

5-2022

CO-CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITIES WITHIN THE HOME BREWING COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE

Ryan Julius Miller
California State University, San Bernardino

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Applied Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Miller, Ryan Julius, "CO-CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITIES WITHIN THE HOME BREWING COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE" (2022). *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. 1457.
<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/1457>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Graduate Studies at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

CO-CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITIES WITHIN THE HOME BREWING
COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE

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

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

by
Ryan Julius Miller
May 2022

CO-CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITIES WITHIN THE HOME BREWING
COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE

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

by
Ryan Julius Miller

May 2022

Approved by:

Dr. Caroline Vickers, Committee Chair, English

Dr. Parastou Feiz, Committee Member

© 2022 Ryan Julius Miller

ABSTRACT

This project applies Community of Practice (CoP) theory to examine co-constructions of identity and membership within a Community of Practice based around the home brewing of beer. The study focuses on both the interactions of members with each other and within the community, as well as how the members display their membership and expertise while participating in their practice and acting as identifiable members of their community.

By observing members and their interactions as members of a community, this study attempts to both further the development and understanding of Community of Practice theory as well as gaining understanding of a community that is relatively new and lacking research into both their chosen practice and how they constitute their status as a community through social interaction. In studying this community, this work also observes how members interact with one another, as home brewers, as well as how they co-construct their identities based on their expertise with the practice of their community and their own identities as home brewers.

This study shows that members of the home brewing CoP go through extensive negotiation to position themselves as not being novices, while at the same time positioning professional brewers as the experts in their community, despite that such positions are not home brewers. Expertise of members is generally found to be based in the brewing practice, but is typically only associated through the product produced, as home brewing is a unique practice

that does not require other members in order to actively participate in the community as a member. Members believe that the only dividing line for membership as a home brewer is to brew at home. All other factors are second to that main determining factor of membership.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

. I would like to sincerely thank my committee readers, Dr. Caroline Vickers and Dr. Parastou Feiz, for their unwavering and continued support. I would also extend my gratitude in acknowledging Dr. Sunny Hyon for going above and beyond to help me see this project to completion. I would also like to thank the faculty of the California State University, San Bernardino English department for providing such amazing instruction and opportunities during my time there. I would like to acknowledge Nathan Jones and the CSUSB Writing Center for being there for me in the many times that I found myself at odds with my work. Thank you to my friends and family for their endless patience and willingness to put up with me during this undertaking.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	3
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW	4
1.1 Introduction.....	4
1.2 Objectives of the Study.....	8
1.3 Literature Review	9
1.3.1 Community of Practice	9
1.3.2 Identity	22
1.3.3 Membership Categorization	26
1.3.4 Co-construction and Membership Relationships	32
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY.....	36
2.1 Methodological Approach	36
2.2 Ethnographic Context	37
2.3 Data Collection	39
2.4 Transcription.....	41
2.5 Data Analysis.....	42
CHAPTER THREE: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF STUDY	43
3.1 Discourse Analysis.....	43
3.1.1 Co-construction of Novice Identity and Membership Categorization.....	43
3.1.2 Membership Categorization and Identity of Expertise	57
3.1.3 Co-construction During the Practice of Home Brewing	73

3.2 Discussion and Implications of Findings	79
3.3 Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Research.....	85
APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER	89
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT	91
APPENDIX C: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS	95
REFERENCES	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. List of Interview Participants	40
---	----

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Introduction

From both professional and personal interactions and experiences, the activities people undertake and participate in constitute membership to social groups. The acquisition of knowledge and learning of skills necessary to further membership in these social groups as communities is what defines them. This relationship between communities and their practices is one of the main aspects of the theory that supports what a Community of Practice (CoP) is (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger 1998). To observe these social groups accurately, looking at the community and its members from the inside, as a member of the community itself, is the ideal situation. The circumstances behind membership within a CoP, in turn, would constitute participating in the practice of a community so as to be positioned and considered a member of a CoP. By observing and studying such communities as a participant and member, scholars can gain insight and understanding on the socially embedded natures of both the practice and participants as members construct, and reify, their own identities, those of other members, the practice, and the community itself.

In an effort to expand the scholarly work being done on CoPs, this study has chosen to analyze and observe “home brewers” as a CoP. Home brewers are individuals who produce or “brew” their own beer without the use of a

brewery or alcohol production license or manufacturing location and the multiple permits and requirements that come with establishing such a location. The State of California Business and Professions Code, which can be considered an appropriate authority on this subject as the data collection for this work was conducted in the state of California, has several stipulations as to what a home brewer is legally defined as, and what they can/cannot do with the home brew they produce. The most important points for the purposes of establishing home brewers as a CoP are that home brewers cannot produce above a given amount of home brew (100 gallons per calendar year) and that they cannot profit or attempt to sell the home brew they produce (Cal. Business and Professions Code, 2016). This means that if a home brewer profits from, or produces enough home brew in a year, they are no longer considered a home brewer. While it can be argued that only a community can decide who is and is not a member, this is an instance where a state government authority has clearly and legally established a criterion for when someone is no longer considered a member of a given community, while also clearly acknowledging the community and its practice.

As of 2016, the estimated number of home brewers in the United States is above 1.2 million individuals (AHA, 2016). It is safe to assume that this number has only grown in the years since this study was conducted. This estimation is also only counting home brewers who have registered with the American Homebrewers Association (AHA). One part of what the AHA does for the home

brewing community is the facilitation of activities relating to, and including, the community and practice of home brewing (such as organizing home brewing competitions, meetups, and brew clubs in local areas). It is important to note that membership to this association is not a typically considered a criterion for participating in the practice of home brewing and membership to the home brewing CoP, though the members themselves all identify as home brewers and members of the home brewing CoP through their membership to the AHA. The AHA and other organizations centered around home brewing show that resources exist to foster membership and growth of the CoP, but also that membership is solely based around the practice of home brewing. If someone “brews” their own beer at “home”, then they are a home brewer. This allows for multiple identities anchored in various types of memberships to exist, as well as for members to exist as part of the community without directly interacting with the community, as long as they fulfill the single tenant of participating in the practice of the community.

More recent examples from scholars, concerning CoPs, focus on how these groups exist within businesses and corporations, attempting to on how management and workplaces can encourage and foster employee-based CoPs to increase productivity and benefit their business through increased and efficient workflow (Snyder et al., 2003; Wenger, 2004; Smith et al., 2018) along with developing “relationships with peers and stakeholders” (Snyder et al., 2003, p. 2). These new approaches place more emphasis on the identity of individuals within

a given context as grounds for forming and facilitating a “community”, while still calling it a CoP. Scholars in other disciplines have begun to study the practice of home brewing and the rapidly growing community surrounding it in more recent years, much of the existing literature focuses more on the practice and aspect of home brewing with marginal few scholars turning their focus to the people that are undertaking the process of producing home brew (Murray & O’Neill, 2015; Alonso et al., 2017). This shows the shift taking place in CoP as it spreads to new disciplines and fields of study, along with the shifts and changes the theories undergo to find a space within these fields.

Lave and Wenger (1991) use examples of instances that place an emphasis on apprenticeship as a means of creating peripheral participation with the intent of becoming core members of the CoP. As CoP theory has been more traditionally associated in many professional and business areas, where apprenticeships are known to take place and be professionally facilitated, there has been scholarship that focuses on looking at CoPs which do not function within a professional or profit-based setting and exist outside of these traditional settings. These new perspectives place an increased emphasis on the practice, with members prioritizing the practice itself instead of the product produced and cultural capital it holds (Lave & Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998; Holmes & Woodhams 2013).

1.2 Objectives of the Study

In order to understand how members of the home brewing community co-construct their identities as home brewers, establish their roles within the community, and negotiate these roles within their interactions with one another, it is essential to look at these factors from a position both within and outside of the community as well as outside of and during membership interaction.

This study then considers the following:

1). Investigate how home brewers identify themselves as home brewers and how these identities are constructed and influenced.

2). How do members negotiate their positions with and within the community itself? What do the members' identities indicate and show about the community and how it structures both membership and the practice itself?

3). How do members identify and categorize their position/membership among one another within the community?

In exploring these questions, not only will this act as expanding the theory and study of CoP on a community in which very little literature exists, but it will also address and explore how this community functions and negotiates identities of its members in light of existing scholarship and theory. In addition, exploring both membership categorization and the co-construction of identity within the community can open discussion and exploration of CoP and membership categorization theory in ways that the current scholarship does not address or engage with.

1.3 Literature Review

1.3.1 Community of Practice

Lave and Wenger (1991) present the concept behind a CoP that, "learners inevitably participate in communities of practitioners and that the mastery of knowledge and skill requires newcomers to move forward toward full participation in the sociocultural practices of a community" (p. 29). Wenger (1998) defines CoP as being, "a kind of community created over time by the sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise" (p. 45). As the name indicates, CoPs are based around people who share in active participation of a given practice. While not as critical to membership, sharing the knowledge practitioners gain from their participation with their fellow practitioners is also a large part of CoPs. Participation is also an important aspect of CoPs, in that an individual cannot become an active and participating member of a CoP without participating in the practice of that CoP. This also means that lack of participation by a member of a CoP positions the individual as an "outsider" and denies the identity of membership to a CoP for the outsider. The sharing of information and knowledge related to the practice of a CoP with said community, as opposed to being required for membership within a CoP, acts as the means by which a member can become a full participant within their community, in turn also contributing to the practice of the community through its development and growth. This shows that members are intended to also function as learners within a CoP, and that

membership does not constitute a point in which learning, and development of the practice finishes or comes to a stopping point. Wenger (1998) generalizes and standardizes that CoPs are not a rare occurrence or happenstance, that in fact, “communities of practice are everywhere” (p. 6). While the concept of a “card-carrying club member” has become a rare instance in the modern day, the notion of membership artifacts that are directly linked to the practice of a community have become a much more common sight and means by which membership can be identified. While the concept of artifacts that exist solely to display membership do still exist in some CoPs, it has become much more common for artifacts that are used as part of a practice to also act as the means by which membership to a community is displayed and signaled.

Lave and Wenger (1991) discuss participation within CoPs as existing within two specific positions for participants: legitimate peripheral participation and full participation. The first comes from those who have entered or are entering the community but are placed as learning the practices of a given community due to their lacking the knowledge of the practice that would be expected of someone who identifies as a practitioner within a given CoP. Full participation is used to label and identify those that have attained sufficient knowledge and moved beyond legitimate peripheral participation. Lave and Wenger generally define legitimate peripheral participation as, "a way to speak about the relations between newcomers and old-timers, and about activities, identities, artifacts, and communities of knowledge and practice" (p. 29). Lave

and Wenger describe one of the key points of legitimate peripheral participation as knowing and acknowledging, "that there is a field for the mature practice of what [novices] are learning to do" (p. 110). Jacoby and Gonzales (1991) define learning as, "a social achievement within a complex framework of community, goals, tools, and activities" (p. 150). The inclusion and recognition of a complex framework allows for multiple influences and motivations for learning to take place, as no CoP will have the same learning take place with the same motivations and reasons. Shifting away from novice status in the periphery of the community is reliant on such participation, as CoPs are based around learning. While the name, legitimate peripheral participation, denotes there is a periphery to membership within a CoP, Lave and Wenger make it clear that they do not view participation and membership as having, "a single core or center", despite there clearly being a form of periphery to membership (p. 36). Rather, Lave and Wenger place the emphasis that the position is focused on, "the process by which newcomers become part of a community of practice" (p. 29).

The position of full participation is less defined by Lave and Wenger (1991) in comparison to legitimate peripheral participation, focusing more on the social aspects of membership, "full participation is intended to do justice to the diversity of relations involved in varying forms of community membership" (p. 37). Davies (2005) supports the importance of the social aspects of membership within CoPs, "Communities of practice characterize membership as being

created and maintained through social practices (linguistic or otherwise) at a local level, rather than global categories being imposed on individuals” (p. 557).

Lave and Wenger (1991) also stress that the position exists to place emphasis on, "what partial participation is not, or not yet" (p. 37). Lave and Wenger give a term for full participation as being a "master practitioner" (p.111), which becomes contextually based on both the practice and community in question. In this case, the label is grounded in their research of looking at apprentice/master relationships within given communities of practice. Within their exploration of different apprenticeships, a key example and outlier comes in the form of their study of supermarket butchers, or “meat cutters” (p. 76). This group, among the groups studied and discussed in Lave and Wenger (1991), acts as an example of how an apprenticeship (and a CoP in turn) can become dysfunctional and inhibit those entering the community from moving to core membership through stagnation and lack of access to the knowledge of the community. Lave and Wenger look to the “commoditization of labor” that takes apprentices from the position of learners to being positioned as “a cheap source of labor, put to work in ways that deny them access to activities in the arenas of mature practice” (p. 76). They discuss that the ways in which work is given to apprentices and rather than acting as a means by which success at a task will lead to gaining access to new tasks and more knowledge, they are positioned to do only this task until a new apprentice arrives to take their place. At this point, they are then given an opportunity to learn a new task and increase their knowledge. As such,

no apprentice can move to core membership, as those giving them knowledge do not want them to attain full membership. While starkly different from home brewers, there are a number of similarities and points of comparison between home brewers and Lave and Wenger (1991)'s butchers. Both have members who join with the intention of learning the practice. Knowledge in butchering comes exclusively from either an apprenticeship program or from a certification program, in a classroom setting. In homebrewing, there is no certification program or formal apprenticeship that is required to participate in the practice (there are educational institutions that offer programs and certifications related to brewing, but they are only orientated towards professional brewing and have no established connection to the home brewing CoP or practice). Membership categories within butchers start with apprentices, then journeymen, and eventually are considered butchers once they have fully learned their practice and the tasks inherent to it.

