Socialization beyond the Speech Event
Author(s): Stanton E. F. Wortham
Source: *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, Vol. 15, No. 1, Special Issue: Discourse across Speech Events: Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity in Social Life (June 2005), pp. 95-112
Published by: Wiley on behalf of American Anthropological Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/43104041
Accessed: 04-10-2015 01:31 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Anthropological Association and Wiley are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

■ *Stanton E. F. Wortham*
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Socialization beyond the Speech Event

Socialization takes place intertextually, across events. This article develops the concept "trajectory of socialization," a connected series of events across which individuals come to participate in forms of life. The empirical analysis follows a trajectory of socialization traveled by one ninth-grade student as she gets socialized into academic life in an urban U.S. school. This student's trajectory illustrates how connections across events emerge contingently, as both local and more widely circulating resources contribute to social identification across time. [language socialization, intertextuality, social identity, classroom discourse]

At age 14, most American children begin high school. This often represents a transition for students, as high school teachers typically demand more intellectual rigor. Ninth grade is thus an important site for socialization into academic life. In order to complete high school successfully, as the large majority of American students now do, these students must learn to write, speak, and reason in passable academic ways. High school teachers communicate their academic expectations to students, both explicitly and implicitly, across many events of socialization. Students react in different ways. As they move through ninth grade and beyond, many students are successfully socialized into the academic practices and beliefs intended by their teachers. Others, although they generally recognize the new practices and expectations, do not participate fully. Socialization into academic life thus happens differently for different students, and as a result students often develop different social identities in school. Teachers and fellow students identify them as students who have successfully or unsuccessfully made the transition to high school, as "smart" and "promising" students, as "unintelligent" and "unpromising" students, as "disruptive" and "resistant" students, and so on.

How can we best conceptualize students' socialization to academic life and development of school identities? This article sketches an approach, one that builds on research in "language socialization" (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). The body of work on language socialization provides a useful starting point for analyzing academic socialization, because of its sensitivity to the interrelations between language and culture and its focus on pragmatics as well as semantic content. Along with others in this volume working on intertextuality and interdiscursivity, however, I argue that we must also study chains or trajectories of events across which academic socialization occurs. I borrow the concept of "speech chains," developed by Agha in the introduction to this volume, to describe "trajectories of socialization" across which individual students are socialized academically and develop school identities. I illustrate this approach with data from a ninth-grade U.S. English and history classroom. The analyses describe how one student changes over the academic year, from being identified as a student who successfully

Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, Vol. 15, Issue 1, pp. 95–112, ISSN 1055-1360, electronic ISSN 1548-1395.
© 2005 by the American Anthropological Association. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website, at http://www.ucpress.edu/journals/rights.htm.

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

uses academic discourse to being identified as a student who disrupts class and fails to participate appropriately.

Language Socialization

In the 1970s, inspired particularly by Ervin-Tripp, work in "developmental pragmatics" brought together analyses of linguistic pragmatics and analyses of child development (Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan 1977; Ochs and Schieffelin 1979). This opened up child development research on the social functions and contexts of speech. Ochs and Schieffelin expanded this approach to include culture, studying how children become socialized to use language competently within different cultural contexts (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). Research on language socialization has shown how socialization and language acquisition are mutually constitutive, how "socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language" are intertwined (Schieffelin and Ochs 1996:252). The classic work in language socialization studied how children become competent members in a cultural group as they learn to use language appropriately, in ways that index culturally salient dimensions of the situation. In a society like the Kaluli, for example, where sharing, reciprocity, and exchange are central to many aspects of life, speech events of requesting are important sites both for teaching children the appropriate language for addressing others and for enculturating children into beliefs about reciprocity (Schieffelin 1990; Schieffelin and Ochs 1996).

A language socialization approach to the phenomenon of academic socialization would examine how habitual academic ways of speaking embed assumptions about appropriate academic practice. We would study practices in which novices, like new ninth-grade students, "through interaction with more expert members (e.g., teachers), become competent participants of that community" (Schieffelin and Ochs 1996:252). Such competence is developed through "recurrent communicative practices" (Schieffelin and Ochs 1996:253). We would examine how classroom participation in recurring types of speech events not only helps students learn to participate competently in academic discourse but also conveys assumptions central to school culture. An academic argument, for instance, embeds assumptions about how knowledge is developed and justified, just as requests among the Kaluli embed assumptions about reciprocity and exchange (see He 2003 for a detailed example).

Such a language socialization approach has several useful aspects. It directs us to language use as a site for examining academic socialization, and becoming a competent student is clearly accomplished in significant part through language use. It directs us to move beyond the referential function of language, to study the social, cultural, and interactional presuppositions of speech, since becoming a competent high school student clearly involves pragmatic as well as semantic competence. It also directs us to borrow tools from contemporary linguistic anthropology, a strategy that has enriched educational research on academic socialization and related phenomena (e.g., He 2003; Rymes 2003).

One limitation of classic language socialization research has been its emphasis on "*recurrent* communicative practices of novice and expert members" (Schieffelin and Ochs 1996:253, emphasis added). Defining culture as "a set of socially recognized and organized practices and theories" (Ochs 1996:409), classic language socialization research has identified recurrent types of practices characteristic of a culture and has attributed much of socialization to novices' repeated exposure to these practices. In Samoa, for example, a high-status person expects a low-status person to move toward him or her when interaction is called for. This expectation fits with important cultural beliefs and practices concerning social status and respect. Language socialization researchers study habitual uses of deictic verbs like English *come* and *go*, for example, in order to explore how children simultaneously learn to use such verbs and learn about cultural expectations surrounding status and respect (Ochs 1988, 1996).

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Current work on intertextuality and interdiscursivity shows how the insights of language socialization research can be extended beyond recurrent types of speech events. Socialization is a process that happens across events, as an individual moves from more peripheral or novice participation to fuller participation in a set of practices (Dreier 2003; Lave and Wenger 1991). Individuals' trajectories across events vary, in their ultimate direction and in the nature of the links among specific events. A classic language socialization approach would not study this complex intertextual process of moving across such a trajectory, exploring instead stable types of events characteristic of a group. Recurrent types of events certainly play a role in academic and other types of socialization. But to focus only on recurrent events would be to miss the indeterminacies and complexities of how individuals move across specific trajectories and how events in a trajectory are linked. Socialization, as an inherently intertextual process, must be studied in part by examining links among events across time.

