwhile, she taught high school English in four different schools in Kyonggi-do province, South Korea for 10 years until she joined the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in 2000 for a Ph.D. degree. In the University of Tennessee, she worked for international students at the Center for International Education as a graduate associate. She is completing her Ph.D. in Literacy, Language and ESL education in August 2005.