CoP theory emphasizes that the move to a position of full participation/membership is about more than just expanding and refining a participant's own expertise of a given practice, they are also developing their own understanding of the "embeddedness in the culture that surrounds it [their community]" (Paechter, 2003, 70). Adams (2018) applies CoP theory to beekeepers in the United Kingdom as a way of understanding and measuring the influence from introducing structured education and "enskillment" have had on the community. By applying CoP theory, Adams is able to better understand and

chart the movement from outsider to peripheral, and eventually full, participant in the beekeeping community. Adams also makes it a key point to note the involvement of government agencies and community led groups focused on creating locations and means for members to learn the practices of beekeeping without having to immediately start their own apiaries. Adams notes that the initial step of entering the CoP for beekeeping is a critical step in gaining the knowledge necessary to become a beekeeper, this is mostly due to the circumstance that beekeeping involves taking care of a living, breathing, stinging group of insects that can die if not properly taken care of. This, as compared to home brewing where the only "killing" that can typically take place is in the propagation of yeast, carries a much greater emphasis on the price of failure for participants.

Anyone who participates in a given practice is considered a member of that community, by that community. Lave and Wenger (1991) discuss how people on the periphery of given communities are actually considered and recognized as legitimate participants within their given communities, despite their placement as being on the cusp of membership by the community (p. 34-6). This movement and learning blends to construct the idea of peripheral participation within a CoP and that it actively influences the community, the practice, and the members, "legitimate peripheral participation refers both to the development of knowledgeably skilled identities in practice and to the reproduction and transformation of communities of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.55). The

novice or non-member, who enters a CoP on the periphery, gradually transitions to full participation and becomes a master or expert in that field through consistent interaction and experience from the very beginning. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) also discuss how participation can exist within a CoP in different ways along with the influence it can have on a given community, “modes of participation determine not only the development of particular strategies of performance and interpretation, but more generally access to meaning and to meaning-making rights” (p. 473).

Eckert and Wenger (2005) label this initial learning within the community as being a "transformation driven by the community's regime of competence" (p. 583). So the community, as it already exists, shapes newcomers/peripheral members into fitting what the community defines as membership and the practice itself. McClellan (2018) contributes to the CoP idea that competence within a community is something developed, “also through action in communities in which the knowledge is created and used” (p. 33). This supports that as members are learning the practice, even if they are not taking direct actions related to the practice of their community, they can still be contributing to the competence of themselves and their community if the actions are taken within the community. Wenger (1998) points to the community itself as negotiating both how membership is defined and reified, as well as how the practice itself is shaped and changed over time (p.73-4). This shows that while the identity of members is constantly in flux and developing as the community

itself is constantly being redefined and developed by members, these same members move from periphery to full participation and shape their own identity within the community, while the community shapes itself around their identities.

Alonso et al. (2017) conducted a study of home brewers and their motivations/interests in the community as a hobby in Australia. Of the 219 participants questioned in as part of the study, no questions were made based around the interest of home brewers to shift into professionally brewing. Alonso et al. only explored the concept of participants' interest to brew professionally in interviews, and even then, only in response to their comments when asked about their motivations to begin home brewing. Alonso et al. (2018) expands on previous research concerning the social aspects and collaboration within home brewing in an effort to expand and make the community more accessible to newcomers.

The joining of a CoP, as long as an individual is actively participating in a/the practice, is inevitable. As individuals invariably find themselves becoming members of CoPs, the identity of those who are entering such a community is one of gradual understanding and learning of the practice through and from the community, leading them to eventually becoming more knowledgeable and practiced within how the community defines both itself and the practice it is based around. Wenger (1998) establishes participation as being both personal and social, that it consists of, "doing, talking, thinking, feeling, and belonging" and

is a “source of identity” (p. 55-6). Wenger also discusses how a practice is something inherently social:

the concept of practice connotes doing, but not just doing in and of itself. It is doing in a historical and social context that gives structure and meaning to what we do. In this sense, practice is always a social practice (p. 47).

As more people participate in a practice, a community naturally begins to form. This is due in large part to people establishing a means and definition by which a practice is accomplished. To solidify a practice, the exchange of knowledge relating to the practice becomes necessary for participants. Even if no interaction directly occurs between participants/members, as long as the practice itself is considered to be a practice and people participate in that practice, a community will exist. With regards to interaction between members, Murray and O’Neill (2015) state that, “while home brewing can be a source of membership and socialization...[home brewing] can be a solitary quest for creation and perfection, providing internalization and inner dialogue, the chance to commune with oneself” (285).

In conjunction with participation, Wenger (1998) also introduces “reification” as the concept that works with participation to create meaning within a CoP (p. 55-65). Wenger generally uses the term of reification as based on its established, dictionary definition, that of taking something that is abstract and treating it as though it exists as a “material object”, though Wenger makes it clear that the concept functions in a much broader function within their work (p. 57-8).

The idea of reification works concurrently with the production that takes place through the practice of a CoP, “Any community of practice produces abstractions, tools, symbols, stories, terms, and concepts that reify something of that practice in a congealed form” (Wenger, 1998, p.59). Each of Wenger's examples acts as a means of not only giving meaning to the practice but becomes a part of the practice itself. These artifacts act as how the abstract within a practice is given a physical or grounded form, but also act as "the technology of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 101).

When a CoP firmly establishes something through reification, “it becomes something people can point to, refer to, strive for, appeal to, and use . . . in arguments” (Wenger, 1998, p.61). Wenger also points out that “having a tool to perform an activity changes the nature of that activity” (p.59). Lave and Wenger (1991) tie artifacts and their place within a CoP as also being a part of shifting to full participation from legitimate peripheral participation, “becoming a full participant certainly includes engaging with the technologies of everyday practice, as well as participating in the social relations, production processes, and other activities of communities of practice.” (p. 101).

In more recent years, Wenger has expanded their works to adopting CoP theory in different fields and areas of study. Most notably among these has been their work in using CoP in business management. Wenger (2004) shifts their definition of CoP from those of the earlier works to focus more on “passion” and that members “interact regularly in order to learn how to do something

better” (p. 2). Wenger (2004) also splits members of a community into “managers” and “practitioners”, positioning some members as those who do not participate in the practice directly, but work to enable the practitioners in their community. Wenger (2004) also posits that “no community can fully manage its own learning”.

Snyder et al. (2003) works on expanding the definitions of CoPs and applying the theories to government work. Their definition for CoP by relating it to concepts such as “knowledge communities, competency networks, thematic groups, and learning networks” (p. 18). Snyder et al. (2003) also label CoPs as “a particular type of network that features peer-to-peer collaborative activities to build member skills” (p.18). Snyder et al. also stress the importance of “an appropriate leadership infrastructure that can guide, support, and renew” (p. 20).

One of the more modern works Wenger has contributed to comes in Smith et al. (2018). Smith et al. (2018) suggest that “there is a dearth of attention to using CoPs within leadership programs for entrepreneurs” (p. 65). They go on to discuss the manufacturing of CoPs and shift away from a community being based around a practice and instead creating a framework in which those that “cultivate” a community can position what they choose to function as the practice. These ideas from Wenger almost juxtapose scholars such as Merriam, Courtaney, and Baumgartner (2003) who find the study of CoP to be more effective when directed at communities that, “develop spontaneously and informally” and that “a marginalized community that practices in relative isolation

might be an even better [location] for understanding participation and learning in a community of practice” (171).

An eventual step in obtaining the knowledge of a CoP comes from outside the community at the same time as it comes from within. Wenger (1998) theorizes that participation extends itself from one community into the negotiation of meaning, “in the context of our forms of membership in various categories” (p. 57). People can belong to multiple CoPs, as many communities interact and can be seen to influence one another, “a community of practice is a set of relations among persons, activity, and world, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.98). Wenger (1998) also shows that CoPs are defined by not only their boundaries of where they begin and define themselves, but also their connections and interactions with other communities, “communities of practice cannot be considered in isolation from the rest of the world ... their members and their artifacts are not theirs alone...they are histories of articulation with the rest of the world” (p.103). Paechter (2003) supports Wenger (1998) viewpoint, “joining a community of practice involves entering not only its internal configuration but also its relationship with the rest of the world” (73).

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1995) discuss the positioning of communities of practice as being situated within larger communities of practice that include or overlap with their own community’s practice. They position athletic jocks and burnouts as being members of their own respective communities, while

also having their communities be part of the larger community of the student body of a high school. This concept of communities themselves being part of larger communities that are a part of, but are defined by, their own communities. This relates to Wenger (1998) in their discussion of reification crossing boundaries and that people can have the status of “multi-membership” (105), though these communities are not necessarily connected in the way that Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1995) discuss. Alonso et al. (2018) also discusses the connection between home brewers and craft brewers and the influence they have on one another when it comes to the development of the practice of brewing, supporting the idea that while they may act as separate communities, their shared practice creates a larger community that they both contribute to in relation to their shared practice.

Lave and Wenger (1991) voice a similar opinion, “activities, tasks, functions, and understandings do not exist in isolation; they are part of a broader system of relations in which they have meaning” (p. 53). Marlatt (2019) applies the CoP framework as a means for analyzing a group based around the practice of playing video games with one another. Their application of CoP theory encompasses parts of the knowledge seeking activities undertaken by members of the CoP to further their knowledge and understanding of the practice, even if those activities are not directly engaged with the community or practice and are not necessarily required to be a member or practitioner. Specifically, Marlatt (2019) points to the act of “observing game play of expert colleagues...and

perpetuating its expanding societal presence by talking about the game in multiple settings” (p. 5).

By looking at this project with a CoP framework, it becomes much easier to observe and discuss both how the identities of members develop and change from within the CoP. In doing so, it is my intention to illustrate that the co-construction of roles and hierarchy of expertise shows itself in how members discuss and assess the community from within it, as well as how members negotiate and shift into roles of expert/novice during interactions with one another.

1.3.2 Identity

Numerous scholars have studied and documented “Identity” and how it is constructed. This work has established and expanded the idea that identity is something that both exists and is constructed socially (Bucholtz, 2003; De Fina, 2007; McConnell-Ginet, 1992; Jacoby & Ochs, 1995; Schiffrin, 1996; Vickers & Deckert, 2013; Wenger, 1998). As a CoP is inherently based around people learning and interacting with one another to further their knowledge and understanding of a practice, as well as the community surrounding that practice, identity becomes a critical point of discussion in looking at CoP members.

Schiffrin (1996) suggests that identity is, "locally situated: who we are is, at least partially, a product of where we are and who we are with" (p. 198). Shifts and changes in identity depend not only on what activity or practice an individual may be engage in, but also where a person is located. In relation to CoP theory,

this means a person does not need to be actively participating in a practice, or talking with another member of that CoP, in order to be displaying or presenting an identity associated with a given CoP. Any location or person, even those not part of a CoP, can give a person enough justification to display a given identity associated with a CoP. By facilitating engagement and discussion based around a practice, this study can engage and discuss both the practice and community of home brewing with those that identify as home brewers. This is also achieved without needing these discussions to take place in a location related to home brewing. Simply basing the discussion and interaction around the practice of home brewing is enough to allow for the representation and engagement of home brewing identities in interaction with one another, “identity in this sense is an experience and a display of competence that requires neither an explicit self-image nor self-identification with an ostensible community” (Wenger, 1998, p. 152).

De Fina (2007) posits that people position themselves and their identities in relation to where their interaction takes place (p.372). De Fina puts forward a different idea from Schiffrin that this positioning happens in response to these factors, this holds true for a CoP that would multiple participants in order to physically participate in the practice of a CoP. Within the work presented here, the community itself would function as such a place without the direct need for a physical location. Interaction is something that typically takes place between members of a community but as this community is based around a practice, such

interaction can also be said to take place between the member and the practice itself, as the practice does not explicitly require other people despite social interaction being a critical part of any CoP. By conducting interviews with research subjects, the identities presented by the interviewees are focused on how they identify the community, their identity and position within the community, and their own interactions with the interviewer facilitating co-construction. Supported by the theory that one does not need to directly interact with others in order to be fundamentally interacting within a CoP (Wenger 1998).

Identity shifts can be rapid and are dependent on a multitude of circumstances. Vickers and Deckert (2013) state that identity has a "fluid nature" (p. 116). The idea of this fluid nature not only points to the idea that it is something constantly in flux and changing, but that it is something different depending on the contexts that surrounds it. This fluid nature can stem from both the circumstances behind an interaction, but it can also stem from the fact that identities are constantly changing and are never singular in their representation. Identity is something that always functions as multiple, rather than as a singular entity, and is a patchwork of multiple and varying identities into one identity at any given time (Wenger 1998). As such, someone can be a member of a community and have an identity that they associate with that CoP, but such an identity is not strictly formed by their interactions with that community alone. Identity is formed by negotiation both with ourselves and through the co-

construction that takes places during interaction with others, which will be explored in a later section.