More recent approaches to language socialization have moved away from assuming stable, bounded cultures. As contemporary conceptions of culture have shifted from bounded groups that share beliefs and practices to more widely dispersed flows or chains of circulating signs and metasigns (Agha in press; Appadurai 1996; Urban 1996, 2001), research on language socialization has adjusted. Ochs (1996), for instance, describes how language socialization research has moved beyond a static conception of culture to exploring the constitution of cultural patterns in particular events. The recent emphasis on intertextuality heralded by this volume can help extend language socialization research beyond recurrent events, and beyond the creation of culture in isolated events, by using trajectories of participation as an empirical site for examining socialization.

Contemporary studies of socialization, then, must go "beyond the speech event," in two respects. First, as I have just argued, socialization involves a series of events, intertextually linked, across which an individual moves from novice to more established community member. Empirical studies of socialization must do more than identify recurrent types of speech events. We must also examine trajectories of socialization across which individuals move. Second, because individuals' trajectories often diverge, research on socialization should also attend to individual and not just generic trajectories. The links between events that compose an individual's trajectory are contingent accomplishments, and we must examine how trajectories are accomplished in both typical and unusual cases. By examining cases in which individuals diverge from typical trajectories of socialization, we will learn both about the individual's particularity and about the collective resources used to accomplish that particularity. The case examined in this article illustrates how an individual can travel along an unusual trajectory of academic socialization, as she and others use various resources to construct links between events across several months.

Trajectories of Socialization

In the introduction to this volume Agha describes "speech chains," series of events across which a sign moves. Speech chains help specify the concepts of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, by describing mechanisms through which events can be linked. Many sociolinguistic phenomena, like register formation (Agha 2003), can be explained only with reference to intertextual series of events. Speech chains help explain how series of events are linked together and do the work that constitutes registers and other phenomena (cf. Agha in press). In this article I use the concept of speech chain to study the socialization and identity development of a biographical individual. In studying the academic socialization of an individual, I am concerned with linked series of events that partly constitute the phenomenon of socialization. I will call these series of events—across which an individual participates, becomes socialized, and thereby develops aspects of a social identity—the "trajectory of socialization" of an individual (following Agha, in press, and Dreier 2000, 2003). Trajectories of socialization provide a mechanism to explain sociolinguistic phenomena—in this case, to explain

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

aspects of the academic socialization and classroom identity development undergone by one ninth-grade student across several months.

Establishing a trajectory of socialization is in some ways similar to establishing coherence in a single speech event. In a speech event, participants and analysts can interpret a sign (say, a sign of identity that helps establish a participant's social position) only as the meaning of that sign gets presupposed by subsequent discourse (Garfinkel and Sacks 1970; Goffman 1976; Silverstein 1992). No matter how robust the typical meaning of a sign, it must always be contextualized in use. At the moment of utterance, participants and analysts often do not know what context is relevant for interpreting a sign. In general, although there are of course many formulaic, predictable utterances and interactions, participants and analysts can (provisionally) interpret a sign of identity only as a pattern of mutually presupposing indexical signs allows entextualization—the solidification of an interactional text such that the sign in question comes to have a more determinate meaning (Silverstein 1998; Silverstein and Urban 1996; Wortham 2001). Sometimes one denotationally explicit metasign suffices to frame other signs as having meant something in particular. But more often several subsequent utterances, each of which presuppose the same meaning for the focal sign, are required. Each of these signs ends up presupposing both a reading of the focal sign and a reading of each other. Locked together in such a poetic structure—a configurational, tacit, "reflexive" metasign (Jakobson 1960; Silverstein 1993)—all the signs can presuppose something more definite about how the focal participant is being identified.

Within a speech event, then, meaning is often indeterminate until subsequent utterances contextualize focal signs as having meant something robustly presupposable. I argue that a similar principle holds across trajectories of events. The indeterminacy of contextualization that inhibits the clear interpretation of signs at the moment of utterance can also inhibit the interpretation of single events along a trajectory. The academic socialization and social identification of an individual is rarely accomplished, outside of ritual events, in one discursive interaction. Individuals get socially identified only across a trajectory, as subsequent events come increasingly to presuppose identities signaled in earlier ones. Socialization happens, and social identities emerge, across several events as subsequent ones come to presuppose an identity for an individual. A "poetic structure" of signs and event-segments gets established, across events, as these signs and segments become mutually presupposing. Such a structure of mutually presupposing signs and segments allows a trajectory to form, across which an individual gets socialized and emerges as a recognizable type of person.

The various events in a trajectory thus cohere not only because of chain-like links tying prior events to subsequent ones. A trajectory also depends on other indexical links that tie together more than just temporally contiguous events. Signs and event-segments from various events come to presuppose each other and thereby establish a more determinate social identity for the individual in question. Across the trajectory of events, a model of identity emerges as signs and segments from several events converge and come to presuppose each other. The following analysis illustrates how this happens, by following one student across several months in a ninth-grade classroom. The analysis traces both denotationally explicit metasigns of identity (e.g., "you're a bad student") and configurational, tacit, reflexive metasigns that depend on mutually presupposing indexical links across signs and event-segments. The analysis shows how the focal student's ongoing socialization and emerging identity could not have been predicted from preexisting types of recurring events but instead must be traced through the contingent process of emerging intertextual links across events.

Timescales of Socialization

Accounts of academic socialization that focus only on recurrent events cannot explain how the potential indeterminacy of socialization—the fact that an individual

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

could move along various trajectories, toward being different types of person—gets overcome as coherent trajectories of socialization emerge across events. Any important event of socialization could be linked to various other events, to compose an indeterminate number of potential trajectories, and we cannot tell ahead of time which events will form the relevant trajectory of socialization for an individual. Furthermore, individuals move along different trajectories, with only some of them following normative or characteristic trajectories. Some individuals follow atypical paths to the usual ends, while others do not get socialized into the usual behaviors and identities at all. Adequate empirical study of academic socialization will trace the trajectories of both normative and unusual individuals as they move across events.

In order to conceptualize how trajectories of socialization sometimes diverge, it will help to distinguish several "timescales" (Cole 1996; Lemke 2000). There are "social-historical" patterns, which develop over decades and centuries. The development of capitalism, the rise and fall of the British Empire, and similar processes happen at a social-historical timescale. In order to understand social-historical processes empirically, one needs data from across decades and centuries. There are "ontogenetic" patterns. Individuals develop identities and other characteristics over months and years, drawing on but also developing sometimes unique versions of more widely circulating models and categories. In order to understand ontogenetic processes empirically, one needs data on an individual across months and years. There are "local" patterns, which can develop over days, months, and years. Teachers and students in a classroom over an academic year, for example, establish shared models and habits that draw on but can be unique versions of more broadly circulating models and habits. In order to analyze identity development, socialization, and other processes that are often influenced by locally variable models and habits, one must study models and habits that develop in a site over days and months. There are also "microgenetic" patterns. Within speech events, as described previously, the relevant categories for identifying a given sign emerge in context. In order to study microgenesis empirically, one needs detailed data on how particular events unfold. There are other timescales, around and between "social-historical," "ontogenetic," "local," and "microgenetic," forming a continuum of timescales relevant to describing processes in the human and natural worlds—ranging from processes that characteristically take fractions of a second to processes that take thousands of years.