The other large factor to identity as it relates to CoP comes from learning and knowledge, which is a large part of CoP. As individuals learn and shift based on the inclusion of new knowledge and experience. Wenger (1998) posits that, "learning transforms who we are and what we can do, it is an experience of identity" (p. 215). To put another way, identity is constantly in flux and fluid in its motion but the things that really influence it are the things that influence what we have access to and knowledge of along with the multiple communities we belong to and expand our own view on who we are and who we are not. Eckert and McConnel-Ginet (1995) discuss the connection between identity and CoP as how looking at the members of a CoP and the practice of their community can act as the "raw materials through which they constitute their own and other's identities" (505). Murray and O'Neill (2015) in their exploration of home brewers address how identity impacts their work and the limitations it presents in the study of a group that is based around self-identification, "this study does not directly address all home brewers engaged in the activity of home brewing outside this organization [American Home Brewers Association]. The act of joining, indeed participation in the survey at all, may indicate that the participants are a relatively homogeneous group that is inherently different from the entire population of home brewers and are not a representative sample of anything beyond this group and its norm" (294).

As the interactions taking place as data for this work consist of looking at the interactions between home brewers practicing their home brewing and interview settings in which individuals are labeling themselves as home brewers, their interactions and talk can be considered representative of the home brewing CoP and looking at these examples can enlighten how their community and identities are produced both in and through these interactions, as explained in Psathas (1999):

The notion here is that, if the 'identities' of the parties, their socially situated, conventionally identifiable identities, are relevant for the parties in interaction, then these will manifest in the various ways that the parties invoke, formulate, and orient to contingently relevant membership categories (p. 142).

Wenger (1998) emphasizes on the inherent connection between community and identity. Even if an individual is only a member of a community by some tenuous connection that would place them in the most periphery of potential positions or complete lack of participation, "belonging to such a community can contribute to the identities of those involved, even if it does not involve the joint development of a shared practice" (182).

1.3.3 Membership Categorization

Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) establishes itself in the works of the sociologist, Harvey Sacks. Sacks (1986) defines Membership Categorization through the use and implementation of the Membership Categorization Device (MCD), which Sacks defines as:

any collection of membership categories, containing at least a category, which may be applied to some population containing at least a member, so as to provide, by the use of some rules of application, for the pairing of at least a population member and a categorization device member. A device is then a collection plus rules of application (p. 332).

The concept of the Membership Category (MC) is shown defined by Sacks and quoted by Roca-Cuberes (2008), “a membership category is a type of reference form used to describe persons ... those categories in the language in terms of which persons (emphasis in original) may be classified” (p.547-8). Bilmes (2011) states that Membership Categorization, “attends to choices of categories in actual situations of talk and the effects of those choices in promoting certain understandings” (p. 131). MCA, then, looks at how participants classify and describe themselves and others through their use of categories and categorization within their talk. Roca-Cuberes (2008) describes MCA as being, “the employment of membership categories by members in performing ordinary activities” (p. 547). The ways and methods by which these membership categories are applied for a group allow them to function as MCDs.

While MCDs may contain numerous categories within them, they are policed by several rules Sacks and other scholars describe. The first of the rules is the Economy rule. The Economy rule describes that while multiple categories may be applicable or appropriate for describing an individual or action, a single category from any given MCD can be referentially adequate. All the possible

categories that may be used to describe a person are still applicable but only one is needed in order to give a description to a person. Every conceivable category for a given person does not need to be explored.

The consistency rule describes when multiple categories are used in succession, even if not for the same subject, then they can be viewed as being used to describe belonging to a collection together. The idea behind this rule being that categories can act in multiple devices, by using this rule listeners are able to discern which device the category belongs to when put in conjunction with other categories by the speaker and which devices though the category may still belong to, or does not belong, within the given situation and context. As the view of these categories belonging to a cohesive collection is something optional and not a steadfast law or rule, this rule becomes more of a found resolution than something that is sought after with observation. As a corollary to the consistency rule, the hearer's maxim states that, "if two or more categories are used to categorize two or more members of some population, and those categories can be heard as categories from the same collection, then: Hear them that way" (Sacks, 1986, p. 333) This maxim and rule allows for terms to encompass multiple reference points without creating conflicts or confusion and create consistency in the interpretation of such usages.

The use of MC expands how speakers make choices in their speech that lead to the categorization of collections. These choices of categorization can be analyzed as a means of observing and understanding the choices made by the

speaker/s. Categorization allows for visibility of the ways in which members organize their experiences into acting as flags of their identities that are formed and made relevant through being participants in interaction (De Fina, 2006). This act of categorization also, then, constitutes a practice where, “members render their ordinary activities observable and accountable” (Roca-Cuberes, 2008). This can be used to look at how members of a CoP learn the categorization of language and knowledge by the community they are entering or are already a part of, as a means of not only functioning with and within their community but also to be regarded by other members as being "competent" (Garret and Baquedano-López, 2002; Jacoby and Gonzales, 1991). Roca-Cuberes (2008) further supports this connection, “when members go about categorizing, they presume a shared common sense knowledge of their world” (p. 547).

Identity and CoP theory open the way for looking at numerous factors as a means of study and understanding. Lave and Wenger (1991) discuss the ways in which they look at members of CoP and how they are placed into different locations within the community based on varying factors as identified and constructed by the community itself. They explain that the practice and activities of members within a CoP, “don’t exist in isolation; they are part of broader systems of relations in which they have meaning” (p.53).

Schegloff (2007) discusses the works and ideas of Harvey Sacks in exploring both the ideas behind MC. While the majority of Schegloff is elaborating and attempting to explain Sacks and the ideas presented in their

work, Schegloff (2007) also presents a new perspective on MC. This new perspective is founded in Sacks' work as, "a collection of categories grounded not in relationships but in knowledge" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 466). By opening the analysis to question and taking a more concentrated look at categories themselves, Schegloff makes it much easier to understand and question why someone may use or put forward a given category rather than questioning just the word choice itself and not looking at it in a larger scope, "any attributed member of a category (that is, anyone taken to be a member of the category) is a presumptive representative of the category" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 469) Anything that would go against the expectations of people, when it comes to a given category, is considered to be an exception to their expectations rather than changing what their expectations are for a given category or it's representation. Through this, the problem is with the representative, not the community. (Schegloff, 2007, 469-70). In connecting with the expectations of people, Sacks (1986) presents the example of, "The baby cried. The mommy picked it up" (p.330). Sacks looks at how people come to create "possible descriptions" for what they observe, "possible descriptions which are recognizable per se, then one need not in the instance know how it is that babies and mommies do behave to examine the composition of such possible descriptions as members produce and recognize" (p.331-2). This acts as a means by which people who are not members of a given community can identify what members do, despite their position of not being a member of practitioner of a given CoP. This furthers that

people outside a CoP can recognize and define both expectations and descriptions for what constitutes a member of a given community.

When looking at the ties between membership and identity, Wenger (1998) states, “our membership constitutes our identity, not just through reified marker of membership but more fundamentally through the forms of competence that it entails” (p. 152). Membership as identity, according to Wenger, is, “relating to the world as a particular mix of the familiar and foreign” (p.153). Wenger makes it clear that the identity of membership is founded based on what is a part of that membership and what remains unknown or outside the confines of that membership only serves to reaffirm our identity, “our non-membership shapes our identities through our confrontation with the unfamiliar” (p. 153).

When looking at the categorization of membership, scholars use a variety of different naming conventions for the positions of members within a given community of practice. Some naming conventions are based around the practice itself while others are tied to the identities of members and the practice. Wenger (1998) looks at the larger scope of member positioning within the community, using the labels of inside and outside, while inside is further broken down into peripherally and marginality (p. 166-7). Brown, Collins, and Duguid (1989) break membership categories down into just plain folks (JPF), practitioners, and students with the differences between their status owing to the means by which they are learning a given practice (p.35). Other scholars categorize with two groups using namings such as: master and apprentice,

novice and expert, core and peripheral members, students and teachers, newcomers and old-timers (Jacoby & Gonzales 1991; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Vickers, 2009; Vickers & Deckert, 2013; Lave & Wenger 1991).

1.3.4 Co-construction and Membership Relationships

Jacoby and Ochs (1995) focus on the factors and circumstances concerning co-construction in a variety of circumstances and disciplines. They define co-construction as, “joint creation of a form, interpretation, stance, action, activity, identity, institution, skill, ideology, emotion or other culturally meaningful reality” (p. 171). Jacoby and Ochs (1995) also expand on co-construction as a means of "sense-making", calling such sense-making an "interactional affair" (p.174). This suggests that groups that come together and interact with one another are forming identities and stances that are both contextualized and reliant on where they are constructed socially. The constructions are something reliant on interaction and thus are considered to be a “co-construction” of all participants’ design.

For true collaboration to take place between multiple participants, that being multiple people actively partaking in a practice together, they must not only coordinate with one another but either have the knowledge needed to participate or have the communication needed to facilitate participation (Goodwin 2000). This means that the practice itself requires co-construction to take place in order for more than one practitioner to actively participate along with active

engagement from all participants. Also, those that do not have the knowledge needed for collaboration must look to those that do within the actual practice taking place in order to be considered a participant and practitioner. This positions the identity of membership, which is contingent on participation in the practice, as something that is invariably co-constructed by participants when there is more than one participant.

Looking at the movement and growth of members within a CoP, the relationship and identity of the roles within and as members of the community are very important. Goodwin (2007) explores the relationship between novice and expert, "education and apprenticeship through which newcomers gain mastery of the practices that constitute being a competent member of a relevant community." (p. 57). It is the inherent role of core members and those who are practiced members of a community to facilitate access to knowledge and understanding to allow for novice members to learn what is necessary to become core members or "experts". Jacoby and Gonzales (1991) show that despite the lack of knowledge those who do not know can still participate and affect members of the community, "novices can sometimes affect the experts" (p. 150). This means that the position of being on the periphery does not deny any member the ability to contribute and construct both the CoP as well as how core membership is seen and defined by the community.

Goodwin (2007) describes examples from their work as all containing both a novice and an expert, without exception. This is not to say there is no

possibility for a situation to exist in which there is no expert within a CoP, but that there will be the dynamic co-constructed by the participants at some point during the interaction between members. As identity is constantly in flux and shifting during interaction and co-construction takes place between participants, the positions of novice and expert will find themselves present during any interaction between members of a community. These identities are not always present and are even open to reversal multiple times within an interaction depending on multiple factors. (Goodwin, 2007; Vickers and Deckert, 2013). Vickers (2020) takes this further in their study of “occasional membership categories”. They state that membership categories “may be interactionally reformulated as more specific categories in the process of interaction” (p. 8). While this supports and expands on the fluid nature of identity (Vickers & Deckert, 2013), Vickers (2020) makes a critical contribution that these fluid natures are based on interaction and are contingent on the interaction taking place between the participants and cannot occur in a non-interaction setting, which posits that the main context for this fluid nature is the direct interaction with other participants in a given practice. As such, expertise can only be occasioned between members and that it can shift or be removed altogether, under the proper circumstances and interaction.

Vickers (2009) furthers discussion on novice-expert relationships and the establishment of these identities within locally situated practices. Vickers argues that identities are co-constructed and re-constructed across multiple interactions between participants (p.117). Co-construction is not something that

only occurs once, as CoPs are constantly changing and shifting as members and their identities are in flux, they allow for members to use co-construction as a means of facilitating understanding and making sense of new changes to the community and practice. These constructions exemplify that the dynamic fluidity in the co-constructed membership relationship is “micro-interactionally” achieved (p. 118). As interaction is the quickest method for developing expertise, it also becomes the main thoroughfare by which peripheral participation is established and acknowledged

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

2.1 Methodological Approach

To understand and study how a specific community of practice co-constructs identities between members, I conducted discourse analysis as influenced by conversational analysis (CA). CA allows for analysis of membership relations in the course of unfolding talk as well as how people make meaning in interaction (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Vickers, 2008, 2009). Because CA studies genuine interactions as opposed to those artificially constructed, it is the best choice for this study as all the data collected is recorded either in discussion of the practice within an interview setting, or during the practice of home brewing directly and the conversations that take place during the practice of home brewing. For the purposes of this study, I conducted a micro-ethnography as exemplified by multiple scholars (Hymes 1974; Briggs 1986; Vickers & Deckert 2013; Holmes & Woodhams 2013) and defined by Jacoby and Ochs (1995) by aiming to, "examine bounded, situated activities not only as microcosms of larger cultural structures, but also as loci and media for the interactional engendering of these structures." (p. 175).

As my study was focused on looking at and observing a CoP, I employed such a lens in my analysis in order to determine how members co-construct their positions and identities through interaction with one another, as

well as how they construct their own identities as members of the home brewing CoP (Lave & Wenger 1991; Holmes & Woodhams 2013; Wenger 1998). By looking at both the identities constructed during the actual practice and in discussion about the community, I would be able to see how members talk about their identities and the membership categorization within the community as well as how they actually construct and negotiate it during the practice of home brewing. While focusing on a CoP for observation, it became clear that a community which focused on a practice that did not explicitly require interaction with other members of the community as a means of participating in the practice was important in attaining subjects that naturally positioned themselves into membership roles during such interaction, being that such interaction is taking place by the choice and agency of the practitioners and not at the requirement of the CoP in order to be a member/participant (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Vickers, 2010; Vickers & Deckert 2013). By applying a lens of CA to interactions that take place within the practice of a community but are completely optional and not required by the community or the practice, I am able to study and analyze these interactions to observe how displays of reification of both membership and identity are both established and shift within the practice.

2.2 Ethnographic Context

The data collected was done so through a micro-ethnographic approach along with field notes made during observation of the practice and interviews with self-identified members of the community (Briggs 1986; Holmes & Woodhams

2013; Hymes 1974; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vickers and Deckert 2013). To collect the data, I video-recorded two separate instances of home brewing on different dates which totaled over four hours of non-continuous video footage. Within these recordings two home brewers worked together to produce one beer for a given instance. I also conducted one-on-one interviews with individuals with questions based around the home brewing CoP and their experiences and opinions on the community and practice. Ethnographic notes were taken during the recording process.

Home brewing, as a practice, is something that can be done by a single individual or by multiple participants working together on the same product. There are also groups that come together based around the practice of home brewing, as well as organizations that attempt to organize and direct the practice of home brewing, though membership and participation in such organizations is not required to be a member of the community. The purchasing of ingredients and equipment required for successfully home brewing are completely legal and there is no federal age requirement or limitation. From inception to drinkability, the home brewing process is broken into three sections: recipe, brewing, bottling. Recipes are usually made prior to the actual brewing and the entire brewing process is estimated to take anywhere from four to six hours. This timeframe for the formulation of the recipe is dependent on the equipment used and the complexity of the intended recipe. The bottling of the beer will be done anywhere from one week to a month after the brewing has finished and can be done by a

single individual. This act of bottling, however, is much easier with assistance and can take anywhere from thirty minutes to an hour, pending any complications or issues.

2.3 Data Collection

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board in Winter 2017 (see appendix A). Data was collected at California State University, San Bernardino and at the house of one of the participants who is also a close friend. Participants were recruited based on their admission and acknowledgement that they identified themselves as home brewers and were not professional brewers. Participants were also asked if they were over the legal drinking age of twenty-one. No other consideration or criteria were used for the recruitment of participants. For the interviews, an audio recorder was placed between the interviewer and interviewee. Cameras were placed at stationary locations and an audio recorder was used in sync for audio as well as visual data. The interviews ranged between forty-five minutes and one hour in length and were only audio recorded. The eight interviews conducted were done at varying times. The audio tracks themselves were then recorded onto WAV files that were later stored onto an encrypted computer. By conducting collection in this way, I was able to observe members by themselves as well as interacting with each other while home brewing together.

For the observation of home brewing as a practice, I was able to participate in the home brewing community prior to data collection in order to

place myself as being a periphery member of the community itself for over 16 months by brewing on eleven separate occasions with a chosen group of home brewers (Bucholtz, 2003; Vickers & Deckert, 2013). These home brewings took place at the house of one of the participants, in his garage and driveway. Active participation was observed from all home brewers present, though non-members frequently attend these events, none were present at the time during the brewing sessions recorded as part of this study. From these recordings, written transcriptions were created for analysis.

All participants will remain anonymous and will only be referred by pseudonyms in this study. All identifiable information about the participants and non-participants in the data were trimmed and deleted to protect the anonymity of each participant. All 5 of the interviews were coded and analyzed for the purposes of this study. Of the 5 one-on-one conferences that were collected, coded and analyzed for this study, 11 excerpts from 5 interviews were included in this study. There are also 2 additional excerpts taken from recordings made during actual brewing sessions with 2 of the interview participants, in order to provide a diverse and detailed analysis of the data coming from both one-on-one interactions and interactions occurring during the actual practice of home brewing.

Table 1. List of Interview Participants

Home Brewer Name	Acronym
Paul	Pa

Mal	M
Pinche	P
Mr Beer	B
Bernie	N

2.4 Transcription

Data was collected using a digital audio/voice recorder that records data into WAV files and video cameras for the observations that included video recording. Once all of the files were securely uploaded and removed from the recording device, I transcribed the data using ExpressScribe and Microsoft Word. I applied Du Bois (2006) transcription conventions (see appendix C), to the resulting transcriptions from the interviews and observations. As the brewing sessions had times in which there was no activity to record, the transcripts are taken in sections with areas not relevant being omitted from the transcripts. Transcripts themselves, in addition to providing a way of seeing the interactional features as they were used in talk, also gave light to the ways in which the expert/novice identities were negotiated and co-constructed by participants as well as the other identities displayed by participants (Briggs 1986; Holmes & Woodhams 2013; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vickers and Deckert 2013). A table including the transcription symbols used, their description and meaning, as well as how they were used in the analysis are included in the appendix for reference.

2.5 Data Analysis

In approaching the analysis of the data obtained, this study looks to emulate the work done by Vickers and Deckert (2013). This work also looks to discuss and observe the co-construction of identity by participants, though rather than looking at one individual over a period of time and their identity, this research will instead look at identities of multiple individuals within the community at varying stages of belonging and membership. As the data also includes interaction between members as they participate in their practice, the study will also look at the active co-construction between participants of their placing themselves and each other in expert/novice positions as well as any shift which may occur between them and the participants. By transcribing with Du Bois (2006) and focusing on discourse analysis, many avenues for the exploration of identity are made apparent with a variety of linguistic forms acting as means for identity to be observed (Schiffrin, 2006). The analysis shown in Schiffrin (2006) also acts as a guide for the discourse analysis conducted in this study, looking at individual utterances as well as the co-construction that takes place between participants in an interview setting and between practitioners during group brewing sessions (Goodwin 2000).

CHAPTER THREE: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF STUDY

3.1 Discourse Analysis

This chapter will present a discourse analysis of the data examples chosen for this study. I will use these examples to highlight patterns found during analysis from 13 excerpts in total. The first 5 excerpts will demonstrate novice identities are co-constructed in the interviews conducted and also explore how MC is present in the negotiation of this identity. The following 6 excerpts will expand on the first excerpts, using the analysis of identity to explore expertise and the use of MC by the subjects. The third section will look at 2 excerpts taken from the separate brewing sessions and discuss the fluid negotiation and co-construction of both novice and expert together by the participants. The last section of this chapter includes a conclusion, as well as suggestions for further research.

3.1.1 Co-construction of Novice Identity and Membership Categorization

Excerpt 1: Very very first batch, comes from Mal (M) and his interview. The interviewer (R) asks Mal about if he has ever brewed beer by himself. Mal acknowledges that he has but only once and that it was also his first-time home brewing. M then proceeds to describe the experience, which in turn leads to him

explaining why his brewing was not actually brewing by his own standard because of the product and process used to brew.

Excerpt 1. Very very first batch

1. M; except for like the very very first batch which was not technically like
2. (H) really brewing because uh:: it was one of those like
3. uh::: out of the can kind of uh:: uhm <ASIDE> what was it called </ASIDE>
4. it was an #extrct extract batch so-
5. R: hmm
6. M: so basically it comes uhm the extract comes in uh in the ca:n
7. and it comes prehopped and then you put the yeast
8. and then (H) you do it and ### it was mister beer
9. uh uhm
10. R; hm::
11. M; i dont know if- a lot of people start with mister beer (H)
12. or like those types of kits (H) and uhm
13. and then they graduate to partial grain brewing and then all grain brewing

The question asked of Mal was not directed toward his assessment or getting him to define what things labeled someone as being a home brewer, those questions are present in the interview, but this was not that instance within Mal's interview. With the way Mal structures his response, he starts with a narrative and shifts to explaining why he was not someone who was "technically" a brewer. By using the term "technically" in line 1, Mal establishes that he is now in

a position, along with the appropriate knowledge required, to know where the “technical” line is for when home brewing occurs. Line 11 shows Mal looking at his first experience in comparison to some other people, who remain undefined though can be assumed to be the starting points of other home brewers with the use of “start”, implying that those who would use a kit like this will continue brewing and move to more extensive equipment and brewing techniques. This is further shown in line 13 when Mal chooses the verb "graduate" for the movement from using "kits" into other, more intensive forms of home brewing that require more knowledge and work from the brewer. By using graduate, Mal shows a natural direction that is expected of brewers, that kits should not be the end point but a beginning that ends with "all grain brewing", as stated in line 13. This shows the idea of membership to a CoP facilitating movement from the periphery to core membership, with Mal defining that shift by the knowledge and ability a brewer has in their home brewing skills and equipment.

Except 2: Easy as Crafting Soup, moves to a different interview participant: Pinche (P). As part of his answer to, "What brought you into home brewing?", Pinche began a narrative citing a television show as the original bad influence. He then moved to buying his own brewing equipment after interacting with brewers at an event. In talking about buying his own equipment, P remembers that he had a "mister beer kit" before that but had never gotten around to using it. P believes that the kit had been gifted to him at some point, though the ingredients went bad before he ever got around to using it. After this,

he uses his current perspective as a home brewer to make an assessment on the mister beer kit.

Excerpt 2. Easy as Crafting Soup

1. P; i- i owned a mister beer kit before that but i never used it (scoff)
2. R; how did you come across a mister beer kit
3. P; somebody bought it for me for christmas i think
4. R; so youre- so people at least knew you had an interest in beer
5. P; yeah
6. R; #into that they would want to buy you a gift as
7. <VOX> oh you like beer..have a brewing kit </VOX>
8. P; absolutely
9. R; and the gifting of brew kit is of course mister beer
- 10.P; yes absolutely
- 11.R; and you never used it
- 12.P; i never did actually i think the ingredients went bad
- 13.before i got to using it
- 14.P;[@@@@@]
- 15.R; [@@@@@]
- 16.P; and its funny cuz no::w looking at mister beer
- 17.i mean thats like making top ramen essentially
- 18.R; [@@@@]
- 19.P; [versus] versus crafting a soup..right?.

20. R; would you..now thats an interesting one you bring up

21. that..its easy to do would you consider someone that brews with a mister beer kit (H) a home brewer

22. P; (H) theyre brewing beer at home so yes:

P, in lines 16 and 17, identifies that the mister beer kit is something he has not thought about since he had possession of one, but had already moved into using and owning his own equipment (something that is considered a large financial investment for a hobby that it is illegal to directly profit from). P makes it a point to co-construct with R that mister beer is something that is given to brewers, specifically those that do not have their own equipment. His agreement of "absolutely" in lines 8 and 10 show his confirmation that R's assessment reflects P's own views on the social construction that non-brewers have towards mister beer and the practice of home brewing as well. As P makes it clear they made no use of the mister beer kit, he goes further to distance himself from the kit by making it clear he never made any use of it as a means of home brewing in line 12. Together the two participants push mister beer away from how they view home brewing as members of the community themselves. In looking at mister beer from a standpoint that is far from being a novice to home brewing, P compares the kit to making "top ramen" in line 17. He immediately gives more definition to his comparison by focusing on the act of top ramen on a scale with "crafting" a soup in line 19, along with this use of "Right?" as a question for confirmation from R. By making this comparison, P makes a point to relate his

comparison to something that top ramen is actually socially relatable to, as they both could be considered cooking. The use of "versus" by P in line 19, places the act as something that would not normally be related to home brewing. By the end of the excerpt, P has made it clear he considers himself to never have been enough of a novice to attempt to brew with a mister beer kit. P let the mister beer kit ingredients go rotten and committed to buying his own equipment and brewing better beer. By his own standard though, had P used his mister beer, he would still be a home brewer even with the most identifiably novice ways of brewing, as P clearly states that the main and only criteria for membership to the CoP is to brew at home (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Turning to Paul (Pa), later in his interview we revisit the subject of novice status, as it is one of the earlier questions asked but a narrative sidetracked the conversation. It is here in Excerpt 3: Mister Beer is for Novices, that the mister beer kit makes its return. Paul has never used a mister beer kit but it eventually shows itself as his chosen example when at a loss for something to exemplify what he considers to be the sign or image associated with being a novice of home brewing.

Excerpt 3. Mister Beer is for Novices

1. R; how would you describe someone who is a novice a home brewing?.
2. Pa; i:ts their first batch
3. and then..anything after that first ba:tch
4. i mean even doing that first batch

5. doing that first batch for me..
6. i learned.. nearly everything
7. #not #### ###
8. i learned quite a bit from brewing that first batch
9. brewing that first batch of beer i was a novice
10. after that i would want to sa:y (H)
11. (snap) (snap) mayb- maybe we can-
12. i can classify it as
13. people who are novices do the extracts...
14. uhm..and then maybe intermediate people uh: can be the partial mash
15. and then all grain (H) all grain it takes uhm (H) a degree of knowledge
16. maybe not novice i dont think a-
17. hm:: maybe a novice could
18. hm:: thats kind of difficult
19. R; @@
20. Pa; <excited> i don't even know if there are novices in this: </excited>
21. people who buy mister beer.. beer kits those people are novices.