As Lemke (2000) argues, human semiotic processes are characterized by interdependence among processes at widely varying timescales. Many natural phenomena can be understood with reference to a focal timescale and the timescales immediately surrounding it. But most interesting human phenomena depend on processes from disparate timescales. Academic socialization, for instance, cannot be understood as a process happening at a single timescale—whether that be the recurrent events characteristic of a culture at the social-historical timescale, or the psychological properties of an individual emerging at an ontogenetic timescale. Academic socialization and social identification involve social-historical categories of identity circulating into schools, local versions of these categories being applied as resources in the ontogenetic development of individuals, and all this happening in contingent events. In order to study individual trajectories of socialization, then, we must focus on an ontogenetic timescale—tracing trajectories of events across days, months, and years. This means, among other things, that we must go beyond studying socialization into generic cultural types and also study the contingent social identification of individuals. But we cannot understand ontogenetic trajectories without attending both to the contingent emergence of identity in particular events and to more stable social-historical and local categories that help give shape both to events and to individual trajectories. We must understand events, trajectories, social-historical and local categories, and their interrelations.

Many other theories of society and culture have described the cross-timescale character of human semiotic activities. Bourdieu (1977), for example, emphasizes the sedimented, differential social-historical distribution of economic and symbolic

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

capital. But he also describes how this unequal distribution of capital gets reproduced both through the ontogenetic development of individual dispositions ("habitus") in primary socialization and through improvisation in contingent events as individuals draw on their dispositions to act socially. Holland and Lave (2001) describe the interdependence between social-historical and ontogenetic timescales with their concept of "history in person." They argue that individual development and social change can only be understood together, by examining situated action in practice.

The plausibility and increasing ubiquity of such multi-timescale accounts show that an exclusive focus on one timescale, like recurrent types of speech event, cannot suffice to explain phenomena like academic socialization. As I have argued elsewhere (Wortham in press), however, these multi-timescale accounts themselves nonetheless overgeneralize. No prespecified set of timescales suffices to explain complex human semiotic phenomena. We cannot always understand socialization, for instance, by studying only three timescales—say, centuries-long social-historical processes, years-long ontogenetic processes, and minutes-long microgenetic processes. Instead, we must determine which timescales are relevant to explaining a given phenomenon, and we should expect that the relevant configuration of timescales may differ from phenomenon to phenomenon. Students may proceed through academic socialization and get socially identified in different ways in different contexts, such that analysts must draw on different configurations of timescales to explain different cases.

Most cases of academic socialization will nonetheless involve some processes occurring at predictable timescales. Academic socialization and social identification generally require an emerging stability in interdependent social-historical and ontogenetic processes. Sociohistorical categories and models of identity circulate through social events. In particular events, individuals get identified using those categories. Over time an individual often gets identified in consistent ways, as certain categories of identity come consistently to circulate through events along that individual's ontogenetic trajectory.

But sometimes processes at other timescales become relevant to explaining the academic socialization of a given individual. In the classroom described below, teachers and students in the local context develop specific habits and models that transform more widely circulating habits and models. In a setting like this classroom, where a group of people interact regularly over a period of time, they develop particular models of identity and come consistently to presuppose that certain models apply to particular individuals. Some of these local models turn out to be crucial to the academic socialization and identity development of the focal student. So an adequate analysis of academic socialization *in this case* requires attention to the local timescale, to the emergence of classroom-specific models of identity among these teachers and students over several months. This local timescale does not suffice to understand the focal student's trajectory of identification. We also need to attend to social-historical, ontogenetic, and microgenetic processes. But an analysis that ignored the local would fail to explain academic socialization in this case.

In addition to requiring attention to the local timescale, in a way that many instances of academic socialization will not, the focal student's trajectory of socialization also contains an unexpected twist. For the first few months of the year, the focal student followed predictably along a widespread trajectory specified both by more widely circulating classroom expectations and by emerging local models of identity. But after a few months she veered onto an unusual trajectory that ran counter to those expectations and models. Understanding academic socialization in this case thus requires attention to a particular configuration of timescales—including both the local classroom development of shared models of identity and the unusual months-long ontogenetic identity development of this student with respect to those local models. In order to study academic socialization, we must sometimes go beyond the single type of speech event, beyond processes at any single timescale, and beyond typical

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

sets of relevant timescales. We must sometimes analyze the unique configuration of timescales relevant to understanding an individual's unexpected trajectory.

Scenes from a Case of Academic Socialization

This case comes from a larger study of academic socialization and identity development in a ninth-grade classroom over an academic year. Space constraints limit the analysis to an abbreviated sketch of one student's trajectory of socialization across a few months. I call the school "Colleoni High," and I call the focal student "Tyisha." Further detail on the school and the classroom can be found in Wortham (1994), and a much more detailed analysis of this student's trajectory of socialization can be found in Wortham in press.

Like most other ninth-grade teachers, Tyisha's English and history teachers ("Mrs. Bailey" and "Mr. Smith") socialized students into the more rigorous academic demands of ninth grade. But individual schools vary somewhat in their expectations. These teachers practiced a specific version of academic writing, speaking, and reasoning, one drawn from Adler's (1982) *Paideia Proposal*. The teachers felt that students had previously been taught to learn material and repeat it, but that they now needed to provide reasons to support their claims. Students needed to go beyond giving predetermined answers, to make their own arguments and engage in reasoned discussion of primary texts. As Tyisha and her classmates both conformed to and struggled against the teachers' intended path of academic socialization, Tyisha increasingly diverged from the trajectory followed by most other students.

Methods

The data presented here come from two years of research at a public high school in a large U.S. city. Throughout my time at the school I took fieldnotes, I had many informal conversations with teachers after classes, and I conducted interviews with teachers, administrators, and students. I spent about 50 hours in one particular class across the final year, and I audiotaped most of these classes. Fifteen of the 19 students in this ninth-grade class were African American, and 14 were female. The class was organized following guidelines in *The Paideia Proposal* (Adler 1982). Adler prescribes "seminar" discussions that involve students defending positions on complex questions, not simply parroting back the teacher's preferred answers. The two ninth-grade teachers I observed in the final year, Mrs. Bailey and Mr. Smith, ran joint history and English classes twice a week, when they had 80-minute seminar discussions with the students. The other three days a week, each teacher ran more conventional didactic lessons for 40 minutes each. Increasingly over the year, they engaged students in rich discussions of complex texts—discussions in which students came to recognize and to formulate arguments about issues of enduring human concern.

The analyses for this article focus on examples in which students' own experiences were used as analogies to concepts from the curriculum. In analyzing the tapes and fieldnotes from Mr. Smith and Mrs. Bailey's class, I transcribed all examples that included such analogies and analyzed their implications for students' social identities. The methods of discourse analysis, which identify types of cues that often serve as signs of identity, are described in Wortham (2001) and illustrated more extensively in Wortham in press. In addition, I have gone through all tapes and notes, looking for explicit statements about and implicit positioning relevant to the focal student's identity. The analyses in this article first present representative instances from across the year in which teachers and students socially identify the focal student using denotationally explicit metasigns. Then I analyze one extended example that illustrates how local categories of identity were drawn from the curriculum and applied to the focal student.

Tyisha the Promising Student

From near the beginning of the year in Mrs. Bailey and Mr. Smith's class, teachers and most students presupposed that girls and boys have different social identities.

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

As Mrs. Bailey said explicitly one day, girls are easier for teachers to deal with, because they conform to school expectations, and thus they are more likely to succeed in school and in adulthood. Boys are more difficult to deal with, because they resist school expectations, and they are less likely to succeed both in school and in later life. This expectation about identity draws on circulating social-historical patterns, like those that identify African American male students as particularly concerned with respect and more likely to resist participation in school (Anderson 1999; Ferguson 2000). But the gender difference became especially salient in this classroom over several months, as the female teacher and the female students developed a robust local model of gender identity. The girls participated actively and dominated classroom discussions, and they often reminded the boys that girls are academically promising while boys are academically unpromising. The boys responded by sitting together in the back of the room, and all but one of them often refused to participate in class discussions.

At the beginning of the year, Tyisha fit this gender stereotype: she was an active, successful female student. Most of the students started the year trying to figure out and parrot back what the teachers wanted them to say. Because Tyisha rarely did this, but instead offered her own opinions, the teachers initially identified her as a student who made her own arguments. In a Paideia seminar this is desirable, so Tyisha was treated as a typical, and sometimes exemplary, promising female student. Her identity was established across many events, as she behaved like a promising student and the teachers positioned her this way.

The following segment comes from a class on October 9. ("T/B" stands for Mrs. Bailey; "FST" stands for an unidentified female student; "TYI" stands for Tyisha; transcription conventions are in the appendix.)

	T/B:	okay, we've got <u>wo</u>men <u>ha</u>ving <u>ba:</u>bies. how does that relate to having <u>wo</u>men <u>god</u>desses?
40	**TYI:**	it <u>does</u>n't, to <u>me</u>.
	T/B:	it <u>does</u>n't to you. how about you?
	FST:	maybe they think that that's supernatural.
	T/B:	that that's <u>su</u>pernatural? having a baby is <u>su</u>pernatural.

At line 40 Tyisha fails to give an answer the teacher is looking for. She also emphasizes her opinion, by adding the phrase "to me." But Mrs. Bailey does not evaluate Tyisha negatively. In fact, the teacher repeats Tyisha's utterance, with similar stress on "doesn't," and goes on to ask for another student's opinion. Especially early in the year, the teachers react positively to Tyisha's offering her own opinions, because they want other students to do the same. The teachers are guiding students away from prespecified answers and toward articulating and defending their own points of view. They react to Tyisha as if she has already started to make this transition, because she readily articulates her opinion.

Later in the October 9 class, Tyisha says something deliberately off-topic, apparently as a joke. In the following segment they are discussing bees, in order to understand a Chinese myth that compares humans to insects. ("MRC" stands for Maurice.)

	T/B:	bees do what?
	TYI:	kill.
290		[laughter]
	MRC:	some bee pollen, they raise [pollen
	T/B:	[they fertilize=
	FST:	flowers.
	T/B:	what do <u>spi</u>ders do? they fertilize <u>p</u>lants. bees <u>are</u>
295		people who, are insects who ahh, Cas<u>san</u>dra?

At line 290, several students treat Tyisha's comment as a joke. It was a small joke, but apparently successful. Note that the teachers do not discipline Tyisha for this. Mrs. Bailey simply ignores Tyisha's comment and continues with the discussion. Tyisha then reenters the conversation more constructively.

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

T/B: how long do insects live?
CAN: maybe ten days, about [a week
MRC: [a week.
T/B: a day, a couple of months, alright.
320 **TYI:** some of them a day because you know, if they bite you, they die.
T/B: okay some of them as soon- as soon as they, they, they put their stinger in it, they're dead. okay, now put that back to Pampu. why might the Chinese believe or feel that ma:n
325 comes from the earth as an insect. that ma:n is similar to an insect?

At lines 322–323, Mrs. Bailey restates and thus ratifies Tyisha's comment as a useful contribution, one that allows the teacher to explore the analogy between humans and insects (at lines 323–326).

At the beginning of the year, then, the teachers treated Tyisha as a promising student. They appreciated her opinions and they did not discipline her when she made jokes. After a month or two, however, several other students learned to offer arguments and give evidence as the teachers wanted. At this point, the teachers increasingly distinguished between Tyisha's comments—which they began to characterize as opinions offered without supporting evidence—and more successful students who gave better arguments. Tyisha's behavior had not changed much. Relative to other students' increasingly successful participation, however, it looked as if Tyisha was acting differently. In December and January, her social identity began to shift from that of a good student to a disruptive one.

Tyisha the Outcast

As her local social identity shifted from "good student" to "disruptive student" in December and January, Tyisha's trajectory of socialization diverged from the one typical for girls in this class. In the first few months of the academic year she had been learning to articulate and defend her own opinions, like most other girls in the class. A series of events involving Tyisha and other students all presupposed this common trajectory, toward the Paideia goal of students developing their own arguments about issues of enduring concern. In December, however, some events involving Tyisha began to have a different character. Teachers and other students started to identify her statements of opinion as disruptive instead of productive. Any one or two of these events might not have altered Tyisha's trajectory of socialization. But together they began to presuppose that Tyisha's trajectory was diverging. Evidence for this comes from the teachers' increasingly blunt evaluations of her, in which they use denotationally explicit metasigns to characterize Tyisha and her behavior. On January 18, for instance, Tyisha offers an interpretation of the text and Mrs. Bailey criticizes her, saying, "You just missed the connection." Another student nonetheless builds on Tyisha's point, saying explicitly, "I'm talking about going back to what Tyisha said." Tyisha thanks this other student at line 450 below, but Mrs. Bailey and another student immediately criticize her.