Paul starts by putting the sign of being a novice in lines 2 through 5 with the repeated reiteration of "first batch". Not pointing to a lack of knowledge directly as novice, but that someone who has not brewed before or is inexperienced is what Pa clearly believes as being the novice to the practice. Pa then switches to telling the narrative of his own first brew, giving his own example with his first brew to

exemplify this. Line 6 shows Pa states that by learning "everything", he considers the first batch to be something that quickly moves a home brewer away from novice status, or at least gains a large amount of knowledge about the practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). After rewording himself to say, in line 8, that he learned "quite a bit", Pa proceeds to give himself the label, in line 9, as being a novice due to this being his first brew. Pa pushes away from using himself as an example of a novice, with "after that" in line 10. Pa moves the exchange to focus on building a scale of the community, instead of just focusing on who is a novice. Pa bases his expanded scale in the brewing methods used within home brewing. Immediately restating "people who are novices do the extracts", which would include the mister beer kit. Looking to further his new scale, Pa announces his intention to continue the example by finding something to exemplify intermediate brewers, which would appear to be not novice in this instance rather than a category of its own merit. The use of "can be" in line 13 furthers that this is something he is creating on the spot, putting emphasis that he is actively searching for something to fit rather than having something in mind already. Being intermediate is not something of note when compared to the position of the novice identity within the home brewing CoP. Line 15 shows Pa adding another category, with all grain brewing being the next level in brewing complexity after partial grain mash, though he never labels what this is in comparison to novice and intermediate. This lack of a continuation indicates that the priority was labeling the novice identity, the rest was built around this goal. Then Pa jumps

back to the novice in lines 16 and 17, he could be referring to another line in his thinking he has yet to verbalize or he may have been thinking of how full grain factors into novice status and if there is something there he perhaps overlooked. Pa's consistent elongation of "hm" is clearly being used to illustrate that he is thinking, which extends the amount of consideration Pa is putting into certain answers. After the laughter from the interviewer, Pa returns with a much more excited tone. With an increased tempo and raised pitch, Pa states his new perspective in line 20 with "I dont even know if there are novices in this". What Pa is referring to in his use of "this", is questionable, but it can be assumed as referring to the home brewing CoP. It could also be in reference to his categorical comparison between the complexity of brewing practices and status within the community and practice. The lack of novice within the community would be much less likely between the choices, but Pa proceeds to direct the conversation in line 18 to a reoccurring example of novice within the home brewing CoP, the mister beer kit (Schegloff, 2007).

Excerpt 4: The Novice and the Unsuccessful, comes from Mr. Beer (B). He is a business owner that sells equipment and supplies for home brewers as well as wine makers and others that make and produce their own liquor and spirits. He commonly uses "us" in reference during his interview to himself and his employees who are often expected to have knowledge of both the products as well as the practice they are intended for. His response in Excerpt 4 directs the interview more toward the difference between how B views novice brewers

and unsuccessful brewers in response to the prepared question of what he thinks makes someone a novice home brewer.

Excerpt 4. The Novice and the Unsuccessful

1. B; i think novice would just be
2. just speak to experience
3. th- the- the number of times they brewed
4. the number of ..(H) issues they have run into
5. uhm: if their beer has gotten better from that
6. that kind of thing (H)
7. uhm:: i would just say novice is-
8. for me novice is you know
9. <QUOTE>i brewed five batches of beer </QUOTE>
10. thats a novice (H)
11. uhm: somebody whos brewed fifty batches of beer
12. gets the same off flavor over and over again
13. but thinks that the beer is good and refuses to change it
14. even though (H) they enter competitions
15. and they get the same problems
16. they get the same markdowns
17. that kind of thing (H)
18. i think that #i ####
19. you can call them an unsuccessful home brewer

20. thats- i guess you could (H)

21. R; hm:

22. B; you know i guess in their eyes theyre successful

23. because they like the beer that they brew

Given the choice between talking about novice or unsuccessful home brewers, B opts to discuss the novice identity first. B immediately places the deciding factor in novice status as experience, which can be taken to mean home brewing experience or just a hands-on understanding of the practice itself, similar to Paul in excerpt 3. He proceeds to solidify this in line 3 but then moves into a further definition in line 4. B points not just to experience in brewing as being something a novice is lacking, but experience dealing with or having problems with brewing with the number of "issues" they have had. This reliance on "number of brews" and "issues" shows that B believes solving problems and issues is part of the movement from novice. Labeling problems as a form of experience and something needed to become a core member of the home brewing community is something found only in the interview with B. No other participant gave anything that could be considered supportive of this connection. B continues the evolution of the tasks of the novice, adding that their beer must also improve from their experience and the "problems" that occurred as they brewed multiple times. B attempts to further his definition but ends up shifting from "I" in line 7 to "to me" in line 8, as he repeats his intention to keep defining and describe novice. From line 11 onward, B switches his focus to the unsuccessful identity by basing it off

similarities and comparisons to how he built the novice identity. B increases the experience in line 11 with “fifty batches of beer”. In the following line 12, B repeats a problem/issue with brewing, “the same off flavor over and over”. B then shifts to the opinion of the individual in question for line 13, “but thinks that their beer is good and refuses to change it”. The use of “refusal” in line 13 is of specific note, as it shows that the option to “change” is expected to be presented to this hypothetical novice, but that they would make the conscious choice to not change what has been suggested. This phrasing also suggests that the “change” would come from someone with authority or expertise, which would then position a novice as being someone who does not take guidance or “changes” from those who would be experts, to them. This is another factor that stands out with B, while it was not associated with novice construction, no one in any of the interviews mentioned the opinion of novices and what they think of their own beer as being a factor of moving away from being a novice, or as something novices lack within the home brewing CoP. The idea of a home brewers own opinion playing a factor in their success in home brewing is further discussed in lines 22 and 23 as B “guesses” that if they like their own beer, then they must be successful home brewers in some way. This would lead to the conclusion that a home brewer produces beer that someone, at least the ones who are expected to drink it, enjoys, and wants to consume it based on the flavor of the beer produced. The value of the product to others and the producers places a new aspect of the value the product itself holds, which is not something commonly

associated with home brewing as it is something that explicitly cannot be sold or used in a way that produces monetary compensation for those that produce it without the proper licensing, which would make them professional brewers and no longer considered home brewers at that point.

Excerpt 5: Home Brewers and Consumers, comes back to Mr. Beer (B) at a later place his interview. This section has Mr. Beer answering where he would define the line of membership to the CoP of home brewing. In essence, where would the most novice of members be located and what is it that separates that example member from being on the outside of the community.

Excerpt 5. Home Brewers and Consumers

1. R; as far as the definition of a home brewer
2. who would you define as who is and who is not a home brewer?.
3. B; (H) uhm: i would say
4. anybody that brews at home
5. so anybody that- that brews beer because they like it
6. and they enjoy it
7. and they want to: try something different other than
8. whats already bottled or: kegged
9. uh..is a home brewer
10. somebody that isnt a home brewer i::s
11. somebody that just buys beer @

B frames his answer around the practice, using "anybody" in line 4 along with the literal namesake of the practice. Line 5 shows a shift that there is also an emotional motivation for being a home brewer, brewing because, "they like it". Line 6 serves to further define the emotional motivation for home brewing, switching to "enjoy" from "like" in line 5. This switch gives a more defined and solidified response to the emotional expectation of community members in relation to their practice. The use of "try" in line 7 goes against what others have said in their interviews, that most members don't try when they have done anything beyond a bought kit such as mister beer. B does not explicitly point to a kit or equipment but as the equipment is not considered a light investment for most practitioners, it stands that most would not be able to associate "try" with investing thousands of dollars in brewing equipment and supplies. B's word choice raises the question of if one can "enjoy" and "try" a practice and make an informed and just assessment of both the community and their experience in it, if it is also something that requires multiple brewing experiences just to be considered a novice within the community (Excerpt 4). Line 8 bring the conversation to the outside direction of home brewing, the consumer. As B categorizes based on the common containers used for beer, "keg" and "bottle", by introducing these with "already been", B pulls away from home brew and points towards mass produced beer. As licensing and permitting is required, home brew can never be mass produced or even sold for any form of monetary compensation, a home brewer is expected to enjoy the consumption and

consumer identity at a different level by comparison to a consumer that is not associated with the home brewing community. That a home brewer would be a consumer of beer as well is something B states plainly at this point, he goes even further to suggest that a consumer is the starting point for home brewing. Line 11 drives this point even more clearly with the inclusion of "just" along with his laughter at the end. By using "just", B places consumption as a foregone aspect of home brewing and that it is done by both the non-brewing consumer and the home brewer, with the practice of home brewing putting the latter in a position beyond or above the non-brewing consumer.

3.1.2 Membership Categorization and Identity of Expertise

Before moving forward into new excerpts with the focus of looking for identity and expertise within MC, I will use the first part of this section to look at the construction of expertise and identity within some of the previous excerpts.

Excerpt 1 illustrates MC in how Mal refers to the direct referencing of the interviewer in line 8 with "you" that becomes indirect "they" and "them" when he moves to discussing those who are not novice or beginners in line 13. While not clearly stating these distant individuals as experts, by bringing partial and all-grain brewing into the conversation it becomes clear that Mal is talking about the shifting in identity from novice to expert. Excerpt 3 brings the same brew methods in conversation as also being signs of shifting away from the novice identity and towards one of expertise.

Excerpt 3 makes clear indications in line 15 of all-grain brewing being associated with expertise within home brewing, though Paul categorizes this as being an identity as something beyond intermediate within the community without giving a name.

Excerpt 4 has Mr Beer takes and separates novice from unsuccessful, which in turn lays what is needed for someone to move from novice inward within the community. By saying that the unsuccessful is no longer a novice, B has established a checklist of what a successful expert within home brewing must accomplish or avoid in order to be recognized by himself and the community as such. The amount of beer brewed acts as a means of pushing a member out of novice identity, what comes from repeated brew sessions along with the knowledge of the practice and its standards for the expectation of the product and meeting those standards are what lead to expertise, according to B.

Excerpt 6: Others as Experts, introduces Bernie (N), a micro-biologist who works at a lab which produces and grows yeast for use in the brewing of beer. Here Bernie is answering direct questioning of his acknowledgement of there being anyone he would consider an expert within his knowledge of the home brewing community.

Excerpt 6. Others as Experts

1. R; is there anyone out there you would consider an expert on home brewing?.

2. N; uh:...uhm ### my #vicepin is the tha brewers here at ----- also are over ####
3. a couple of them..at least three
4. are also home brewers a::nd im always consulting them
5. when i have like weird questions and stuff
6. R; now weird questions as in reactions from your own brewing?,
7. or just questions youve just kind of come across that youd like answers
8. so you go to them
9. N; yeah cuz im always feel like i ask them about like
- 10.<VOX> yeah like i just decided to put it in a keg after two weeks </VOX>
- 11.and they were like what was the ph?,
- 12.you know what was the final gravity
- 13.what was the..you know all these like interesting
- 14.i mean final gravity is pretty standard thing
- 15.i feel like most home brewers check their gravity
- 16.but: yeah
- 17.###
- 18.ive never bothered to check my ph at home
- 19.i dont know

Bernie immediately answers in reference to a number of his co-workers at his workplace (whose name has been omitted to protect Bernie's identity). Line 4 shows N making sure that it is clear that the co-workers Bernie is discussing are

home brewers and ones that he "consults". Consulting phrases the interaction as possibly being more of an exchange and does not necessarily place the participants as being experts unless N is calling them as well as himself an expert, which I don't believe to be the case. To further place a rift between himself and his coworkers, N further clarifies that he approaches these coworkers with home brew related questions he may have. N never mentions if these coworkers use him as a resource, so it is assumed that this works as a one-way street with N pursuing this knowledge from more knowledgeable and practiced home brewers than himself. The inclusion of "weird" in line 5 adds to this as well, N is not coming to these others with just any regular or expected questions. By having his questions be "weird", N is able to justify this assistance and push further away from a position that puts himself as being lower in comparison to his co-workers as a home brewer. The interviewer asks for clarification as to why the questions he asks would be weird and if they are reactive to his own experience as a brewer or if the questions are weird by another standard, to which N replies "yeah", in lines 9 and 10. Line 10 has N giving an example of a question he would ask of these home brewers, as he uses a different voice quality to imitate himself asking them a question that is not actually a question. Lines 11 and 12 in fact show that in response to his statement, his co-workers are the ones asking him questions in order to better understand his own question, searching for clarification and facts that will contribute to their own understanding of N's request/statement. Line 13 had N

beginning to list another aspect or factor that his fellow home brewers wanted to know in order to diagnose his decision/problem keg after two weeks' time, but he decides to categorize any others he would choose to share and those he has already as being "interesting". By this label, N is able to position himself as being closer to his co-workers in their identity as experts instead of being the novice in comparison to their expertise. Lines 14 and 15 have N focusing on the aspect he is more familiar with, gravity. As this is something commonly measured in home brewing as part of most any recipe and would be very hard to consistently brew without measuring, it is indeed something "most home brewers check". This shifts his identity from standing with the co-workers to pushing him into the majority of home brewers, more of an average brewer than an expert or novice, but definitely not a novice. Line 16 has N creating a shift in the narrative with the use of both "but" and "yeah" along with a slight elongation. N comes back to the other response he got from his coworkers about "ph" in line 18, admitting it is not something he has ever checked as part of his own brewing process. Line 19 follows into N admitting that he has little or nothing else to add on the subject with "i dont know".

In Excerpt 7: Personally Relatable Experts, Paul is asked directly who he would consider an expert. This is followed up by asking if there even is anyone at all which he would consider to be an expert.