T/B: o[kay, you just missed-
450 **TYI:** [right, thank you.
T/B: you just missed the point.
JAS: you missed the point. we're not compari [ng them.
TYI: [I know,
but I'm talking about-
455 **T/B:** okay, look at this again. . .

Normally, these teachers encouraged students to refer to each other's comments, as the other student has done. But Mrs. Bailey returns to her earlier evaluation of Tyisha's point, with similar phrasing: "You just missed the point." The speed of Mrs. Bailey's intervention and her blunt characterization of Tyisha's (and the second stu-

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

dent's) point are uncharacteristic for this class. These teachers generally help students develop their own arguments. But by January they have started to presuppose that Tyisha's points will not contribute to the conversation—that her comments are disruptive and not substantive. The fact that another student echoes Mrs. Bailey's evaluation of Tyisha, at line 452, shows how other students have also come to presuppose that Tyisha is often wrong and disruptive.

The teachers continued to react quickly and harshly to many of Tyisha's comments, presupposing that her contributions were incorrect and disruptive. The following segment, for instance, comes from January 25.

	T/B:	okay. well I think that he's talking more not about not being with people, but that he: will not have to have people bail him out at any point. he
1055		can make it on his own.
	TYI:	so you gonna be the only person living there?
	T/B:	no. that's not what he's saying, Tyisha.
	CAN:	he's saying that he can live without people
1060		helping him.

At lines 1052–1055, Mrs. Bailey is summarizing her interpretation of a point. Tyisha offers a gloss at lines 1056–1057, and the teacher reacts immediately by telling Tyisha she's wrong. This quick and blunt response contrasts with the teachers' habitual reaction to other students, and to Tyisha earlier in the year, when they would have explored her point or been gentler. Another student gives a more accurate gloss at lines 1059–1060 and the class continues discussing the point, ignoring Tyisha.

Denotationally explicit metasigns identifying Tyisha as often incorrect and as disruptive, like these given on January 18 and 25, occurred often from December through the rest of the year. These signs of identity began to solidify into a poetic structure, as they increasingly came to presuppose each other. By February 11, Mr. Smith could characterize Tyisha explicitly as a bad student who does not listen, in a way he could not have done earlier in the year without eliciting surprise from the other participants.

50	**T/S:**	I will do a spot check, spot check your notebook. the notebook, and you better listen Tyisha, because you have a habit of never listening to me. °Tyisha°
	TYI:	I know what you're talking about [
	T/S:	[no.
55	**TYI:**	you're talking about[the notebook
	T/S:	[°your ears are unfortunately closed sometimes.°
...		
	T/S:	number five. who made the laws?
65	**FST:**	the assembly.
	T/S:	okay[what page?
	TYI:	[°the king°
	T/S:	no. you're wrong. because you're guessing without looking. and that is= [
70	**TYI:**	[no way.
	T/S:	=exactly what you do as a bad [student.
	TYI:	[no I wasn't
	T/S:	halt.

At line 52, Mr. Smith says that Tyisha never listens to him. And at line 71 he calls her a "bad student." Mr. Smith sometimes made comments like this about other students. But by January Tyisha was the most common target, because teachers and students had presupposed that she was a disruptive student.

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

By February, Tyisha's identity as a disruptive outcast had solidified. Her trajectory of socialization had taken her through two mutually presupposing series of events—first when she was identified as another promising girl learning to make her own arguments, and then when she was identified as a disruptive student who often led the class off track. In January and February teachers and students acted as if she was disorganized, prone to offer comments that took the class off-topic, and concerned with her own ideas more than with helping the group pursue a coherent discussion. She had become an exception to the gender stereotype, an unpromising, disruptive girl.

Tyisha the Beast

Tyisha's descent from good, independent-thinking student to disruptive outcast was accomplished through at least three mechanisms: denotationally explicit descriptions of her identity, like Mr. Smith's comments on February 11; interactional positioning of her as wrong and disruptive, like Mrs. Bailey's treatment of her on January 18 and 25; and the use of Tyisha herself as an example during class discussion. I have identified eight extended segments, from November through February, in which Tyisha became a "participant example" (Wortham 1994), an example that includes a student or teacher as a character and that students and teachers use to explore the curricular topic. These examples allowed teachers and students to use a distinctive local resource to identify Tyisha: categories from the curriculum (Wortham 2003). A fuller analysis of Tyisha's case shows that participant examples involving local categories played a central role in facilitating her divergent trajectory of socialization (Wortham in press).

In almost all of the eight participant examples involving Tyisha, the curricular topic involved collectivism and individualism. During January and February the class discussed the enduring question of whether individual rights should be subordinate to the good of the society or vice versa. They read arguments from Lycurgus, Aristotle, Ayn Rand, and others that give different answers. Tyisha herself became the favored example when a text included an outcast—someone who acts for his or her own good without considering the good of the society. As students discussed these examples, Tyisha's identity as an outcast became more and more heavily presupposed. Local curricular categories became a resource for identity development, through these participant examples, because the discussion of Tyisha's hypothetical identity as an outcast within the examples communicated that Tyisha herself was becoming an outcast in the classroom. Teachers and students borrowed the metasign of identity "outcast" from the curriculum, through their discussions of collectivism and individualism, and applied it to Tyisha herself. As Tyisha became a participant example of an outcast several times from December through February, teachers and students increasingly presupposed that she herself was a disruptive outcast more concerned with her own opinions than the common good in the classroom.

Teachers' and students' local construals of collectivism and individualism often focused on Aristotle's character of a "beast in the woods," an outcast from human society. During class discussion on January 24, Tyisha became an example of a beast. The following analysis of this example illustrates how participant examples became important events along Tyisha's trajectory toward being a disruptive outcast. For class on January 24, students had read selections from Aristotle's *Politics*, in which he argues that "the state is by nature clearly prior to the individual since the whole is of necessity prior to the part," and that "he who is unable to live in society, or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be beast or god" (Bk. I: Ch. 2 [1253a:19–20; 27–29]. The teachers focus on the character of a "beast," a person who refuses to make the sacrifices necessary to live as part of society.

Mrs. Bailey and some students start to distinguish between such a "beast" and a human being. They explore Aristotle's claim that one who does not live in society is

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

not fully human, by discussing what humans have that animals do not. They come up with a tentative answer: Humans have goals, while animals do not. Tyisha objects to this, in the following passage:

	TYI:	Mrs. Bailey? I- I have to <u>dis</u>agre:e.
		[class laughter]
660	**T/B:**	can I- can I finish this before you disagree,
		okay. the idea that he's putting out here is that
		they- they <u>have</u> goals, and that they can in
		discussion decide the best way to accomplish their
		goal. now, Tyisha what's your disagreement?
665	**TYI:**	becau(hh)- because if a- like- if my- <u>okay</u>,
		if my cat want to- um you know to get to the top of
		something, you know, he might sit there and be
		[three unintelligible syllables] and he'll sit there and
		try everyday. and then finally he will do it, that was
670		the goal to try and get up there. he had a <u>goal</u>.
	T/B:	okay (1.0) he's got a [<u>goal</u> but
	FST:	[was his goal really
		necessary? [laughter from class]
	T/B:	let's- let's- let's take what- (3.0) let's take
675		what your cat's doing that every day he sees that-
		counter that he wants to get on, and every day when
		he passes that counter he tries to get up there. that's
		a goal. okay [
	FST:	[yeah.
680	**T/B:**	how is that different than your goal, the goal
		that you might have had last night when you had
		this reading, or [some chattering]
	TYI:	°I don't know°

Tyisha offers a reasonable argument here: The teacher and other students have claimed that "having goals" distinguishes humans from beasts, but Tyisha points out at lines 665–670 that her cat has goals too. Mrs. Bailey accepts Tyisha's objection at lines 671 and 674ff. She grants that Tyisha's cat has goals, and she goes on to distinguish between uniquely human goals and more beast-like goals.

Tyisha's argument here forces the teacher to reformulate her interpretation of Aristotle. This provides evidence that Tyisha has learned the skills of academic argument, at least to some extent. It is not yet clear, microgenetically in this event, whether Tyisha's argument is serving the class objective of formulating positions on the curriculum or serving to disrupt class. Initially, at least, it seems to be the former. The whole class benefits as they go on to explore the distinction between uniquely human and more widely shared types of goals—a distinction made possible by Tyisha's example.

Despite her academic contribution here, however, there are already indications that other students identify Tyisha as a deficient student. At line 659, students laugh after Tyisha's first utterance. They do so because Tyisha's description of her own action—"to disagree"—fits well with the identity they are presupposing for her by this point in the academic year: a student who regularly interrupts class with her off-topic opinions. It is only with reference to this presupposed identity that Tyisha's use of "disagree" in line 658 becomes a sign of identity that other students find funny. At lines 672–673, students also seem to be laughing at Tyisha—presupposing that, because of her identity as a disruptive and suspect student, her argument can be easily defeated.

Mrs. Bailey, however, recognizes the strength of Tyisha's argument, and she does not condone the other students' laughter. She uses Tyisha's example of the cat to pursue the academic issue: how are humans different from beasts, if beasts have goals apparently just like we do? To continue the discussion, Mrs. Bailey also adopts and develops Tyisha's example, at lines 674–678. As she does so, it becomes

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

a participant example. Both Tyisha and her cat become characters in the example, and the class explores how Tyisha, as a human being, might have different goals than her cat.

In the next segment, teachers and students continue discussing Tyisha's example in order to understand how humans are different from beasts.

	FST:	humans can do more things than cats can do,
		like they can build
	TYI:	no that's not- just a goal. my goal is to win
		in Nintendo and
695		[laughter by a few girls in the class]
	FST:	that's your goal?
	TYI:	it's a go:al, so
	T/B:	okay maybe winning at Nintendo is like your
		cat's goal of getting on top of the-
700	**TYI:**	right
	T/B:	the- the counter. but aren't- don't we have
		more = [long
	FST:	[better
	T/B:	= ranged goals than your cat getting on
705		top of the counter, or you winning Nintendo?
	TYI:	but I'm just saying they're goals, you said
		animals can't have goals or something, so I just told
		ya I disagree.
	T/B:	okay, but can we- can we qualify that then.
710	**TYI:**	yeah.
	T/B:	can we qualify that and say that man (2.0)
		doesn't just have immediate goals, but also has-
		long-range goals.
	T/S:	umm, consider your cat. [Tyisha giggles a bit]
715		your cat gets sleepy. what does your cat do?
...		
	T/S:	what goal did you have in mind this morning,
		even when you went to sleep?
	TYI:	[laughing] I didn't h(h)ave o(h)ne.
	T/S:	sure you did. didn't you- didn't you have the
730		goal you had to wake up at a certain time, get
		dressed in a- by a certain time, get to a place
	TYI:	yeah that's true.
	T/S:	so you had goals even before you s [tarted
	TYI:	[but not in
735		the summertime. I just got up, see, just like
	T/S:	ah, and in summertime when you got up
		because you had to come to school what was your
		goal or was it to sleep until three in the afternoon?
		or to get up and play with your friends?
740	**TYI:**	the same goal my cat had, to go to sleep,
		and get up and eat.
	T/B:	ahhh, isn't that interes[ting? [increase in pitch,
		'mocking' effect]
	T/S:	[ahhhh

While Mrs. Bailey and other students try to distinguish between humans' and beasts' goals in this segment, Tyisha continues to resist the distinction. At lines 693–694, she argues that her goals—like winning at Nintendo—are similar to her cat's. Mrs. Bailey accepts her argument at lines 698–699, granting that humans have some goals equivalent to beasts'. But the teacher goes on to argue that humans also have "more long-ranged goals" that beasts don't have. At lines 734–735 and lines 740–741, however, Tyisha reverts to her old argument: she has some goals that are qualitatively similar to her cat's, and therefore the teachers' attempt to distinguish humans from beasts (based on goals) cannot work.

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Tyisha's persistence makes clear that there have been at least two possible "interactional texts" (Silverstein 1992) in play since Tyisha's initial comment at line 658. First, Tyisha may have been making an argument, one that contributes to the academic substance of the discussion. In this case, teachers and students would be on the same side, collaboratively and earnestly discussing Aristotle's account of human nature. Second, Tyisha may have been using her example as an opportunity to make jokes, by referring to aspects of everyday life that students would not normally discuss in the classroom. The laughter at lines 665 and 673 might reflect Tyisha's skillful manipulation of the academic genre of an "example" to introduce inappropriate topics. In this case, Tyisha would be like a "clown," and she might gain some status by successfully bending the teachers' expectations about what can legitimately be discussed. This second interactional text presupposes an opposition between teachers and students, with teachers as disciplinarians and students as sometimes resisting or evading their rules.

In the first segment and the beginning of the second segment above, Mrs. Bailey works hard to entextualize (Silverstein 1992; Silverstein and Urban 1996) Tyisha's example as a contribution to academic substance, and she initially succeeds. Tyisha did make a good academic argument, with the counterexample of her cat's goals, and Mrs. Bailey helped her articulate it. But the "joking" frame remains potentially relevant throughout the second segment. A few students laugh at line 695, probably because the topic of playing Nintendo is not one normally discussed or admitted to in school—yet Tyisha has managed to mention it by placing it within her example. After Mrs. Bailey accepts Tyisha's argument at line 709 and goes on to pursue the distinction between uniquely human and more beast-like goals, the teachers have taken control of Tyisha's example, making it part of an academic argument.