Excerpt 7. Personally Relatable Experts

1. R; who would you consider to be: an expert is there anyone you would consider an expert on home brewing?.
2. Pa; see- tha- thats uh..I hm: i dont think so
3. maybe thos:e..maybe those few home brewers that turned professional
4. R; [okay]
5. Pa;[i] um: maybe- maybe they can be seen as uh:: as an expert
6. uhm: (TSK) (H) i mean even .. still like
7. i ask my buddy pelican im like hey you know what about this:
8. he goes <VOX> oh:: you should do this </VOX>
9. because hes now an expert

Paul's first instinct, in line 2, is to say there are no experts in home brewing. That is not to say that there are only novice brewers, but that there are no home brewers that Paul would consider to be experts. Line 3 has Paul placing the expert role on some home brewers, who moved from being home brewers into brewing as a profession and are thus no longer home brewers. Despite the acknowledgement from R, Paul uses line 5 to justify his statement in further stating that these "can be seen as experts". In looking for ways to justify his statement, Paul makes a shift in line 6 into beginning a narrative in line 7 with his own personal experiences acting as justification. The narrative begins with Paul engaging his buddy, Pelican, who he has mentioned before is a professional brewer who used to home brew with Paul and another individual. Paul's narrative has no exact moment to exemplify, instead using a hypothetical situation with no

defined question in line 7, "what about this". Paul gives a response from Pelican in a different voice that carries no answer beyond that it is one. Paul is only able to position Pelican as being an expert because he is a professional brewer, which he has established as the only criteria for being an expert on home brewing. Because Paul comes to Pelican as a resource on brewing beer and is in a position where he can consult a professional brewer due to their intimacy, he is an expert, just as Bernie did with his coworkers in excerpt 6. Paul makes it clear from the beginning that, by his own standard, home brewers cannot be experts on the practice of home brewing as long as they remain home brewers. They can only be novice or something that is neither a novice or an expert. This is further explored in Excerpt 8: Shifting to Expertise.

Excerpt 8. Shifting to Expertise

1. Pa; he started as a home brewer now hes an expert
2. or now hes working in a professional environment
3. R; So once someone shi[fts] from home brewer to [professional] brewer
4. Pa; [yeah] [professional]
5. R; you would consider that moving into a position of expertise? (H)
6. Pa; yes even if it's <raised> slight </raised> expertise, even though they just started.

Continuing from excerpt 7, excerpt 8 has Paul explaining and defending his choice to consider Pelican an expert in home brewing. Between lines 1 and 2, Paul makes it clear that the shift to working as a brewer in a professional and

employed context constitutes shifting into a position of expertise as a default. Anyone who makes this shift is an expert in Paul's opinion. Paul does give that it might only be a little amount of expertise compared to himself or other home brewers in line 6 if their experience is limited in the role, but the position itself as an expert is unquestioned. It is in this exchange that an interesting relationship is brought to light with regards to expertise in the home brewing community. The practice of home brewing, what is done as the process of making and producing the beer, is the same as what is done for the production of beer by any professional company or brewery. There is no difference beyond the scale of the brewing and the access to equipment, only the amount each is allowed to legally produce and that one of the two is allowed to be paid for what they produce.

The law within the state of California, and most every other state, has it in place that a home brewer can only produce, "100 gallons per calendar year if there is only one adult in the household or (2) 200gallons per calendar year if there are two or more adults in the household" (Cal. Business and Professions Code §23356.2). As the typical home brew is made in a quantity of at least 5 gallons, a home brewer is not legally allowed to brew on the same scale as those of the professional without some form of licensing. This acts as the main dividing line between home brew and professional brewing: a home brew is not allowed to make as much beer as a professional and the professional must produce enough to justify the licensing that makes them no longer a home brewer.

Considering the legislation on home brewing, there are multiple reasons that home brewers could consider professionals to be "experts" on the practice of brewing. It is a common notion that being paid for providing a service requires an individual to be competent at that service, thus it would be a logical assumption that being paid to brew beer would mean that the individual brewing would be someone good at brewing beer to attain their position. This raises the question of if anyone who can be compensated for a skill or practice is automatically an expert or better than others at it because of that compensation? This will be explored in the discussion section of this research but suffice it to state this a unique interaction from the interview data obtained from Paul and others.

Mal takes his approach to what he considers to be an expert of home brewing in Excerpt 9: Levels of Expertise. Coming from him talking about meeting other home brewers and his expectations for them when they discuss home brewing and making their own beer, Mal expands in this excerpt why he is sometimes let down when he talks with people who only brew extract brewing.

Excerpt 9. Levels of Expertise

1. M: theres a lot of research thats involved
2. and a lot of like work that goes into (H) uh
3. finally getting to that moment ..
4. to- where you can say like .. like
5. i can make some great beers and uhm
6. and i think we make some pretty great beers

7. and uh and (H) it- i think its just uh @@
8. its like when someone calls themselves a photographer
9. but all they do is they have their
10. uhm digital camera .. and they set it on automatic
11. and then .. they click the button
12. you know (H) tha-thats one thing
13. you can you can have some great photography
14. and yeah ### there are some great photographers
15. that all they do is they shoot on automatic (H)
16. but its a whole different skill set
17. and a whole different uhm ..
18. like amount of research that you need to do
19. to know how to shoot everything on automat-
20. on manual (H) know how to set the expo::sur:es
21. and uh the ti::me and like uh the shutter rates
22. and (H) all that stuff
23. its like theres..a lot of like the- yeah
24. theres #a #uh: a bit of a journey in between that so (H)
25. theyre not quite on the same level in my opinion

Mal moves to qualifying what makes someone a "good" home brewer in his opinion. The result of making "great beers" in lines 5 and 6 act as his credential to not justify his expert identity in comparison to other home brewers, but its the

means by which he expects other home brewers to reach the same point. That this is the forgone destination for home brewers, as he states in line 3 "finally getting to that moment". Relating this to another practice that Mal is establishing himself as familiar with, Mal introduces his analogy between making great beers and photography from line 8 onward. By turning to another practice to exemplify his idea of expertise, Mal both reinforces that he has an understanding of his own expertise while at the same time opening the possibility that he only knows what expertise is from an outside source and is only able to attain his own expertise within home brewing by such means. Mal relates novice identity (and thus extract brewing as established in Excerpt 1: Very very first batch) to using a digital camera on automatic settings, where the camera takes care of the intricate details and all the user must do is point and "click the button" in order to create "great photography". Mal makes use of similar wording in his comparison, "great" described both the beer Mal produces as well as the pictures of those who use the automatic settings. Mal also repeats his mention of the "research" involved from line 1, in line 18. Though this usage in line 18 directs to "you" rather than it simply being "involved", as it was earlier. By speaking directly, Mal takes a stronger stance of authority and expertise with photography than he does with home brewing, though this could also be due to his shifting from "we" (as Mal brews with other people) to the singular of his own photography which is done by himself. In Excerpt 1, Mal used "graduate" to describe the upward movement that takes place in the shifting out of the novice identity and moving toward the core

membership of expertise within the home brewing CoP, in this excerpt he uses "journey" in line 24 in a similar fashion. While graduate is a step upward within an organized system, the use of journey points more to the internal motivation to move from one place to another without any indication of upward movement or improvement. This shift is furthered as Mal makes the point to stress they are "not on the same level" in line 25. By bringing the idea of levels in, Mal pulls back to graduation and the idea of upward movement within the CoP instead of simply moving in any given direction.

Mr. Beer begins Excerpt 10: Collaboration, talking about his position as an expert in his performance of brewing demonstrations and working with people who come to him for help with home brew they are trying to formulate or create. Mr. Beer also moves into their elaboration of what collaboration is to them and what it can be to home brewers. Of all the interviews conducted, this was the only instance where collaboration was not only talked about but also explicitly defined by a participant. Other participants indicated that they brew with other people, but nowhere in their interview was the term "collaboration" used by anyone other than Mr. Beer.

Excerpt 10. Collaboration

1. B; collaboration is just
2. i would sa:::y
3. any help that i can give
4. im collaborating with that person to get that

5. that specific beer done (H)
6. R; [hmm]
7. B; [so] uhm (H) uh:::
8. (2.1)
9. B; i would say most people would say collaboration is
10. you show up to the brewery
11. you brew with that person
12. (H) you come back you know a couple weeks later
13. and help them transfer and (H)
14. help them do all of that stuff (H)
15. you know obviously i cant do that with every person
16. (H) so (Hx) uh:::
17. but you know uh:::
18. if- if someone needs help with a recipe like that i try to help them out
19. any way i can

Twice, both at lines 3 and 19, B talks about "any" as what he tries to do. By giving "any help" and helping in "any way I can", B leaves his position and expertise as something unnamed and vague, but also as something that is encompassing and applicable in a number of situations. B lets those who come to him decide and contextualize the help they receive from him rather than letting him establish his expertise and using what they would want from what he offers. It is also important to restate that B, unlike the other participants, does run a

business that explicitly caters to home brewers. B does specify that his collaboration is always pointed towards the practice of his community. Lines 4 and 5 point at B helping with finishing beer, everything stems from this end but he still allows for most anything to be justifiable under that goal. After an extended pause, B turns to defining how, in his mind, others would view collaboration. This collaboration is more using the facilities and equipment of someone as well as their actual person for help with the processes involved with the brew, something B does not offer in his own form of collaboration. Line 10 has B placing an actual brewery as where the outside definition for collaboration would come from and be situated in. B could be referring to “brewery” as a given location where beer is brewed, which would still be applicable to home brewers. Though it is shown in practice that most home brewers do not refer to the location they brew their beer at as a “brewery”, even though it is where they brew beer. B also places the outside definition for collaboration as coming from someone who has ownership or access to facilities and equipment, as he roughly describes the entirety of the brewing process in lines 11-14. something that would have to come from a brewery or the brewer themselves. The main reason this would be more commonly associated with a professional brewery and brewer than a home brewer stems from most home brew equipment being mobile and able to be moved with relative ease while professional equipment is so large it cannot be moved easily or readily. To brew with a professional, you have to go to them, they do not come to you. B does not deny his ability to also offer

something similar in line 15, "i cant do that with every person", but he does not include if this is something he offers or the frequency at which this occurs. B restates his definition of collaboration as helping with line 18 and 19, but makes it clear that he focuses on the "recipe" in his most common and available form of collaboration.

Excerpt 11: Two Ways for Success, has B discussing what he considers to be a successful home brewer and how they are able to achieve that identity within the CoP. After which, B talks about who would be an unsuccessful home brewer.

Excerpt 11. Two Ways for Success

1. B; a successful home brewer is somebody who uhm::
2. either learns from their mistakes and their beer consistently gets better
3. or: just comes to (TSK) somebody like us (H) where (H) if they..uhm: keep
4. getting the same problem and we try to help them to diagnose it
5. so theyll you know were usually..willing to have them bring in a bottle and
6. sample it with them so that they can figure out
7. where they think they are going wrong

As in excerpt 4, where B says that novice brewers dont look to improve their brewing and beer, in line 1 B gives two ways in which someone can become "a successful home brewer". The first way comes from wanting to improve and gaining knowledge of the practice and how the community shapes it from the individual finding an opportunity to "learn from their mistakes", which means they

must also have the knowledge of brewing needed to identify and acknowledge mistakes within their practice and the product produced (Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schiffrin 1996; Wenger, 1998). The second way that someone can become a successful home brewer is to come to an expert and learn from them directly based on assessment of practice and product. By starting line 3 with "somebody like us", B places him and his business as being experts while saying he is not the only choice people have there. Distancing himself from being seen as the lone authority and only part of the membership that has expertise within this community location by working with extensive knowledge that is used in the context based on the needs of those that come to them, as shown with the use of "diagnose" in line 4. This then leads to B's focus on the product itself, "willing to have them bring in a bottle". By being "willing", it comes as something that B allows to happen rather than something brought forward by the one producing it. This places the identity of the expert as having what is needed to work with both the process and the product as means of "diagnosis" while novice members must work with only the process and "mistakes" and hope for improvement of their product to occur. B then shifts in lines 6 and 7 to giving the ability and knowledge to the one coming to them for help with the use of "they". "They can" puts the ability on the one seeking expertise as having what is needed to discover their problem now that they are sharing their product with B. Line 7 has "they think they are going wrong", which points to a lack of a certainty that after their assistance that the novice will the

right direction and answers for their problem. This could be leading to the process B has seen and that it is here that his expertise and counsel takes place in directing those that come to him towards the true solution that their problem or mistake requires, but it is unknown as B moved on to a different subject at this point in the interview.

3.1.3 Co-construction During the Practice of Home Brewing

Each of the excerpts in this section are taken from brewing sessions recorded with Mal, Paul, and myself at Paul's house. I had spent time brewing with Mal and Paul prior to gathering the data of this project, in order to make the interactions as genuine as possible despite the recording taking place (Bucholtz, 2003).

Two recording sessions were taken at different times with different beers being brewed. Both sessions document the brewing process from the time when all participants arrived until the brewing is considered done and the finished beer is put into its container for fermentation. As the brewing process has considerable time during certain steps in which the brewers do not need to be taking any immediate action and are waiting for certain processes, only times in which the brewing or the practice of brewing were discussed were included in the data. In transcribing and analyzing the data from the brewing sessions, a pattern emerged in that the majority of discussion about the brewing took place before the majority of the brewing process began. As such, the excerpts presented here are from the beginning of each brewing session, as nearly all of the co-

construction and negotiation of roles takes place while preparing the ingredients for the brewing and finalizing the recipe before beginning the brewing of the beer (Goodwin, 2007).

Excerpt 12: Negotiating Pounds, comes from the first of the two sessions. Mal (M) and Paul (Pa) are discussing the grains they want to use for the beer, based on what they have available to them.

Excerpt 12: Negotiating Pounds

1. Pa: lets start off with u s pale malt
2. <lower> because thats what i have </lower>
3. this pale malt came from Canada
4. ##### (multiple people talking at once and laughing)
5. Pa: lets start off with ten pounds
6. <lower> no lets do eleven </lower>
7. e::leven pounds..mashed and steeped
8. and the:n what else do you wa:nt?.
9. M: lets do a pound of carapils
10. Pa: ##### (murmuring while entering information into computer)
11. Pa: a pound?.
12. M: mmhm
13. Pa: so it wi:ll look like..that ((motions towards screen))
14. pretty [light]
15. M: [mm yeah] add um..like half a pound of the sixty?.

16. Pa: ##### sixty

17. M: you want it darker?.

18. Pa: no that looks good #to #me

19. okay so eleven pounds #do #we #have #a #count?,

20. let me get my scale

Paul starts this excerpt speaking clearly and of a volume that makes it clear the other two participants are meant to know and receive this information. The use of "lets" by both Mal and Paul in lines 5, 6, and 9 places their decisions as being ones of the group in the actions that follow, rather than being decisions they have made on their own without input or consideration from others present. After this point, there is only the use of "you" and "me" without any additional "lets" prior to any verb usage. Line 8 signals the end of Paul directing the recipe and turning to Mal for what he wants to have in the grain build beyond the base malt. Here Mal makes use of "lets", showing that this action is one they are taking together despite Paul putting the decision directly on Mal. Paul enters the information into the recipe program on his laptop and confirms the amount, showing he does not question Mal's choice directly but the amount that he wishes to add of this particular grain. With Mal's confirmation, Paul produces a simulated sample of how the beer will look with these ingredients so far on his laptop computer. Paul's immediate assessment in line 14 is confirmed by Mal as he gives it, showing that there was little chance Mal would have not agreed with Paul on his assessment of the color the beer showed through their overlapping. This could be considered

a means of negotiating equal authority, as Mal chose the ingredient and amount without any direct conflict from Paul. Such agreement could also be a co-construction between both participants as Mal immediately moves to add another ingredient to rectify Paul's assessment of the beer as being "pretty light". The use of questioning in lines 8, 11, 15, and 17 by both participants suggests it as a conscious action and means of negotiation and consideration for each other. After a final checking and allowing for participation by Mal in line 17, allowing for a renegotiation within the context of making the beer darker via the inclusion of more/different grains, Paul declares the negotiations over and moves to get his scale and begin measuring the agreed upon grains for the mash process.

In the second brewing session, Paul and Mal discuss water temperature for boil. The recipe for this beer came from Mal though the process is almost exactly the same no matter who is the source of the recipe. While there was some negotiation over the recipe and amount of grains, Excerpt 13: Planning while Boiling, shows a different negotiation of expertise between Paul and Mal.

Excerpt 13: Planning while boiling

1. Pa: um: shoot (1.6) well this is your beer
2. and i dont know anything..i just put it into the recipe
3. M: [@@@]
4. R: [@@@]
5. Pa:[@@ #have]
6. M: #like thats just usually what i do

7. i dont know what im doing but..uh:
8. throw it all in
9. Pa: so two things
- 10.#### (turning on gas burner)
- 11.Pa: two things ..
- 12.what [fucking temp]
- 13.M; [um:::]
- 14.Pa: @@@
- 15.#### (inaudible due to loud gas burner)
- 16.Pa; i know were boiling it anyways but still
- 17.Mal; uh:: ... one fifty four
- 18.Pa: to mash at?,
- 19.so were- what it ## ###
- 20.Mal; ## so i dont really [know]
- 21.Pa; [twelve] degrees so
- 22.one fifty four to one sixty eight
- 23.M; (clears throat) yeah i mean
- 24.it says for adding water so
- 25.one seventy one to one seventy two
- 26.Pa; one seventy o:ne
- 27.okay one seventy one
- 28.how much water does it call for cuz we just kinda guesstimated

29. Pa; [####]

30. M: [####] (Mal and Paul talk to and over each other doing math)

31. Pa; I was pretty close i- i put twenty six

Paul immediately pushes the position of expert onto Mal, with the recipe being his formulation and Paul not as much of a role in the grain build. Paul starts with the exclamation of "shoot" before an extended pause and directing the expert identity at belonging to Mal. The pause creates a larger emphasis on the declaration following, creating an even larger construction of Mal as being the expert now. After laughing, Mal takes the speaking role but refutes his expert identity by stating that there is no order or informed reasoning to how they should ingredients to the boil, claiming "throw it all in". Paul resumes as speaker, turning to Mal and requesting two pieces of information. The temperature for the boil and how much water is needed for a later step in the brewing. With the movement to a more process related task instead of the planning, both Paul and Mal revert to sharing expertise between them as opposed to working in constructing one another as the sole expert. Both attempt to do the math and calculate the temperate needed for the boil as they have made changes to their recipe earlier that are reflected now. This comes after Mal admits in line 20 that he does not know the exact temperature needed. This happens again as they are forced to recalculate the water needed in quarts. This is done with both talking and calculating (though not directly at or to one another) at the same time until an

answer is declared and Paul acknowledges that he was not correct, but "pretty close" in line 31.

3.2 Discussion and Implications of Findings

Based on the data and analysis presented here, the identities are constantly in flux both during and in retrospect of home brewing. The excerpts show rapid negotiated and co-construction by members. In discussion of the community, participants actively work to position themselves as something more than a novice but not always an expert. Though when expertise is displayed, it is done through a very careful navigation, and negotiation in some cases. While some showed no hesitation in asserting their own expertise within the home brewing CoP, nearly all the participants in this study made direct efforts to be identified as "not novices" within their interviews, which was a clear and purposeful distinction from being positioned as experts. Expertise is still a driving point for members looking to move toward the core membership and some strive and consider themselves to be universal experts within home brewing, such as in excerpts 5, 6, and 11.

Expertise within home brewing stems from knowledge of the practice of brewing and the product of home brew. (Garret and Baquedano-López, 2002; Goodwin 2000; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). The practice and the product of home brewing act as separate means by which expertise is negotiated and recognized. Face-to-face interaction during the practice of home brewing is a rarity, as practitioners of home brewing and only as

members of the same community create instances of assessment either through displays of knowledge or by assessment of the product (the home brewed beer). In excerpts 4 and 11, Mr. Beer talks about diagnosis and judgement through the sampling of product in face-to-face interaction, which leads to assessment of the practice itself (Goodwin, 2007; Vickers, 2008, 2009).

This leads to a key point that the work and expertise associated with home brewing mostly comes from the brewing process and work that goes into it, but the main form of assessment is done only on the product being produced. This is a unique situation in that the process is one that can, and commonly is within the community, done alone (Adams, 2018; Murray & O'Neill, 2015). A look into the home brewing community eventually leads to the understanding that the community does not directly require engagement to participate (Murray & O'Neill, 2015), though core membership within the home brewing CoP appears to be more reliant on social engagements with other brewers and the community at large through social/brew clubs, meetings, brewing/beer competitions, among others.

So, without participating or observing brewing processes in order to assess a brewer's expertise and knowledge of home brewing, assessment of product stands as how home brewers are shown to lose expertise (Adams, 2018). If a home brewer produces beer that is not considered "good" by the community, which requires them to expose their beer to the community, they are considered to be "novice". This is contingent on a brewer's engagement in the

process of this assessment, as they are not required to allow other members to assess their homebrew. They also are given the means to conduct their own assessment, based on their own perceived expertise and knowledge of what “good” is. Alternatively, this exposure is expected of those who want to be experts in the community and is either done through submission and participation in home brewing competitions, where home brew is submitted for tasting and judging by a panel of home brewers or sharing home brew with other home brewers.

As brewing can be done alone or with others, the opportunity for social interaction with other members of the community is something less common as practitioners. The community has social groups in the form of clubs, but these are highly inaccessible to new home brewers, as members can be subject to scrutiny and judgment instead of the exchange of information and practice.

The identity of novices within home brewing is tied to very clear flags. A novice brews using minimal equipment, possibly even using the equipment of another home brewer or even a commercial brewery in a form of collaboration, as shown in excerpt 10. Excerpts 1, 2, and 3 show that a novice makes use of extract brewing, the mister beer kit being the most widely recognized of such artifacts (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The novice has not brewed many times (excerpt 3 and 4) and those who move away from the novice identity do not default into being experts. These individuals may be able to function as experts under the

right circumstances for novice home brewers, but they are not considered to be experts within by the community.

In contrast to Lave and Wenger (1991)'s butchers, the membership categories of home brewers are less clear, as the path to core membership is varied and not as direct as with an apprenticeship model. As the main criteria for being a home brewer is to brew at home, the main categories are based around how members undertake their practice. As such, there are members who join social groups based around the practice of home brewing and partake of brewing together with other members, as well as other activities related to their practice and product. These would be considered the "Brew-club Members". Like the butchers, no one is forced to join a brew-club and all members are those who have chosen to join and participate within the activities of the club. Those who brew with others that they already have a relationship with: friends, co-workers, family members, would be considered "Small-group Brewers". These home brewers undertake their practice as a social event but will interact with other members outside of the practice and do not only engage with each other as members of the home brewing CoP. Those that do not brew with others fall into one of two categories: Individuals and the Self-marginalized. The Individuals are usually those who are relatively new to the practice and have only just been exposed to the practice of home brewing. They would be considered novices, in more traditional terms, and tend to be lacking in knowledge as beginners to the practice of home brewing. It is a simple assumption to make that most every

home brewer was an Individual at one point in their membership within the CoP. The Self-marginalized are individual brewers that have chosen to not participate in the community beyond the act of brewing beer at home. This position is something conceptualized through this study, as this position is not something found to be currently reflected in current research regarding CoP theory. While they may not be able to move to a position of core membership, they fully embody the concept of being full participants and members of a community while remaining firmly within the periphery. This is one of the unique membership categories within the home brewing CoP that is not found in typical literature surrounding CoP theory, as most traditional CoPs require members to be physically present or require members to interact with others in the community to some extent, especially in the case of moving from the periphery to core membership.

Novices are introduced to the community by practiced members, but no real apprenticeship exists within the community, at large. Each participant who discussed their first brew or introduction to home brewing found themselves learning the practice on their own, and generally from a “kit” of some kind that is intended for novices. Home brewers only share knowledge and expertise after they have become members and have experienced home brewing themselves, not before. (Lave & Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998; Holmes & Woodhams 2013).

Excerpts 7 and 8 bring forward a dynamic most home brewers do not actively consider; that the experts for a lot of home brewers are professional

brewers. Paul made it clear that professionals are his own experts, with one being someone he personally knows and can consult with. If looked at from within the CoP framework, experts are considered to be the core membership and of the most involved and knowledgeable members within a community (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Having professional brewers hold such positions does not work as a professional brewer is not a home brewer, despite that they can fit the definitions and criteria for membership (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). While the practice is still the same despite the differences discussed earlier, the community is finding itself being shaped and influenced by those who are not considered to be a part of it. As home brewing's most base requirement is the brewing of beer at home, those that do it professionally do not fit this criterion for the most part. This is complicated even more by the circumstance that home brewers have a legal definition attached to their practice as well. This could be giving much larger credit to Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1995) for their work looking at CoPs being part of larger scope CoPs that allow for the overlapping and relation to one another, in this case allowing for home and professional brewers to both belong to the larger Community of Brewers. This could also be representative of a motivation of home brewers intending to become professional brewers. There is literature to support that this could be a way of interpreting movement from periphery to core membership, or possible transfer between communities that share a larger community. (Eckert & McConnel-Ginet, 1995) This can also be seen as an opportunity to explore how those who shape a CoP

are not separated from it. Scholars such as Wenger (2004), Snyder et al. (2003), and Smith et al. (2018) have posited with their approach that outsiders who are not members of the community are in a position to shape CoPs, which directly goes against what Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1995) theorize. I believe it is shown through the work shown in this study that the connection between home and professional brewers is not to be viewed as some separation point between two different groups. This meeting point is indicative of a much larger connection and influence the two have on each other and that these two are part of something much larger. The work shown here is intended as a stronger connection to both CoP theory and its connection to discourse analysis.

Differently, brewers such as Mal are able to negotiate their identity as experts through relation to other such examples. By including other aspects of their identities from outside the home brewing community, individuals can grow and move their identity as home brewers toward core membership and expertise (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Vickers & Deckert, 2013).

3.3 Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Research

As this work shows, the community of home brewers is typical considering CoP framework (Eckert & Wenger, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), but very different in how it is affected by the world around it. CoP theory is still a viable framework but the work of scholars such as Vickers, Holmes and Woodhams, Eckert, and De Fina, has shown that communities are changing and new ways of looking at them must also be brought to the scholarship. It is clear

that identities within a given community are fluid and continuously change through interaction and negotiation (Vickers & Deckert, 2013; Vickers, 2020). Positions can shift closer to, and further from, expertise on a given practice. More studies need to be done on less known and unstudied CoPs to help reaffirm the direction for the theory and field, in light of new literature being focused in ways that deny the core ideas and aspects of CoP theory (Wenger, 2004; Snyder et al. 2003; Smith et al. 2018). Looking at professional brewers and how their views reflect that of the home brew community can be used to better understand why they have such an influence on the community and how the community and practice can benefit from such a comparison. Even going so far as to adopt Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1995)'s theories to approach these connections as community membership to a larger-scale CoP, within which both separate CoPs are contained and reified through their shared practice. Such perspectives and data could also be used to look in the opposite direction at how professional brewers, and the companies they work for, are influenced by the home brewing community, creating a more open passageway for the exchange, and understanding of the communities (McClellan, 2018). Expanding on this research to then include professional brewers and home brewers in looking at the practice of brewing can lead to an expanded framework for looking at CoPs that find their identities being influenced from outside their community (Wenger, 1998). This can even be further expanded on additional factors beyond a shared practice, shifting to the engagement based on the product produced instead of the

practice. In the case of this work, looking at how consumers of beer (home brew or otherwise) position themselves in relation to brewers can lead to a better understand and expansion of MCD theory. This combined with an expanded CoP around brewing can allow for a greater understanding for how those that are explicitly detached from a practice can still influence CoPs they have a connection to through their identities and how membership is categorized in each community.