Tyisha continues to make her initial argument, however, that her goals do not differ from her cat's, when she describes her own indolence at lines 734–735 and 740–741. At this point, a third interactional text also comes into play. At line 742 Mrs. Bailey's mocking tone suggests that she is making fun of Tyisha. Tyisha's strategy—to resist the distinction between uniquely human and beast-like goals and perhaps to joke with other students by introducing inappropriate topics—led her to emphasize her own beast-like tendencies. This gives teachers and students an opportunity to position her as like a beast herself.

745	**T/B:**	same goals as her (1.0) [cat =
	FST:	[cat had
	T/B:	= had. wow.
	FST:	so you are like an animal.
	T/B:	so you <u>are</u> like an <u>a</u>nimal.
750	**TYI:**	I'm not saying, I just don't have
		somewheres to be at.
	T/B:	okay, but that's not- <u>don't</u> con<u>fuse</u> the issue.
		<u>one</u> point at a <u>time</u>, Tyisha. you throw out seventeen
		things and then- nobody can even be<u>gin</u> to address
755		any of these things.
	MST:	tss [hissing laughter]

At line 748 a female student makes explicit the teachers' interactional move here, calling Tyisha an animal, and Mrs. Bailey echoes her comment. This is not part of the academic argument, nor is it part of Tyisha's joking around. Now teachers and students single out Tyisha and laugh at her instead of with her. The teachers and all the students except Tyisha are on one side, both participating in academic discussion and also using that discussion to tease Tyisha, while Tyisha is positioned on the other side, as someone who disrupts the academic discussion and as the object of their teasing.

At line 750 Tyisha backs off. She had gotten away with joking and arguing at the same time, but now she sees that she has taken it too far—she was outdone in her

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

joking by Mrs. Bailey, who has managed to stay within the frame of discussing the example while teasing Tyisha at the same time. Once Tyisha breaks off the example at line 750, Mrs. Bailey switches from teasing Tyisha to disciplining her. She explicitly characterizes Tyisha as a disruptive student, in line with the social identity that teachers and students have been increasingly attributing to her over the past month. Speaking explicitly in her role as authority figure in the classroom, Mrs. Bailey identifies Tyisha as a disruptive outcast in the classroom.

A few minutes later, Mrs. Bailey continues with her explicit identification of Tyisha.

	T/B:	okay, uh, kay, important point. and this- we keep on having a problem with you Tyisha, and this
830		has been ta:lked about and ta:lked about. people cannot communicate in this kind of conversation unless they agree on using certain terms, a certain way, agree on definitions.
	TYI:	but [I
835	**T/B:**	[and if you don't want to agree on the definition then- I think you remove yourself from the conversation for a while, and see where it goes. because we- we are using Aristotle's definitions here, and Natasha was right and that's- (1.0) the
840		issue that we constantly have with you is that you want to come up with a different definition. and that's not what we're about. we're trying to have a discussion based on definitions we've agreed on or come from the piece.

Note the personal pronoun opposition between "you" and "us" at lines 828ff. By this point in the conversation, the teachers and students consistently presuppose that Tyisha is not a member of their group. Mrs. Bailey explicitly identifies Tyisha as a disruptive student who does not participate cooperatively. "*We're* trying to have a discussion" and "*we* keep on having a problem with *you*." In order for students to have the opportunity to voice their opinions in class, everyone must follow the rules of the group. But Tyisha does not follow these rules, and thus she removes herself from the group of promising, cooperative students.

Within the example, Tyisha argued and the teachers have accepted that she is essentially like her cat. This identity as a "beast" was then transferred onto Tyisha herself. Because Tyisha does not obey the rules of the classroom "society," she has been excluded. The teachers and other students have agreed on certain rules, but Tyisha has refused to follow the rules—and thus she is an outcast from the society, a "beast in the woods." Note that Tyisha has *enacted* the curriculum here. Like her character within the example, who acts like an animal and does not participate in society, and like the beast that Aristotle describes in the text, Tyisha gets excluded from the group of teachers and students who participate normatively in classroom discussion. Metasigns of identity from the curriculum, like Aristotle's concept of a beast, have been used to position Tyisha as an outcast and to reinforce her identity as a disruptive student. The use of this curricular category to identify Tyisha here was a contingent microgenetic accomplishment. Teachers and students drew on more widely circulating social-historical and local categories, but they applied the category of beast or outcast to Tyisha only as the interactional text for this event solidified across the discussion.

Just as Tyisha's positioning as an outcast solidified over the course of this event, her identity as an outcast solidified across a trajectory of many events in which she was positioned in similar ways. From December through February, teachers and students discussed several other examples that involved both Tyisha and the curricular category of outcast (Wortham, in press, describes the whole trajectory). No single event sufficed to identify her as a disruptive outcast unconcerned about the collec-

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

tive good in the classroom. Across several examples, however, Tyisha's identity became intertwined with the curricular theme of societies and individuals, as teachers and students drew on the curricular category of outcast to identify her. Her social identity as an outcast from classroom society was made possible in part by metasigns of identity drawn from the local version of the curriculum, like Aristotle's "beast in the woods." Thus Tyisha's unexpected trajectory of socialization depended on local as well as social-historical, ontogenetic, and microgenetic categories and processes.

Conclusions

Mrs. Bailey and Mr. Smith socialized Tyisha and her peers during their ninth-grade year. Most of the students learned about generic academic ways of writing, speaking, and reasoning, about Paideia-inspired practices of making arguments, and about specific curricular contents. A full account of their academic socialization would require more detailed description of recurrent speech events, like academic arguments, and how repeated participation in such events helped students develop both linguistically and culturally. But study of such recurrent events would not suffice. Tyisha and her peers were socialized not just through recurrent events, and not just into stable, homogeneous sets of beliefs and practices. Each individual was socialized across intertextually linked series of events, and each individual traveled along a more or less unique trajectory of socialization. Tyisha, for instance, showed on January 24 and many other occasions that she had learned to argue in acceptable academic terms. But she was not simply socialized into being a competent ninth-grade Paideia student. On several occasions she ended up using arguments not only for academic aims but also to joke or to disrupt teacher-sanctioned academic activity. Because of this behavior, and because teachers and students worked to impose a new identity on her, after three months on a familiar trajectory toward becoming just another promising girl Tyisha's trajectory diverged toward becoming a disruptive outcast.