Exploring one-sided connections, such as how brewers could be expected to be consumers of beer but that consumers of beer are by no means expected to be brewers of beer, can be potentially new areas of expansion for CoP theory and MCD (Murray & O'Neill, 2015). This could also allow for exploration in further categorization within CoPs, as those who do not participate in the practice could still hold positions and membership categories in relation to given communities. This could expand the ideas that define a periphery to better include those who influence and effect CoPs, rather than just those who are learning to participate in a community. Possible participants who remain on the periphery by choice while still actively taking part in the practice of a community could give immense insight and perspective on CoP, whereas they would normally be ignored or inaccessible to CoP study due to their lack of traditional social engagement with the community.

Positioning these communities as connected through a larger CoP framework allows for them to influence each other instead of positioning one as

above another and ignoring the circumstances for all except the CoP being affected. By revisiting and working to expand on theories like CoP, we become able to not only approach new communities in more modern and accessible ways, but also gain new insights and approaches for looking at communities that have been observed and studied before. This revisiting can then be used to further understand how CoPs can affect and influence each other in ways not previously explored.

APPENDIX A
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER



Academic Affairs
Office of Academic Research • Institutional Review Board

December 13, 2016

Mr. Ryan Julius Miller and Prof. Caroline Vickers
Department of English
California State University, San Bernardino
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407

**CSUSB
INSTITUTIONAL
REVIEW BOARD**
Expedited Review
IRB# 16012
Status
APPROVED

Dear Mr. Miller and Prof. Vickers:

Your application to use human subjects, titled "Co-Constructions of Expert-Novice Identities within the Homebrewing Community of Practice" has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Please note a change in your protocol and/or informed consent (no matter how minor the change) requires resubmission of your protocol as amended for review the IRB before you can implement that change. **Your application has been approved for one year from December 13, 2016 through December 12, 2017. One month prior to the approval end date, you need to file for a renewal if you have not completed your research. See additional requirements (Items 1 – 4) of your approval below.**

Your responsibilities as the researcher/investigator reporting to the IRB Committee include the following 4 requirements as mandated by the Code of Federal Regulations 45 CFR 46 listed below. Please note that the protocol change form and renewal form are located on the IRB website under the forms menu. Failure to notify the IRB of the above may result in disciplinary action. You are required to keep copies of the informed consent forms and data for at least three years. Please notify the IRB Research Compliance Officer for any of the following:

- 1) **Submit a protocol change form if any changes (no matter how minor) are proposed in your research protocol for review and approval of the IRB before implemented in your research.**
- 2) **If any unanticipated/adverse events are experienced by subjects during your research,**
- 3) **To apply for renewal and continuing review of your protocol one month prior to the protocols end date.**
- 4) **When your project has ended by emailing the IRB Research Compliance Officer.**

The CSUSB IRB has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval notice does not replace any departmental or additional approvals which may be required.

If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Michael Gillespie, the IRB Compliance Officer. Mr. Michael Gillespie can be reached by phone at (909) 537-7588, by fax at (909) 537-7028, or by email at mgillesp@csusb.edu. Please include your application approval identification number (listed at the top) in all correspondence.

Best of luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Judy Sylva

Judy Sylva, Ph.D., IRB Member
CSUSB Institutional Review Board

JS/MG

909.537.7588 • fax: 909.537.7028 • <http://irb.csusb.edu>

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University - Fullerton • Orange • Placer • Dominguez Hills • Fairleigh • Fresno • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles Maritime Academy • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

I am asking you to participate in a study that looks at how home brewers interact, discuss, and practice home brewing as a community based around the hobby of home brewing beer. This study will be carried out by Ryan J. Miller, an MA student in English, under the supervision of Professor Caroline Vickers, Professor of English. California State University, San Bernardino. As this research has been approved by the Institutional Review Board of California State University, San Bernardino, the Review Board and my supervisor want me to get your permission before you participate in this study, if that is what you choose to do.

In this study, I will ask you to participate in one or more of the following: Video and audio recording of a home brewing session, an interview with myself that will be audio recorded, and/or an interaction between yourself and other home brewers in conversation with one another. The video recording session will be 90 minutes in length. The interview session will be around 30 minutes in length. The group conversation recording session will be no longer than 60 minutes in length. The interview will consist of questions related to yourself as a home brewer and how/if you interact with other home brewers both during and outside of the actual brewing.

The benefits to participating in this study may include becoming aware of how you behave and interact with others while brewing, how you discuss and view home brewing, discussing home brewing with other home brewers. Risks are minimal but could include some discomfort at being video recorded during your brewing process and/or being audio recorded while you are being interviewed or participating in a group discussion. The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding about home brewers as practitioners of home brewing and how they come together as a community based around that practice, as well as how they interact with one another. If you are uncomfortable, you may choose not to participate in any portion of the study at any time without any negative consequence to you.

Your participation is completely voluntary. If you feel uncomfortable at any time, you can ask for me to stop the audio-recorder, and I will. You may freely choose to only participate in a portion of the recordings as well as skip any questions you do not wish to answer. If you decide that you do not want one or any recording to be used, it will be immediately destroyed, no questions asked. I will not use any data that you do not feel comfortable with me using. You should also feel free to ask any questions you may have about this study at any time during your participation.

If you choose to participate, I will take out any information in the audio-recording that could identify you. Names will be replaced by a pseudonym, which is a fake name, and will not be revealed. The audio-recording will be stored on a password protected computer, and will be promptly and permanently erased from the recording device. I will use the recordings and transcripts of the recordings to look at the way you present yourself as a member of the community and how you talk about and interact with other home brewers while practicing/discussing home brewing. I intend to use this data for my thesis work in my MA degree, as well as possible publication and submission for conferences in the future.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to ask now or to contact Caroline Vickers at cvickers@csusb.edu or 909-537-5824.

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

Signature of Participant: _____ Today's Date: _____

As part of this study, I will be collecting audio and video recordings of you during your participation. By initialing all or any of the spaces below, you will tell me what uses of the recording(s) you consent to. You are free to initial any or all of the spaces you are comfortable with, and will in no way effect your ability to participate in this study. I will only use the recordings in ways that you agree to and are comfortable with. When these recordings are used, your name will not be made public. If you choose to not initial any of the spaces below, the recordings will be destroyed.

Please indicate the type of informed consent you wish by initialing below:

(AS APPLICABLE)

- The video/audio-recording can be studied by the researcher for the researcher's Master's Thesis.
Please initial _____
- The video/audio-recording can be shown/played in classrooms for students.
Please initial _____
- The video/audio-recording can be shown/played for scientific publications.
Please initial _____
- The video/audio-recording can be shown/played at meetings with scientists.
Please initial _____
- The video/audio-recording can be shown/played in public presentations to non-scientists.
Please initial _____

I have read the description above and give my permission for the use of the audio/video recording(s) as indicated above.

Signature of Participant: _____ Today's Date: _____

APPENDIX C
TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

Meaning	Symbol	Example
Speaker attribution	A;	A; so...
Pause, untimed (0.2 seconds or less)	...	Wait...what
Hold/micropause i never
Appeal	?.	F; right?.
unintelligible	###	
uncertain	#word	#dont #lie
Laughter	@	
Laughing word	@word	@i @dont @even
Overlap	[]	B; how would [you say] C; [well you]
Truncated/cut-off word	-	nev-
Inhale	(H)	
Exhale	(Hx)	
Lag/prosodic lengthening	:	re:::ally
Vocalism	(COUGH)	
Click	(TSK)	
Voice of another/Vox	<VOX> </VOX>	<VOX> no way </VOX>
Manner/Quality	<MISC> </MISC>	<FAST> give it </FAST>
Time in seconds in recording	<T=0:00:00>	<T=0:45:17> M; so

Transcription Conventions (Du Bois, 2006).

REFERENCES

- Adams, E.C. (2018). How to become a beekeeper: Learning and skill in managing honeybees. *Cultural Geographies*, 25(1), 31-47.
- Alonso, A.D., Alexander, N., & O'Brien, S. (2017). 'Every brew is a challenge and every glass of a good beer is an achievement': Home brewing and serious leisure. *Leisure/Loisir*, 42(1), 93-113.
- Alonso, A.D., Alexander, N., & O'Brien, S. (2018). Networking, collaboration, and home brewing: An exploratory study. *Society and Leisure*, 41(1), 130-153.
- Bilmes, J. (2011). Occasioned Semantics: A Systematic Approach to Meaning in Talk. *Human Studies*, 34(2), 129-153.
- Briggs, C. L. (1986). Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J.S., Collins, A., & Duguid P. (1989) Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.
- Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 398.
- Cal. Business and Professions Code §23356.2 (2016)
- Davies, B. (2005). Communities of practice: Legitimacy not choice. *Journal Of Sociolinguistics*, 9(4), 557-581.
- De Fina, A. (2006). Group Identity, narrative and self-representations. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, & M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and Identity*. (pp. 351-375).

- De Fina, A. (2007). Code-switching and the construction of ethnic identity in a community of practice. *Language in Society*, 36(3), 371-392.
- Du Bois, J.W. (2006) Transcription conventions. Retrieved from:
<http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/projects/transcription/A05updates.pdf>
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review Of Anthropology*, 21(1), 461-490.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1995). Constructing meaning, constructing selves: Snapshots of language, gender, and class from belten high. In K. Hall and M. Bucholtz (Eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*. (pp. 469-507). London and New York: Routledge.
- Eckert, P., & Wenger, É. (2005). Communities of practice in sociolinguistics. *Journal Of Sociolinguistics*, 9(4), 582-589
- Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339-361.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(10), 1489-1522.
- Goodwin, C. (2007). Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 53-73.

- Grasseni, C. (2010a). Introduction: Skilled visions: Between apprenticeship and standards. In C. Grasseni (Ed.), *Skilled visions: Between apprenticeship and standards* (1st ed., pp. 1-20). Berghahn Books.
- Holmes, J., & Woodhams, J. (2013). Building interaction: The role of talk in joining a community of practice. *Discourse & Communication*, 7(3), 275-298.
- Hymes, D. H. (1974). Foundations in sociolinguistics; an ethnographic approach. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jacoby, S., & Gonzales, P. (1991). The Constitution of Expert-Novice in Scientific Discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 149-81.
- Jacoby, S., & Ochs, E. (1995). Co-Construction: An Introduction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28(3), 171-183.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY. Cambridge University Press.
- Marlatt, R. (2019). Capitalizing on the craze of fortnite: Toward a conceptual framework for understanding how gamers construct communities of practice. *Journal of Education*, 200(1), 3-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057419864531>
- McClellan, E. (2018). Communities of practice that contribute to undergraduate identity construction: A case study. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 17(3), 30-56. doi:10.22176/act17.3.30
- Merriam, S. B., Courtenay, B., & Baumgartner, L. (2003). On becoming a witch: Learning in a marginalized community of practice. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 53(3), 170-188. doi:10.1177/0741713603251213

- Murray, D.W. & O'Neill, M.A. (2015). Home brewing and serious leisure: Exploring the motivation to engage and the resultant satisfaction derived through participation. *World Leisure Journal*, 57(4), 284-296.
- Paechter, C. (2003). Masculinities and femininities as communities of practice. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26(1), 60-77.
- Psathas, G. (1999). Studying the organization in action: Membership categorization and interaction analysis. *Human Studies*. 22(2-4), 139-162.
- Roca-Cuberes, C. (2008). Membership categorization and professional insanity ascription. *Discourse Studies*, 10(4), 543-570.
- Sacks, H. (1986). On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. (pp. 325-345). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language Studies*, 39(3), 462-482.
- Schiffrin, D. (1996). Narrative as self-portrait: Sociolinguistic constructions of identity. *Language in Society*, 25(2), 167-203.
- Schiffrin, D. (2006). From linguistic reference to social reality. In de Fina, Anna, Schiffrin, Deborah and Bamburg, Michael (Eds.), *Discourse and identity* (pp. 103-131). Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, S., Kempster, S., & Wenger-Trayner, E., (2018). Developing a program community of practice for leadership development. *Journal of Management Education*, 43(1), 62-88.

- Snyder, W., Wenger, E. & De Sousa Briggs, X., (2003). Communities of Practice in Government: Leveraging Knowledge for Performance. *The Public Manager.*, 32(4), 17–21.
- Vickers, C. H. (2008). Expertise, language competencies and the L2 user. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(3), 237-255.
- Vickers, C. H. (2009). Language competence and the construction of expert-novice in NS-NNS interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(1), 116-138.
- Vickers, C. H., & Deckert, S. K. (2013). Sewing empowerment: Examining multiple identity shifts as a mexican immigrant woman develops expertise in a sewing cooperative community of practice. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 12(2), 116-135.
- Vickers, C. H. (2020). Occasioned membership categorization in a transnational medical consultation: Interaction, marginalization, and health disparities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 24(5), 574-592.
- Watson, D. R., (1978), Categorization, authorization, and blame – Negotiation in conversation. *Sociology*, 12(1), 105-113.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (2004). Knowledge management as a doughnut: Shaping your knowledge strategy through communities of practice. *Ivey Business Journal*, 68(3), 1–8.