Tyisha's case illustrates how a full account of academic socialization must go beyond the speech event and attend to individuals' trajectories across events. Socialization is always a contingent accomplishment, because many different events could have been linked together into many different trajectories for any individual, yielding both different pathways and different endpoints for that individual. We must explain how a particular set of events became central and how these events were linked together into the trajectory of socialization that actually coalesced. I have argued that such trajectories are held together by poetic structures of mutual indexical presupposition across signs and event-segments. Tyisha's case illustrates this, showing how both denotationally explicit metasigns of identity and tacit positioning through participant examples (and other events) formed a trajectory of events that came increasingly to presuppose that Tyisha was a disruptive outcast instead of a promising student.

Tyisha's case also illustrates how resources from several timescales are relevant to the trajectory traveled by an individual. Tyisha was originally identified as another promising female student, drawing on a gender stereotype that circulates sociohistorically but was also intensified locally in this classroom over several months. Her trajectory diverged from those of other promising girls, in part, when locally circulating categories from the curriculum—like Aristotle's concept of a "beast" or outcast—became available as resources for teachers and students to identify her. Academic socialization in this case depended on more widely circulating social-historical categories and on the microgenetic emergence of identity in discrete events, but it also required categories developed by members of this class over several months together—like the intensified local gender stereotype and local versions of the curricular categories. Adequate analyses of academic socialization will require not only attention to individual trajectories but also attention to the diverse configurations of timescales relevant in different cases.

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Appendix: Transcription Conventions

'-'	abrupt breaks or stops (if several, stammering)
'?'	rising intonation
'.'	falling intonation
'_'	(underline) stress
'(1.0)'	silences, timed to the nearest second
'['	indicates simultaneous talk by two speakers, with one utterance represented on top of the other and the moment of overlap marked by left brackets
'='	interruption or next utterance following immediately, or continuous talk represented on separate lines because of need to represent overlapping comment on intervening line
'[...]'	transcriber comment
':'	elongated vowel
'°...°'	segment quieter than surrounding talk
','	pause or breath without marked intonation
'(hh)'	laughter breaking into words while speaking

References Cited

Adler, Mortimer
1982 The Paideia Proposal. New York: Macmillan.
Agha, Asif
In press Language and Social Relations. New York: Cambridge University Press.
2003 The Social Life of Cultural Value. Language and Communication, 23(3-4):231–273.
Anderson, Elijah
1999 Code of the Street. New York: W.W. Norton.
Appadurai, Arjun
1996 Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Aristotle
1941 Politics. Richard McKeon, trans. *In* The Basic Works of Aristotle. Richard McKeon, ed. Pp. 1127–1316. New York: Random House.
Bourdieu, Pierre
1977 Outline of a Theory of Practice. Richard Nice, trans. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Cole, Michael
1996 Cultural Psychology. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Dreier, Ole
2000 Psychotherapy in Clients' Trajectories across Contexts. *In* Narratives and the Cultural Construction of Illness and Healing. Cheryl Mattingly and Linda Garro, eds. Pp. 237–258. Berkeley: University of California Press.
2003 Learning in Personal Trajectories of Participation. *In* Theoretical Psychology: Critical Contributions. Niamh Stevenson, Hazel Lorraine Radtke, René Jorna, and Henderikus Stam, eds. Pp. 20–29. Toronto: Captus Press.
Ervin-Tripp, Susan, and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan, eds.
1977 Child Discourse. New York: Academic Press.
Ferguson, Ann
2000 Bad Boys. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Garfinkel, Harold, and Harvey Sacks
1970 On Formal Structure of Practical Actions. *In* Theoretical Sociology. John C. McKinney and Edward A. Tiryakian, eds. Pp. 337–366. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.
Goffman, Erving
1976 Replies and Responses. Language in Society 5:257–313.

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

He, Agnes
2003 Linguistic Anthropology and Language Education: A Comparative Look at Language Socialization. In Linguistic Anthropology of Education. Betsy Rymes and Stanton Wortham, eds. Pp. 93–119. Westport, CT: Praeger.
Holland, Dorothy, and Jean Lave, eds.
2001 History in Person: Enduring Struggles, Contentious Practice, Intimate Identities. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
Jakobson, Roman
1960 Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. *In* Style in Language. Thomas Sebeok, ed. Pp. 350–377. Cambridge: MIT.
Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger
1991 Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Lemke, Jay
2000 Across the Scales of Time. Mind, Culture, and Activity 7:273–290.
Ochs, Elinor
1988 Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1996 Linguistic Resources for Socializing Humanity. *In* Rethinking Linguistic Relativity. John Gumperz and Steven Levinson, eds. Pp. 407–438. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi Schieffelin
1979 Developmental Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
1984 Language Acquisition and Socialization: Three Developmental Stories. *In* Culture Theory: Essays on Minds, Self, Emotion. Richard Shweder and Robert LeVine, eds. Pp. 276–320. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rymes, Betsy
2003 Relating Work to World: Indexicality during Literacy Events. *In* Linguistic Anthropology of Education. Stanton Wortham and Betsy Rymes, eds. Pp. 121–150. Westport, CT: Praeger.
Schieffelin, Bambi
1990 The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schieffelin, Bambi, and Elinor Ochs
1986 Language Socialization across Cultures. New York: Cambridge University Press.
1996 The Microgenesis of Competence. *In* Social Interaction, Social Context, and Language. Dan Slobin, Julie Gerhardt, Amy Kyratzis, and Jiansheng Guo, eds. Pp. 251–264. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Silverstein, Michael
1992 The Indeterminacy of Contextualization: When is Enough Enough? *In* The Contextualization of Language. Aldo DiLuzio and Peter Auer, eds. Pp. 55–75. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
1993 Metapragmatic Discourse and Metapragmatic Function. *In* Reflexive Language. John Lucy, ed. Pp. 33–58. New York: Cambridge University.
1998 Contemporary Transformations of Local Linguistic Communities. Annual Review of Anthropology 27:401–426.
Silverstein, Michael, and Greg Urban, eds.
1996 Natural Histories of Discourse. Chicago: University of Chicago.
Urban, Greg
1996 Metaphysical Community. Austin: University of Texas Press.
2001 Metaculture: How Culture Moves through the World. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Wortham, Stanton
1994 Acting Out Participant Examples in the Classroom. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
2001 Narratives in Action. New York: Teachers College Press.
2003 Curriculum as a Resource for the Development of Social Identity. Sociology of Education 76:229–247.
In press Learning Identity. New York: Cambridge University Press.

This content downloaded from 128.239.99.140 on Sun, 04 Oct 2015 01:31:17 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions