Academic Discourse Socialization of Graduate PhD Students

Abbas Hadizadeh

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
July 2020
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

<div style="text-align:right">

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Director

</div>

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English Language Teaching.

<div style="text-align:right">

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev
Chair, Department of Foreign Language
Education

</div>

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English Language Teaching.

<div style="text-align:right">

Prof. Dr. Gülşen Musayeva Vefalı
Supervisor

</div>

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu

2. Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek

3. Prof. Dr. Gülşen Musayeva Vefalı

4. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev

5. Asst. Prof. Dr. Elmaziye Özgür Küfi

ABSTRACT

The present study explored the graduate students' socialization through and to the oral academic discourse in the Department of Foreign Language Education (former ELT Department) in Northern Cyprus. Through an ethnographic design (comprising micro- and macro-perspectives) it provided attested discourse evidence and interview insights to the socialization experiences of the culturally and linguistically diverse candidates in the space of a graduate classroom, as well as across various spaces in the academic context. The results indicated that the students' participation in the whole-class academic discussions as well as outside the classroom discursive activities and practices was conducive to their gradual socialization to and through the oral academic discourse. Specifically, the students accrued epistemic stance, employed intertextuality, and constructed intersecting identities in that they enacted various discourse and situated identities as well as transported unique personal, academic and professional identities. The findings revealed that the socialization experiences of the PhD students were challenging, however rewarding in that they learnt to cope with their advanced academic studies through exercising their agency and were constructing academic identity as a form of competence in the graduate community.

Keywords: oral academic discourse, participation, whole-class discussion, socialization, identity, novice/expert, intertextuality, stance, agency.

ÖZ

Bu çalışma Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta eğitim dili İngilizce olan üniversitelerin birinde Yabancı Dil Eğitimi (eski adıyla İngilizce Dil Eğitimi) bölümünde okuyan doktora öğrencilerinin sözlü akademik söylemi hem amaç hem de araç olarak kullandığı sosyalleşme süreçlerini araştırmıştır. Çalışmada etnokrafik tasarım yönteminin kullanılması akademik söylemin içerdiği çeşitli alanların yanı sıra, lisansüstü sınıfındaki farklı kültür ve anadillere sahip doktora öğrencilerinin sosyalleşme deneyimlerine ilişkin bulgu ve içsel görüşlerin enine boyuna araştırılıp, detaylı bir şekilde incelenmesine olanak tanımıştır. Çalışma bulguları doktora öğrencilerinin sınıf içinde yürütülen akademik tartışmaların yanı sıra sınıf dışında söylemsel etkinlik ve uygulamalara katılımlarının onların sözlü akademik paylaşımlarını kademeli olarak artırdığını ve sosyalleşmelerine yardımcı olduğunu göstermiştir. Çalışma sonuçları özellikle öğrencilerin kaynakları referans olarak kullanarak çeşitli söylemler ve içinde bulundukları ortama uygun paylaşımlar yaptıklarını, epistemik duruş sergilediklerini ve kendilerine özgü akademik ve profesyonel kişiliklerini geliştirerek kesişen kimlikler oluşturduklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bulgular ayrıca doktora öğrencilerinin sosyalleşme deneyimlerinin onlara oluşturdukları akademik kimlikler aracılığı ile akademik çalışmalarıyla başa çıkmayı öğrettiğini ve onları yetkin kıldıldığını göstermiştir. Bu bağlamda bu çalışma bulgularının doktora öğrencilerinin zorlayıcı bulduğu akademik sosyalleşme süreçlerinin aslında onlar için öğretici deneyimler olduğunu ortaya çıkardığını söylemek mümkündür.

Anahtar kelimeler: sözlü akademik söylem, katılım, tüm sınıf tartışması, sosyalleşme, kimlik, yeni/tecrübeli, metinlerarasılık, duruş

DEDICATION

To my wife

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The world is getting smaller as a result of globalization precipitated by the World Wide Web. Importantly, over the past decades, the global spread of the English language has been one of the unprecedented sociocultural developments (Crystal, 2004). English has been spreading its net all over the world and, for the better or worse, it prevails almost everywhere. Consequently, English has played a significant role in the economy and advancement of trade, businesses and especially education in countries around the world. A huge amount of financial and economic capital has been allocated to teaching English in educational institutions, schools, colleges and universities in the world. Migration to other countries in pursuit of better educational careers and programs has been on the rise especially at graduate level. For example, during the 1989-1990 academic year, approximately 386,000 international students registered in US only, while in the 2018-2019 academic year, this number reached 1,095,299 (Open Doors, 2020). International universities in other countries have also attracted a large number of students. However, the research to date shows that new students experience considerable challenges and difficulties in their socialization to new academic cultures and settings (e.g., Morita, 2000, 2002, 2004; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a, 2007b).

Graduate students become apprenticed, to use Rogoff's (1990) metaphor, into oral academic discourse through engagement and participation in ongoing interaction and

negotiation with instructors, classmates, and other students as they study, observe, perform, and complete various activities in the academia such as routine discussions, oral presentations, portfolio writing, projects, and essays inside and outside the classroom. The dynamic atmosphere of the graduate studies, constant interaction with others in the academic setting, as well as challenging workload and requirements can put tremendous pressure on graduate students. These aspects of advanced studies shape graduate candidates' academic discourse through their socialization into the academic context. They socialize to use the academic English language and through the use of academic English language (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b) to the culture, norms, expectations, and values of their new academic community.

In recent years, the field of second language education has witnessed increasing attention to academic needs of multilingual graduate student population, not only due to their rising numbers in doctoral programs but also due to understanding that the multiplicity of academic texts and plurality of academic practices of ethnolinguistically diverse newcomers in disciplinary discourses and communities can be an asset (Hyland, 2000; Prior, 1995, Seloni, 2012) for graduate course instructors (CIs), course designers, materials developers and other stakeholders. In this regard, researchers have called for socioculturally and sociohistorically situated studies in applied linguistics (e.g. Duff, 2003, 2007b, 2010, 2019; Ho, 2011; Morita, 2000, 2004), especially socialization to academic settings.

Language socialization pertains to the process in which a language learner, either a child or an adult, acquires the communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) of a target language and its functions. It is a relatively new area in applied linguistics (e.g., Duff 2003, 2019) which dates back to the early 1990s. Graduate students experience

enormous difficulties while socializing into the culture of their academic setting (Morita, 2000, 2002, 2004) in that they need to engage in intensive and extensive advanced studies resorting to multiple and diverse sources to become competent members of academia. Graduate candidates are thus exposed to different academic discourses and genres which they need to acquire through socialization to their surrounding settings. Hence, socialization is regarded as a complex process through which newcomers become legitimate and competent members of their culture (Duff, 2010) after years of cognitive and social experience through constant engagement in different tasks and activities, and through negotiation and interaction with their instructors and peers.

The pertinent studies on academic discourse socialization have mostly adopted an ethnographic approach in their research design and have investigated the process rather than the product of language acquisition and learning (e.g. Morita, 2002) since language is a sociocultural system which "constructs and is constructed by a wide variety of social … relationship" (Norton & Toohey, 2002, p. 209) and controlling contextual factors is not an easy process (Pennycook, 2001). This thesis also adopts a process approach to the investigation of academic discourse socialization of graduate candidates in an international context in the Northern Cyprus.

It is noteworthy that the studies on academic discourse socialization have focused mostly on discourse socialization of writing practice (e.g., Belcher & Braine, 1995; Bronson, 2004; Casanave, 1995, 2002; Okuda & Anderson, 2018; Seloni, 2012; Seror, 2009; Zappa-Hollman, 2007b) by investigating a number of related variables such as feedback effects on writing quality (e.g., Hyland & Hyland, 2006); citation, textual borrowing and plagiarism (e.g., Flowerdew & Li, 2007); and metadiscourse (Hyland, 2004). However, only few studies have explored the oral academic discourse

3

socialization mostly focusing on oral presentations and small group discussions in ESL contexts (e.g., Duff, 2007a, 2010; Duff & Kobayashi, 2010; Ho, 2011; Kobayashi, 2003, 2006; Morita, 2000, 2004; Wang, 2009; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Over the past decades, there has been an increasing interest in language socialization studies in second language contexts (e.g., Duff, 2002; Ho, 2011; Morita, 2000, 2002, 2004; Seloni, 2012; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a). This has been mostly due to the Social Turn in applied linguistics (Block, 2003) which is a shift from the individual psychological process to the social process in contexts of the target language learning. Accordingly, a range of studies conducted within the perspective of language socialization paradigm (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a) investigated the intrinsic, reciprocal connection between second language learning and its respective sociocultural context (Duff, 1995, 1996, 2002, 2009). The major premise of the socialization paradigm has been that it is through participation in language-mediated socio-cultural activities that novices socialize into the language as well as through the use of the language of a given community (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a).

PhD studies in general and in applied linguistics in particular are advanced, challenging and demanding. PhD students require not only good academic background and academic English proficiency but also sound discipline-specific knowledge. Socialization into the academic cultures, norms, and expectations is not a unidirectional process (Duff, 2010), it puts huge pressure on PhD students, especially international candidates, mostly coming from traditional educational backgrounds and requiring more than the adequate mastery of the academic discourse.

Importantly, the studies conducted in the field of academic discourse socialization contended that it is a complex, conflictual, multifaceted, multilayered, multi-

dimensional, unpredictable, and non-linear process, interestingly, for both native and non-native speakers of English especially in tertiary education (Duff, 2003, 2009, 2010, 2019; Morita, 2000, 2002). Thus, graduate students socialize into academic language and through academic language as they participate in a variety of activities with different people inside and outside the academic setting. They experience an asymmetry of academic knowledge between themselves and others and adopt different identities as they seek and gain membership in academic communities (Morita, 2004).

In academic communities, socialization of graduate students to academic discourse which requires formation, precision, analysis and argument of cognitively difficult concepts (Davies, 2005) has always been challenging, especially for those students from diverse lingua-cultural and educational backgrounds who have not experienced sufficient socialization opportunities to the mainstream academic norms, values and expectations. It should be noted that early studies on academic discourse socialization were mostly limited to surveys and concerned not with the experiences rather with the end product of language socialization such as oral communication skills or perceptions (Ferris & Tagg, 1996a, 1996b; Weidman & Stein, 2003). Also, the research to date on process-oriented oral academic discourse socialization, especially at the graduate level, is still scarce although oral academic skills play a significant role in graduate students' socialization to their academic community.

Therefore, we addressed this gap in our study by exploring the socialization experiences of PhD graduate candidates (GCs hereafter) at one of the English-medium international universities in North Cyprus. This research focused on oral academic discourse socialization through whole-class discussions in that these discussions were perceived as the most challenging activity (Ferris, 1998) and the major cause of apprehension (Kim, 2006) at the graduate level in ESL contexts. It should also be

noted that within the outer circle countries (Kachru, 1985), oral academic discourse socialization has been less examined and most of the studies in this area have been conducted in the North American context (Duff, 2019). The research on graduate students' socialization to oral academic discourse has also noted that it is "a complex cognitive and sociolinguistic experience" (Morita, 2000, p. 282) "due to the complexity of institutional conventions, practices, and requirements" (Ho, 2011, p. 439). Although individuals may experience the socialization process differently, the research to date has noted the challenging nature of the academic discourse socialization for graduate students (Duff, 2019; Duff, Zappa-Hollman & Surtees, 2019).

1.3 Purpose of the Study

Recently, universities in Northern Cyprus have attracted a total of 102,000 students from various countries (Daily Sabah, 2019). The present study aimed to investigate the process of oral academic discourse socialization of a cohort of ELT PhD students at Eastern Mediterranean University on the island where English is the main medium of instruction at the tertiary level. A large number of students choose international universities such as EMU as their academic study destination for a variety of reasons. Eastern Mediterranean University is an international university which is a member of the community of Mediterranean Universities and the European University Association. It also possesses highly developed infrastructure, facilities, academic staff from around 35 countries and more than 17,000 students from 110 different nationalities (Eastern Mediterranean University [EMU], 2020). English is predominantly the medium of instruction and interaction in the university; students use English for a variety of academic, administrative, social and other purposes.

The study was designed as an ethnographic study involving a macro- and micro-perspective on the socialization phenomena. The research therefore examined from the micro-perspective the "attested"-oral academic discourse data collected from a graduate classroom and from the macro-perspective the interview data on the students' socialization experiences in the graduate context, specifically related to interaction with peers and professors and engagement in other discursive activities and practices of their community. The study thus adopted a novel approach towards exploring the discourse socialization process through analysis of the attested whole-class oral academic discussions of the cohort from a variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds as well as their insights to the socialization experiences in the graduate community.

It should be noted that academic discourse socialization process "is a potentially complex, conflictual, and transformative process, involving not only the acquisition of new academic knowledge and skills but also the negotiation of competence, identities, cultures, and power" (Morita, 2002, p. 6). Therefore, the study addresses the following research question:

How do the graduate candidates socialize to and through the oral academic discourse in the context of the study?

    a. micro-perspective (identity work, stance display, agency manifestation)

    b. macro-perspective (identity work, stance display, agency manifestation)

1.4 Significance of the Study

Investigation of the socialization process can shed light on the complexity of academic discourse socialization as well as into how graduate candidates acquire academic English and discipline-specific knowledge in order to become a proficient and legitimate member of their community (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Morita, 2000).

Therefore, exploration of this process can help new graduate candidates to become aware of challenges ahead in their PhD journey and can enable them to adjust and adapt better to their new academic communities. Bearing this in mind, the current research intended to contribute to the still under-researched area of the oral academic English discourse socialization especially in a non-western setting. Graduate program managers and instructors need to better understand the complexity of graduate candidates' socialization experiences in order to help them cope with related challenges and difficulties and become legitimate members of their respective graduate communities. Therefore, the exploration of academic discourse socialization of graduate students in a non-western context can empower all those concerned in the context of the study as well as across similar contexts.

At the theoretical level, this study made a contribution to the "deconstruction of well-bounded discursive events" (Duff, 1995, p. 513) in the graduate classroom by providing various insights to socialization practices and experiences which will allow comparison across diverse graduate contexts. The study also offered methodological implications for the multicultural and multilingual settings where English is a language of instruction and interaction. Importantly, it contributed novel attested and perceptual data on academic discourse socialization to the pertinent research.

1.5 Operational Definitions

1.5.1 Academic Discourse

Hyland (2009) defined academic discourse as the ways of thinking and using language and the prevalent discourse in the community of academia which distinguishes one discipline from another. Duff (2010) also defined academic discourse or academic language or literacies as "forms of oral and written language and communication - genres, registers, graphics, linguistic structures, interactional

patterns that are privileged, expected, cultivated, conventionalized, or ritualized, and, therefore, usually evaluated by instructors, institutions, editors, and others in educational and professional contexts" (p. 175). Defined critically, academic discourse is:

> A complex representation of knowledge and authority and identity that comprises language(s), ideologies, and other semiotic or symbolic resources, often displayed in texts, but one that has strong social, cultural, institutional, and historical foundations and functions (Leki, 2007). As Fairclough (1989) put it, discourse is text, interaction, and context. (Duff, 2010, p. 175)

1.5.2 Language Socialization

In disciplines such as sociology, cultural psychology, sociolinguistics, anthropology, and other related fields, socialization is traditionally defined as a process whereby children are enculturated into the values, norms, and expectations of their home community which does not include the learning taken place afterwards (Burgess, 1995).

Ochs (1988) and Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a) defined socialization as a lifespan process by which newcomers including both children and adults are apprenticed into the norms of a certain sociocultural community.

Subsequently, Ochs (1993) viewed socialization "as a dynamic interactional process between participants in expert and novice roles who develop cognitively through their activity, thereby changing over interactional time" (p. 1).

1.5.3 Second Language Socialization

Several scholars have argued for a language socialization paradigm in SLA (see Atkinson, 2002; Kramsch, 1987; Rymes, 1997; Watson-Gegeo, 2004; Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003). Duff (2007a) defined it as:

> The process by which novices or newcomers in a community or culture gain communicative competence, membership, and legitimacy in the group. It is a process that is mediated by language and whose goal is the mastery of linguistic conventions, pragmatics, the adoption of appropriate identities, stances (e.g.,

epistemic or empathetic) or ideologies, and other behaviors associated with the target group and its normative practices. (p. 310)

1.5.4 Academic Discourse Socialization

Duff (2010, p. 169) defined it as a dynamic and socially situated process which is multimodal, multilingual, highly intertextual, complex and unpredictable; it refers to a process by which newcomers to an academic community become more competent members when they participate in its oral and written discourse. This process is "characterized by variable amounts of modeling, feedback, and uptake; different levels of investment and agency on the part of learners; by the negotiation of power and identities; and, often, important personal transformations for at least some participants" (p. 169).

The pertinent research literature on language and literacy socialization has employed such terms as academic discourse socialization, academic enculturation/acculturation, and the development of academic literacies to refer to similar processes (Duff, et al., 2019).

1.5.5 Oral Academic Discourse Socialization

Kobayashi (2003, 2005) drew a distinction between oral academic discourse and written academic discourse by arguing that the former is more spontaneous and public than the latter, since the latter is produced mostly in isolation. However, it was noted that the two - oral and written modalities- were not fully distinct, since oral activities such as oral presentations draw on a range of written texts and can be used for academic presentations (Duff, 2010).

Although the research to date has noted intermodal and intertextual relationships between written and oral discourse, socialization to oral discourse in classroom is "more immediate, public, and spontaneous than written discourse socialization" (Duff & Anderson, 2015, p. 342). Moreover, especially nowadays oral communication skills

in academic endeavours have become indispensable for knowledge building and sharing (Duff, 2010).

1.5.6 Ethnographic Studies

Ethnographic research is "the study of people's behavior in naturally occurring, ongoing settings, with a focus on the cultural interpretation of behavior" (Watson-Gegeo, 1988, p. 576). Nunan and Bailey (2009) listed three main features of ethnography such as its longitudinality, its comprehensiveness, its view of people's behavior in terms of culture. Ellis (2012) stated that "it emphasizes the importance of obtaining multiple perspectives by collecting a variety of data (e.g. through participant observation, interviews, assembling relevant documents, and member-checking) and using these to describe and understand common patterns of behavior" (p. 43).

1.5.7 Identity and Agency in Second Language Socialization

In second language studies, following The Social Turn (Block, 2003), the concept of identity was viewed as "a dynamic and shifting nexus of multiple subject positions, or identity options" (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004, p. 35). The socialization research holds that identity is fundamentally implicated through socializing interactions (Duff & Talmy, 2011) and that members of an academic community can develop identities ranging from novices to experts through their engagement in various activities, particularly discussions (Duff & Anderson, 2015). Importantly, members "can engage with one another and thus acknowledge each other as participants" who negotiate their identities in the formation of the given community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998, p. 149).

In an academic community, participants can gradually develop their academic repertoire, hence their membership can translate into "an identity as a form of competence" (Wenger, 1998, p. 153). Also, participants can invoke their respective

identity and enact their agency to either resist or accommodate to the power relations or positionality established within their respective communities of practice (Morita, 2000, 2002, 2004). Thus, identity is not a static or homogeneous construct and participation in various language-related activities of a community through multiple possible social groups or roles at any given time involves identity work (Duff, 2012).

It is noteworthy that the concept of identity has recently overshadowed agency which, interestingly, has been considered as an umbrella term for it. Agency was defined as the "socioculturally mediated capacity to act" (Ahearn, 2001, p. 112) and it was associated with ultimate attainment in second language learning (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001). Recently, agency has assumed a central position in both theory and research on language socialization; in this regard, self-socialization has been considered as "the primary medium and outcome of socialization" as well as "a means by which agency is enacted and oriented" (Duff & Doherty, 2015, p. 68).

At advanced levels of second language proficiency, agency is manifested by "concerted effort, sustained and strategic practice, and opportunity" (Duff, 2012, p. 417). Since learners are regarded as "agents in the formation of competence" (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012, pp. 5–6), agency is viewed as a socially-situated phenomenon which requires one's "ability to make choices, take control, self-regulate, and thereby pursue" individual goals (Duff, 2012, p. 417) and, importantly, it "is constantly co-constructed and renegotiated with those around the individual and with the society at large" (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001, p. 148).

1.5.8 Intertextuality

Over the academic discourse socialization process students, especially at the graduate level, learn about conventions, skills, practices, norms and values of their field of study which involves a fair amount of intertextuality (Duff, 2010; Ho, 2011)

defined as "the incorporation, re-entextualization, juxtapositioning, or indexing of texts …" (Duff & Anderson, 2015, p. 342). By making intertextual connections, students not only appropriate the concepts and issues introduced in their textbooks, but also socialize into their respective discourses and practices (Ho, 2011).

1.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter introduced the background to the study and presented the problem statement. Subsequently, it explained the purpose as well as the significance of the study. Finally, the chapter presented and elaborated on the operational definitions used throughout the thesis.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Language, Thought, and Culture

The concern with language, thought, and culture dates back to the early nineteenth century, to two German philosophers Johann Herder and Wilhelm von Humboldt (Kramsch, 2004). Kramsch (2004) noted that both philosophers questioned the Cartesian Linguistics claim on the universality of languages and contended that language and thought were interrelated. Herder (1744–1803, as cited in Kramsch, 2004) argued that a nation's language determines the way its people think by equating one language with one nation. The scholar believed that individuals in a community speak according to the way they think and think according to the way they speak. Von Humboldt (1762–1835, as cited in Kramsch, 2004) also argued for the relationship between language and worldview or cultural mindset. Subsequently, the American anthropologists, Boas ([1911]1966), Malinowski (1923, 1935), Sapir (1929), and Sapir's follower Whorf pursued the issue on small, indigenous and homogenous cultures and societies. Their idea on the relationship in question came to be known as the linguistic relativity or Sapir-Whorf hypothesis which became influential in the late 1920s. The scholars contended that there was a direct relationship between language and culture and that they were inextricably related to each other.

> Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving

14

specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group. . . .We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation. (Sapir, 1929, p. 207)

Sapir's hypothesis was not flawless and has since been criticized by rationalist scholars and philosophers. In this regard, Kramsch (2004) argued that there was "a certain imprecision as to whether Sapir is talking about linguistic relativity (language *predisposes*, the world is *to a large extent . . .* built up on the language habits of the group), or linguistic determinism (language *powerfully conditions* all our thinking, human beings are *at the mercy* of a particular language)" (p. 237). Therefore, according to Kramsch, two versions of this theory can be identified, specifically whether language determines thought (linguistic determinism) or whether language differences lead to different thought patterns (linguistic relativity).

It is noteworthy that Malinowski (1923, 1935) expressed a different view of the relationship between language and meaning. He maintained that context of culture and context of situation was the most important elements in the interpretation of the meaning of language. In the following years, Malinowski's research influenced such prominent scholars as Firth and Halliday. However, several decades later, Chomsky (1967) introduced his famous innateness hypothesis leading to the prominence and emergence of cognitivism and hence overshadowing socio-cultural issues and concepts. As a result, the linguistic relativity hypothesis has been re-conceptualized, redefined, and modified and a weak version of it has become predominant. However, after the late 1980s linguistic relativity hypothesis has been revisited due to some developments (Kramsch, 2004). One development has been the shift of focus from cognitive to sociocultural dimensions in language learning and acquisition, specifically Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (1978) and Bakhtin's (1981) dialogic

perspective. The other development has been the emergence of new fields in applied linguistics such as cognitive semantics, cross-cultural semantics, cognitive linguistics, discursive psychology, cultural psychology, etc.

In the early 1990s, Lucy (1992) came up with a somewhat different view of linguistic relativity hypothesis; in his linguistic relativity proposal he specified the potential influence of language on thought on three levels: the semiotic or cognitive level, the linguistic or structural level, and the functional or discursive level. These levels are discussed in this chapter with reference to other studies in applied linguistics.

The first level related to how possessing a language or code influences thought. Deacon (1997) argued that this was a quantum leap for human being's cognitive development since all the other species lacked this valuable asset. This is the distinguishing element between human and animal communication, since animals only can access the world through iconic and indexical signs without the mediatory role of symbolic signs of language. Vygotsky's (1934, 1962, 1978) influential sociocultural theory also held that language as a social activity influences thought. He argued that in first language acquisition children internalize what they experience in the social plane in the form of inner speech in their mind which is considered as psychological or intramental plane. Vygotsky (1981) considered human language both as a system of linguistic signs as well as a psychological tool.

Further, Lucy's (1992) second level concerned how speakers of different languages think differently. It should be noted that the proposal has subsequently been revisited on the typological, grammatical as well as the lexical and semantic levels. In this regard, Slobin (2000) classified languages into two categories of satellite and verb languages. He argued that speakers of either language categories build different mental images of physical scenes with verb languages focusing minimally on the manner of

movement. McNeill's (1992) study on the role of hand gestures as windows to the mind, and Kaplan's (1967) contrastive rhetoric patterns support the fact that speakers of different languages think differently.

Furthermore, the third functional level involved how language speakers who have had different schooling and educational experiences have different worldviews. In this regard, Lucy (2000, p. x) argued that "verbal discursive practices affect some aspects of thinking either by modulating structural influences or by directly influencing the interpretation of the interactional context". Extensive research has been carried out in this regard in the recent years in different fields such as language socialization studies, discourse studies and cultural psychology. It is noteworthy that the related studies have mostly taken an ethnographic research approach.

2.2 Language Relativity in Applied Linguistics

Before the emergence of Applied Linguistics in 1950s, contrastive analysis and behavioristic methods of language teaching had emerged out of the combination of structural linguistics and behavioral psychology and the first cognitive revolution in educational psychology was brought about by Bruner, Goodnow, and Austin (1956). Then a year later, Chomsky (1957) formulated his revolutionary linguistic theory of ideal learner by liberating the learner from behavioral conditioning. Kramsch (2004, p. 250) argued that although SLA was concerned with social context of learning and acquisition, "it viewed the social as a stable, pre-existing fixture, existing outside the individual, not constructed by an individual's psychological and linguistic processes". The native speaker was also considered as a benchmark for language acquisition, and culture as one monolithic concept (Kramsch, 2004). However, in the 1990s, consideration of social and cultural aspects became unavoidable. The social turn in SLA revitalized the role of the linguistic relativity principle in applied linguistics.

In this regard, the shift of focus from the cognitive to sociocultural paradigm removed the utter emphasis on the individual and replaced it with more holistic concepts such as affordances, collaborative dialogue, mediated activity, creativity and play in language development, ritual and symbolic interaction, as well as the conceptual and subjective make-up of multilingual speakers and learners. It was noted that the "recent developments focus on the way individual and collective thoughts and sensibilities are co-constructed, shaped, and subverted through language as communicative and representational practice" (Kramsh, 2004, p. 251). In addition, culture, "in an individual, as in society at large", was viewed as "plural, changing, and often conflictual" (p. 252). In light of a mismatch between the needs of language learners' cultures and those perceived by teachers, school administrators, researchers or practitioners and in line with linguistic relativity, teachers of English should show their students how English grammar functions, how its culture is shaped through the language, how to learn or be informed about the culture through reading and writing, and how language is linked to its speakers' or writers' stance and beliefs. However, language teachers should also be aware of the danger of stereotyping and prejudice in introducing the target language and culture. Furthermore, Kramsch (2004) contended that the static concepts such as language, culture and thought are being superseded by more dynamic notions such as speakers, writers, thinkers and members of discourse communities and that language acquisition is not:

> An act of disembodied cognition, but is the situated, spatially and temporally anchored, co-construction of meaning between teachers and learners who each carry with them their own history of experience with language and communication. Culture is not one worldview, shared by all the members of a national speech community; it is multifarious, changing, and, more often than not, conflictual. (p. 255)

2.3 Social Turn in Applied Linguistics

In the middle 1950s, the behavioristic view of language learning as habit formation was replaced with the view of language acquisition as a biologically determined phenomenon; the individual mind became a central issue without the consideration of the context of language use or language acquisition (Chomsky, 1957). Innate capacity, universal feature, native speakerism, and competence were among the core issues; performance was considered an imperfect manifestation of the competence within this framework. In the 1980s, SLA, despite its main underlying social framework, did not pay adequate attention to social context of learning and acquisition (Kramsch, 2004). However, this view could no longer overlook the view of language as a social phenomenon or system.

McCarthy (2001) maintained that the view of language as a social phenomenon or system could not be certainly related to one single school or linguist, although Dell Hymes's influence in applied linguistics cannot be overlooked in this regard. The underlying tenets of language as a social phenomenon are summarized as follows:

- The forms and meanings of language have evolved in social contexts and are constantly changing and evolving in response to social and cultural developments.
- Language itself contributes to construct social and cultural realities and is not neutral in the part it plays in our perception and articulations of our social experience.
- Language is acquired in social contexts; language acquisition is one feature of socialization and acculturation.
- Performance is best observed in real language phenomena such as written texts and conversations.
- Linguistic evidence is external.
- Meaning is only an abstraction from the actual communicative achievements of participants in written and spoken interaction. (McCarthy, 2001, p. 48)

Consequently, Applied Linguistics started paying more attention to the social and cultural aspects of language learning and acquisition. The major goal of Applied Linguistics is solving language related problems (Davies, 2007), it is therefore most

comfortable with the social view of language, however, Applied Linguistics does not deny the importance of mind and individualism in language acquisition and learning (Davies, 2007; McCarthy, 2001). In this regard, Dufon (2008) also argued that both views are essential and suggested that we "view SLA theory more like light, which is both wave and particle. Language acquisition is both social and mental; both are required and both depend on the other" (p. 26).

Thus, over the past decades, the shift of focus in Applied Linguistics has led to the resurfacing of the language relativity principle which nowadays can be seen in different theoretical paradigms such as "recent environmental or ecological theories of SLA", "the return of a phenomenological tradition of inquiry", "language socialization research", "sociolinguistic strands of applied linguistics" and "neo-Whorfian perspectives on bi- and multilingualism" (Kramsch, 2004, p. 251). Consequently, the relationship between individual, thought and culture has become one of the major issues in Applied Linguistics.

2.3.1 Early Sociocultural Theory

Early sociocultural theory was developed by two prominent scholars, Leo Vygotsky and Michael Bakhtin who revolutionized the social sciences in the past century. It is worth mentioning that both scholars emphasized the social, cultural and historical issues in different ways (Morson & Emerson, 1990; Wertsch, 1985), although Bakhtin was viewed as the next prominent scholar after Vygotsky (e.g., Emerson, 1983; Shotter, 1993).

After the Russian Revolution of 1917, Vygotsky conducted extensive research on thought and speech. His work on psychology based on the Marxist principles concentrated on human development, especially the development of the higher mental functions. Vygotsky (1962, 1978) believed that four domains could account for the

human mental processes: phylogenesis or the evolution of human species, sociocultural history or the development in a particular culture, ontogenesis or the development of a human being through his or her lifetime, and microgenesis or development over time through interactions in sociocultural settings. The two latter domains (ontogenesis, microgenesis) have received more attention from the Vygotskian tradition.

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory was greatly influenced by Hegelian "universalist, monologic, mono-logical, developmental (diachronic), activity-based philosophy", while Bakhtin's theory was "a pluralistic, essentially synchronic, dialogic, discourse- and genre-based approach to the social involving the hybridity of co-existing competing and conflicting varieties of logic" (Matusov, 2011, p.100). The research to date noted compatibility of Bakhtin's (1981) approach with Vygotskian theory in many ways, however, they were considered to serve different purposes and had different focuses (Lantolf & Beckett, 2009).

2.3.2 Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory and Neo-Vygotskyan Research

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning was a shift from a Pavlov-based conditioning view of psychology (focusing on reflexes and reactions) to a cultural-historical theory emphasizing language, social interaction, and culture (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2003). The scholar held that nurture plus nature can explain the complex nature of language acquisition and learning. Vygotsky's ideas were regarded as challenging but always stimulating and informative; the main idea being that "higher forms of human mental activity are always, and everywhere, mediated by symbolic means" (Lantolf, 1994, p. 418). Further, Vygotsky (1962, 1978) believed that human beings relate the outside world to their thoughts through mediation.

This mediation can take either the form of concrete or abstract objects, in case of the former it can be the physical objects in our surrounding, and in case of the latter, language can be considered as an abstract object. Furthermore, mediation, whether physical or symbolic, can act as an auxiliary device linking humans to the world of objects or to the world of mental behavior. Therefore, considering both the social and individual planes, human action is another important component of this theory which is mediated by semiotic tools and signs. Vygotsky contended that symbolic tools such as language help human beings to take control of their mental processes such as planning, problem-solving, evaluation and others (Wertsch, 1991).

It is noteworthy that the Vygotsky's theory is regarded as a cultural-historical theory which emphasizes the social aspects of learning while acknowledging the individual aspect as well. From the sociocultural perspective, the word *social* takes on unique characteristics (McGlonn-Nelson, 2005). According to the proponents of the Vygotsky's theory, people navigate in the world through interaction with the surrounding milieu. Renshaw (1992) pointed out that in the sociocultural perspective "learning is a process of appropriating tools for thinking that are made available by social agents who initially act as interpreters and guides in the individual's cultural apprenticeship" (p. 2). Vygotsky (1993) viewed everything that happened between interlocutors as social and held that "Culture is the product of man's social life and his public activity" (p. 15).

Further, Vygotsky (1978) believed that in addition to the biological instinct, there were other forces inside human beings. He maintained that cognition could not account for the complex nature of learning, therefore, he spent most of his life searching for an explanation of learning processes and development, and introduced the construct of the zone of proximal development (ZPD). The construct was defined by Vygotsky

(1978) as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem-solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). However, the Vygotsky's research was not limited to ZPD or activity, and the scholar extensively worked on inner speech, private speech, and children playing games. He believed that human beings are never alone because there is constant developmental relationship between their social and inner speech. When a child plays games and talks to himself or herself, this is an indication of this relationship between the inside and outside world (Lantolf, 1994).

Vygotsky's followers, Lantolf and Thorne (2007) summarized the basic tenets of the sociocultural theory as follows:

a. the development of humans as a species,

b. the role of language as a mediator of human mental functioning,

c. human interaction as the determining factor for language learning,

d. the importance of psychological process of internalization, appropriation, and imitation,

e. learning as a socioculturally and sociohistorically situated cognitive phenomenon,

f. language and learning as dialogical or dialectical processes.

It should be noted that currently such terms as cooperative learning, scaffolding and guided learning have been used synonymously in the literature and have become buzzwords in the English language teaching field around the world. However, Lantolf (2000) argued that the view of ZPD as interactions between the novice and the expert is limiting and instead he introduced the concept of "collaborative construction of opportunities for individuals to develop their mental abilities" (p. 17). Kramsch (2004) also pointed to this shift of focus since the inception of the sociocultural theory and

listed a number of related terms pouring into the Applied Linguistics field such as affordances, collaborative dialogue, mediated activity, creativity and play in language development, ritual and symbolic interaction, the conceptual and subjective make-up of multilingual speakers and learners. In this regard, she cogently stated that "recent developments focus on the way individual and collective thoughts and sensibilities are co-constructed, shaped, and subverted through language as communicative and representational practice" (p. 251).

2.3.3 Socialization and Language Socialization

The afore-mentioned shift of focus in Applied Linguistics from the cognitive to the social aspect of language learning and acquisition and the resultant emergence of related terms such as affordances, collaborative dialogue, mediated activity, creativity, subjectivity, cooperative learning, scaffolding, and guided learning (see Kramsch, 2004) necessitated investigation of the individual within his or her sociocultural setting. Emergence of the socialization theory as a byproduct of this shift has placed a great emphasis on the sociocultural, sociohistorical and sociolinguistic aspects of language learning and acquisition. Socialization is one of the most influential sociocultural theories of the modern day (DuFon, 2008) which views language as the most important aspect in the socialization of newcomers into new settings or environments (Duff, 1995, 1996; Ochs, 1988; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a). Ochs (1988) and Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a) defined socialization as a lifelong process by which newcomers, children or adults, are apprenticed into the norms, values, and expectations of a certain sociocultural group. Thus, Burgess (1995) pointed out that in humanistic disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, and other related fields, socialization refers to the process through which children become enculturated into the norms, values, expectations, and beliefs of their home and

community culture rather than to the learning that happens later in their lives. Moreover, Lantolf and Thorne (2007, p. 3) maintained that socialization aims "to understand the relationship between human mental functioning, on the one hand, and cultural, historical, and institutional setting, on the other".

Importantly, Language Socialization (LS) theory is an interactionist theory that considers social interaction crucial to language learning and acquisition, thus, interaction is "the fundamental aspect of language learning (Allwright, 1984) and "the crucible in which acquisition is forged" (Ellis, 2012, p. 237). According to the LS theory, the relationship between language and socialization is a two-fold process: socialization to use language and socialization through the use of language (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b). Socialization to use language is teaching learners directly or indirectly (DuFon, 1994) what to say in a specific situation or context, for example, when a mother or caregiver asks her child to say "thank you" in response to a favor done by an older person. In foreign language contexts, this is always done by teachers through socializing students to use language by telling them how to say a certain thing in the target language. Socialization through the use of language, as DuFon (2008) maintained, is the process through which learners acquire a set of beliefs, knowledge of the culture, a role as a native speaker or nonnative speaker of the language, a new identity, new status and right, a worldview, and attitude as they learn the language.

Duff (2007b, p. 310) defined language socialization as "the process by which novices or newcomers in a community or culture gain communicative competence, membership, and legitimacy in the group". It is rooted primarily in linguistic anthropology; however, it also borrows from other discipline such as sociology, cultural psychology, sociolinguistics, and even to a lesser extent from education. It is

worth noting that language socialization theory puts the emphasis on language use in social interaction and the language learner is considered and perceived more holistically (Watson-Gegeo, 1988; Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003). Accordingly, a number of factors such as the learner's social, emotional, mental and spiritual aspects as well as their sociocultural, political, economic and educational context and setting have to be taken into consideration (DuFon, 2008; Johnson, 2006; Watson-Gegeo, 2004).

Furthermore, language socialization is inherently a developmental process. The most important element of the language socialization research is investigation of interaction or language use between experts and novices in naturalistic interactive settings and environments (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b). The LS research has explored language acquisition or learning over a certain period of time by linking the microanalyses of language use to macro-level analyses of its culture. In this regard, DuFon (2008) pointed out that SLA theories have been questioned and the need for a theory that takes into account the holistic nature of language learning and acquisition and all aspects of our "human beingness and our interconnectedness" (p. 26) is strongly felt. Therefore, LS theory that takes multiple, diverse, complex aspects of language learning into consideration and is an ideal theory. Duff (2007b) summarized some of the key tenets of language socialization as follows:

a. contextualization of social interaction,

b. the importance of expert and more proficient member as well as less proficient
   and novice members,

c. language as a meditational tool,

d. language learning and socialization as a lifelong process,

e. second language socialization does not necessarily lead to enculturation and

assimilation into the second language culture and language.

Duff also noted that "Language socialization is a process marked by peaks and valleys, progression and regression, times of learning and forgetting, of belonging and not belonging, of speaking and being silent, and all the tensions, confusion, and points in between" (2003, p. 333).

The Language Socialization theory has received an enormous amount of attention in applied linguistics since its inception (Belcher & Braine, 1995; Duff, 2007b, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2019; Duff & Kobayashi, 2010; Ho, 2011; Kobayashi, 2003, 2006; Morita; 2000, 2002, 2004; Norton Peirce, 1995; Prior, 1995; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a). Within the socialization paradigm, language learning is not just considered an individual psychological process but rather a socially oriented process (DuFon, 2008). It is worth noting that language socialization has explored how children acquire interactional routines or speech acts of their L1 through interaction and socialization. Thus, the related research to date has mostly focused on L1 language acquisition and learning, whereas, second language socialization research is a relatively new field in Applied Linguistics studies (Duff, 2003, 2007b, 2010) which shares many of the L1 socialization principles and objectives.

The area of second language socialization (SLS) research dates back to the 1990s (Duff, 2003, 2007b), and it addresses second language acquisition of individuals who already have an available L1 linguistic, discursive, cultural and historical repertoire (Duff, 2007b). Moreover, they may come to the second language context with varying expectations and needs, and may approach people in the context differently, with different motivational and affective tendencies. They may not also experience the same degrees of access, acceptance, or accommodation within the new discourse communities as their L1 counterparts do (DuFon, 2008).

2.4 Academic Discourse

Academic discourse was defined as the prevalent ways of thinking and using language which exist in the academy and distinguishes disciplines of study from one another (Hyland, 2009). Duff (2010, p. 170) defined academic discourse as "not just an entity but a social, cognitive, and rhetorical process and an accomplishment, a form of enculturation, social practice, positioning, representation, and stance-taking" and importantly, "identity work and the negotiation of institutional and disciplinary ideologies and epistemologies". It is also "a site of internal and interpersonal struggle for many people" requiring "considerable emotional investment and power dynamics" (Duff, 2010, p. 170). Thus, academic discourse is a complicated process that needs to be investigated to facilitate the socialization experiences of newcomers to the academia.

For successful completion of advanced academic studies in every university around the world, certain requirements such as attending conferences, presenting articles, and oral academic interaction in various contexts must usually be met (Ferris & Tagg, 1996a, 1996b; Ferris, 1998). Importantly, classroom discussions, conversations, dialogues provide the necessary ground for academic learning and acquisition of discipline-specific discourses. However, this process cannot take place unless it is combined with extensive in-depth readings, critical reflection in and on the action, and a good understanding of the classroom culture and norms (Morita, 2000, 2002).

2.4.1 Academic Discourse Socialization

It is noteworthy that unlike first language socialization, second language socialization often takes place in multilingual contexts where participants, especially adults, already possess cognitive maturity as well as cultural, linguistic, and discursive

repertoires of their first language (Duff, 2010). Importantly, second language socialization emphasizes the multi-directionality of the related process, between and among novice(s) and expert(s), and socially, temporally, and spatially contingent nature of the process (Duff & Anderson, 2015). On the other hand, second language academic discourse socialization is one sub-focus of second language socialization and students in the academia are often socialized into and through the academic discourse of their context (Duff, 2010).

It is noteworthy that academic discourse socialization is still a new and under-researched area (Duff, 2010) and has mostly concentrated on socialization into the writing practices (e.g., Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Belcher & Braine, 1995; Casanave, 1995, 2002; Prior, 1995, 1998; Spack, 1997). Although the research to date has noted intermodal and intertextual relationships between written and oral discourse, socialization to oral discourse in classroom is "more immediate, public, and spontaneous than written discourse socialization" (Duff & Anderson, 2015, p. 342). Moreover, especially nowadays due to the heavy emphasis on the amount and quality of collaboration and communication in various vocational and academic fields, oral communication skills in academic endeavors have become indispensable for knowledge building and sharing (Duff, 2010). Also, engaging in oral academic activities such as oral presentation and discussions as a common activity in academia requires great amount of observation and practice and can pose difficulties and challenges for students who come from different sociocultural and sociolinguistic backgrounds (Duff, 2009). The studies carried out in the English speaking countries have also emphasized the important role and the demanding nature of oral academic discourse for both native and non-native speakers in university classrooms across different disciplines (Ferris, 1998; Ferris & Tagg, 1996a, 1996b; Morita, 2000).

Over the past decades, extensive research has been carried out in Applied Linguistics on academic discourse socialization within a number of different theoretical paradigms and perspectives, especially at graduate and postgraduate levels (e.g., Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Hyland, 2004; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Pecorari, 2008; Shi, 2004, 2010). The research to date has focused on a variety of issues such as gender, communication strategies, institutional constraints, voice, identity, agency as well as other linguistic aspects of language (Duff, 2007b; Ho, 2011; Morita, 2004). Over the academic discourse socialization process, especially graduate candidates can learn about conventions, skills, practices, norms and values of their field of study (Duff, 2010; Duff & Anderson, 2015). Socialization to academic discourse takes place in its respective community of practice, whereby learning does not turn into internalization of knowledge, rather becomes "an integral and inseparable aspect of social practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 31). It is through participation in the practices of a given community that new members take an inbound trajectory to move steadily from the periphery towards full participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). The research to date has used participation in communities of practice interchangeably with academic discourse socialization (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Importantly, it is through discourse that participants may be positioned by themselves or others in such a way that their (potential) expertise is established /constructed, validated, or undermined (Duff, 2007b).

In the early 1990s, Mohan and Marshall Smith (1992) carried out a study on a group of Chinese students with limited English proficiency. The findings of the study showed that even in such a context students developed sociocultural and linguistic knowledge in carefully organized classroom activities and tasks through the help of the teacher as an expert user of language. In the mid-1990s, Bell's (1995) study, though

not informed by the socialization theory, followed its line of thought. In the study, the teacher put a lot of emphasis on form focus, observation and imitation. This was not compatible with Bell's (the subject and the researcher) views and beliefs of language learning which led to a kind of tension between her and her Chinese teacher. As a result, Bell did not progress to the extent she wanted. She believed that language and culture could not be separated and should be taught in an integrated way. Within the same decade, Duff (1995, 1996) investigated second language socialization at the secondary schools in post-communist Hungary after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. She examined the socialization to discourse competence between two different instructional settings, the traditional Hungarian assessment method called felele´s where only Hungarian was the medium of instruction, and the non-traditional one where both Hungarian and English were used as media of instruction, although more emphasis was on English. Specifically, Duff explored the impact of the educational reforms on school life and on how students were introduced to academic discourse practices through different tasks and activities in the two aforementioned contexts. The study was of an ethnographic type which used interviews, questionnaires, and essays. Importantly, the lack of harmony between the old and new assessment methods led to the resignation of 18 teachers who were unsatisfied with the new system. However, the students in the dual language classrooms were more active in classroom discussions than the students in the non-dual classrooms. Duff ascribed this finding to their high motivational level, confidence, and smaller numbers and concluded that different models of discourse socialization prevailed and evolved that were "in greater or lesser harmony with existing cultural and government-mandated assessment practices" (1996, p. 431).

In another study, Duff and Uchida (1997) examined the role of culture in Japan. They examined four teachers', two native and two nonnative, beliefs and views by gathering data on their choice of materials, lesson plan, seating arrangements and other aspects. The findings indicated that the teachers' beliefs and views could be traced back to their language learning and teaching histories. Subsequently, Kanagy (1999) carried out a study on American kindergarten children learning Japanese in an immersion program. Three routines, greetings, taking attendance and making personal introductions, were the focus in the study. While these children were learning language forms, they were simultaneously learning the Japanese value system and culture. Thus, the children were socialized through the language by observation and imitation of their teachers and peers.

As regards oral academic discourse socialization, a limited number of related studies at the advanced level were conducted predominantly in the inner circle (Kachru, 1985). In the North American context, Morita (2000) investigated the academic discourse socialization of a group of nonnative- and native-English-speaking graduate students in a TESL program while performing oral academic presentation. The study took an ethnographic approach and lasted eight months, for two academic semesters. It investigated how the students acquired the oral academic discourse through engagement in such graduate activities as oral academic presentations (OAPs). The data were collected through interviews, questionnaires, observations and video recordings of the OAPs. The results indicated that academic discourse socialization is a complex, conflictual, multifaceted, and unpredictable process that both nonnative and native speakers experienced as they steadily became apprenticed through constant interactions and negotiations with peers and instructors while performing oral academic presentations. The latter were found to be a cognitively and

sociolinguistically complex process. The findings also demonstrated that academic discourse socialization "is not a predictable, entirely oppressive, unidirectional process of knowledge transmission from the expert (e.g., instructor) to the novice (e.g., student) but a complex, locally situated process that involves dynamic negotiations of expertise and identity" (Morita, 2000, p. 304). Subsequently, Morita's study (2004) on negotiating participation and identity of six Japanese female students in second language academic communities in a Canadian university revealed that the participants negotiated their participation and non-participation in different activities differently. The study indicated that despite their silence in various classroom activities, the students were exercising their agency to negotiate their participation and language learning in classroom contexts.

In another study, Kobayashi (2003) explored behind-the-scene peer-collaboration of three Japanese undergraduate students in a content-based program in a Canadian university for a year-long period. By adopting a qualitative case study design, the researcher investigated how the participants' out-of-class experiences influenced their class performance. The data showed that the students, prior to their presentations, involved in various preparatory activities outside the classroom such as negotiation, task definition, teacher expectation, sharing experiences, collaboration, rehearsing and peer-coaching. The findings demonstrated that the students' contextualization and orientation to the task, collaboration in task preparation and use of L1 helped them to accomplish their L2 task.

In a similar vein, Zappa-Hollman's study (2007a) involving six non-native English students revealed that during the preparation and delivery of the oral academic presentations the participants encountered various challenges related to linguistic factors (linguistic limitations and lack of familiarity with academic presentations),

33

sociocultural factors (lack of familiarity with academic expectations and requirements) and psychological factors (trying to overcome shyness and nervousness). The participants also developed and employed a variety of strategies to cope with the challenges of academic studies such as choosing familiar topics for presentations, selecting interesting topics to attract their audience, adjusting their speed of delivery, preparing an outline beforehand, searching from multiple sources and rehearsing the presentation in advance. In addition, the study emphasized the important role of oral presentations in socializing the focal students to their respective communities of practice.

Further, Duff (2006) explored the academic socialization of Korean undergraduate exchange students into different discourses and practices at a Canadian university. The findings of the study indicated that her participants failed to connect with Native English speakers for a variety of personal and contextual reasons and connected mostly with students from Korean and other similar backgrounds. The latter experience provided the participants with the English practice and information exchange about the target academic culture that they needed. Furthermore, Ho (2011) examined the academic discourse socialization among Native Speaker and Non-native Speaker students while performing small-group discussions in a TESOL postgraduate course at a state university in the U.S. The results indicated that small-group discussions helped the students to steadily socialize into the specific sociocultural context and their discipline-specific norms and values of the TESOL profession. The socialization the students experienced was evident through their transportable identity-construction, critical thinking, and intertextual connections.

Subsequently, Seloni (2012) examined the academic literacy socialization of six multi-lingual PhD students over a period of one year. The detailed micro-ethnographic

analysis of the audio- and video-recorded classroom discourse, interviews, outside the classroom chats, as well as field observation indicated that the participants socialized into the practices of the academic discourse in multiple ways as well as in different spaces such as formal academic environments, informal preparations for the academic tasks, and out-of-class academic experiences. This afforded the candidates opportunities to acquire the literacy and socialization skills necessary for their legitimate participation and membership. Furthermore, Cho (2013) investigated the disciplinary enculturation experiences of three Korean students in a MA TESOL program mainly through in-depth interview data. The findings indicated that the varied participation rates of the study participants were due to the negotiation of different social identities and meaning-making in the academic communities of practice under investigation and that a number of factors such as supportive networks and institutional support determined their participation. More recently, Anderson (2017) explored seven Chinese doctoral students' internal and external academic discourse socialization. The results showed that the participants' recursive self- and other-socialization and their agency were the key aspects of their socialization process.

The following sections elaborate on the main aspects of academic discourse socialization which is characterized "by variable amounts of modeling, feedback, and uptake; different levels of investment and agency, the negotiation of power and identities; and, often, important personal transformations for at least some participants" (Duff, 2010, p. 169).

2.4.1.1 Feedback

In Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (Richards & Schmidt, 2002) teaching feedback "refers to comments or other information that learners receive concerning their success on learning tasks or tests, either from the

teacher or other persons" (p. 199). Feedback in the language classroom is mostly of corrective type which refers to teacher and peer responses to learners' erroneous second language production. Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized such oral corrective feedback into six types namely reformulation, explicit feedback, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition. At the graduate level, oral activity is "socially, cognitively, and discursively complex and variable" (Duff, 2010, p. 178) and speakers are under constant pressure of presenting and negotiating convincing arguments in relation to comments and feedback from the course instructor and peers. This makes oral activities demanding and challenging, especially for novices. This study is mostly concerned with feedback on the content knowledge or discipline-specific knowledge exhibited in participants' contributions to the academic discussions in the graduate classroom.

2.4.1.2 Stance

The research to date on academic discourse socialization has emphasized the significance of stance development through communities of practice and socialization perspectives (Ohta, 1991, 1993). Morita's (2000) study revealed that through participation in activities and interactions in the graduate context, the students indexed their epistemic stance as either experts or novices. Also, participation afforded the students the opportunities to benefit from the more expert peers' or professors' feedback. The graduate students also "expressed their stance as relative experts by drawing on relevant personal experiences, critiquing the subject of the oral academic presentation confidently and convincingly, and displaying their presentation skills" (p. 290).

In this study, stance is viewed as "a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating

objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field" (Du Bois, 2007, p.163). Stance is thus a 'dialogical act' which can also encompass identity work. In this regard, Bucholtz and Hall (2005, p. 585) argued that "identities may be linguistically indexed through…stances" and that a frequent stancetaking move or pattern of moves may be indicative of an identity. Specifically, through taking on various stances in oral academic discussions graduate candidates display and index various positions, positioning and identity (Morita, 2000, 2002).

2.4.1.3 Identity

The issue of identity has traditionally been considered as the connection or identification of a person with their social, ethnic, cultural, and religious group often entailing emotional ties and sentiment (Duff, 2012). Thus, the term was considered to be a static and fixed phenomenon under the social-psychological paradigm (Tajfel, 1974, 1978). However, most recently, identity has come to be described more as "a dynamic and shifting nexus of multiple subject positions, or identity options" (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004, p. 35). Importantly, as a result of the social turn in SLA (Block, 2003) theories of second language acquisition have started taking the socially situated nature of learning into account. Influenced by this social turn, Norton (1995, 2000) defined identity as:

> … to reference how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future. I argue that SLA theory needs to develop a conception of identity that is understood with reference to larger, and more frequently inequitable, social structures which are reproduced in day-to-day social interaction. (p. 5)

Therefore, considering a fairly homogeneous and stable identity category is very problematic both in theory and practice (Duff, 2012).

In the light of the community of practice (CoP) theory, Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001) argued that there is a "dialectic struggle between the learner and the community out of which emerges the learner's position and identity" (p. 149). Wenger (1998) also maintained that:

> There is a profound connection between identity and practice. Developing a practice requires the formation of a community whose members can engage with one another and thus acknowledge each other as participants. As a consequence, practice entails the negotiation of ways of being a person in that context.... In this sense, the formation of a community of practice is also the negotiation of identities. (p. 149)

In a similar vein, Morita (2002) noted that "within a COP, we experience and co-construct ourselves with other members in terms of differing degrees of competence recognized by that community" (p. 48). In addition, Wenger (1998) noted that:

> Our various forms of participation delineate pieces of a puzzle we put together rather than sharp boundaries between disconnected parts of ourselves. An identity is thus more than just a single trajectory; instead, it should be viewed as a nexus of multimembership. (p. 159)

Zimmerman (1998), by drawing on an interactionist perspective, proposed different categories of identity which are based on the particularities of the talk (graduate classroom discussions in the present study) and the social context where it unfolds. These categories are as follows:

1. Discourse identity which is "integral to the moment-by-moment organization of the interaction" (p. 90). It is related to the sequential development of the talk as participants in the conversation take different roles as speaker, listener, questioner, etc.

2. Situated identity which arises in different situations and refers to the contribution of participants "engaging in activities and respecting agendas that display an orientation to, and an alignment of, particular identity sets" (p. 90).

3. Transportable identity referring to the "identities that are usually visible, that is, assignable or claimable on the basis of physical or culturally based insignia which furnish the intersubjective basis for categorization" (p. 91).

This study acknowledges the *multiple* possible social groups or roles that an individual belongs to or identifies with at any given time and the role of the language and discourse as well as the contexts and situations in constructing those identities.

2.4.1.4 Agency

Following the debate over L2 learners as socially situated beings by Firth and Wagner (1997), agency has become a very important theoretical concept in SLA (Kinginger, 2004). Duff (2012) defines agency as "people's ability to make choices, take control, self-regulate, and thereby pursue their goals as individuals leading, potentially, to personal or social transformation" (p. 417); that is, learners are not passive recipients of information or passive participants in a community of practice, rather they are knowledge transformers themselves and play a very important role in determining the qualities of their learning. In this regard, Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001) maintained that:

> Ultimate attainment in second language learning relies on one's agency… While the first language and subjectivities are an indisputable given, the new ones are arrived at by choice. Agency is crucial at the point where the individuals must not just start memorizing a dozen new words and expressions but have to decide on whether to initiate a long, painful, inexhaustive and, for some, never-ending process of self-translation. (pp. 169-170)

Recently, agency has assumed a central position in both theory and research on language socialization. Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001, p. 148) viewed agency as "mediated relationship" between individual learners and the social world. That is, individual learners construct different meaning and "significance" through engagement in different activities in that every individual exerts their agency in the community where they participate. Ochs and Schieffelin (2012) viewed language

learners as "agents in the formation of competence" (p. 6) who "play a defining role in shaping the qualities of their learning" (Dewaele, 2009, p. 638).

By viewing agency through the prism of second language academic discourse socialization, Duff (2002) noted that "knowledge and participation in educational activities are co-constructed and are crucially linked with issues of *identity, agency, and difference"* (p. 291). Also, Morita (2004) found that academic discourse socialization process not only contributes to graduate students' acquisition of "increasing competence in an academic way of knowing, speaking, and writing" but it also develops their voice, identity, and agency in their respective fields of study (p. 576). Subsequently, Duff (2012) argued that:

> A sense of agency enables people to imagine, take up, and perform new roles or identities (including those of proficient L2 speaker or multilingual) and to take concrete actions in pursuit of their goals. Agency can also enable people to actively resist certain behaviors, practices, or positionings, sometimes leading to oppositional stances and behaviors leading to other identities, such as rebellious, diffident student. A perceived lack of agency on the part of learners might lead to similar outcomes as they become passive and disengaged from educational pursuits. Agency, power, and social context (structures) are therefore linked because those who typically feel the most in control over their lives, choices, and circumstances also have the power--the human, social or cultural capital and ability--they need to succeed. (p. 417)

Recently, Duff and Doherty (2015) considered self-socialization as "the primary medium and outcome of socialization" as well as "a means by which agency is enacted and oriented" (p. 68).

2.4.1.5 Negotiation of Power

Academic discourse socialization also involves power relations between or among individuals as they get engaged or participate in various activities of a community. In this regard, Morita (2002, 2004) viewed power as a dynamic construct negotiated situationally and locally. In this regard, Morita (2002) noted that:

> Academic discourse socialization is far more complex than the unproblematic appropriation of established knowledge and skills on the part of newcomers. It is

likely to involve struggles over access to resources, conflicts and negotiations between differing viewpoints arising from differing degrees of experience and expertise, and transformations of the practices of a given academic community as well as of the identities of those who participate in them. (p. 42)

Further, Leki (2001) demonstrated that power differentials prevented the learners from taking advantage of the academic and social interactions and sometimes L2 learners were even made to be silent although they did not like such positionings. Subsequently, Morita (2004) reported that her silent nonnative research participants were actively negotiating their agency, power and competence. She also pointed to the power relations between the students and their instructors. Also, Duff (2010) noted similar characteristics of academic discourse socialization and pointed to the "considerable emotional investment and power dynamics" involved in the process (p. 170).

It is worth noting that within the community of practice framework, power relations are considered inherent characteristics of participation in a community of practice. Legitimate peripheral participation (LPP), as one of the main concepts, is not an easy assimilation process rather a "conflictual process of negotiation and transformation" (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Morita, 2002, p. 42) which involves tension, anxiety and change. The legitimate peripherality takes place in a social setting where participants interact with each other. Therefore, power struggle is an indispensable part in this regard. Lave and Wenger (1991, p. 42) argued that "hegemony over resources for learning and alienation from full participation are inherent in the shaping of the legitimacy and peripherality of participation in its historical realizations". In this regard, Morita (2002) contended that although newcomers need to have access to all the necessary resources for their legitimate participation, the existing power structure can either facilitate or debilitate it.

2.4.1.6 Investment

Social structure is constructed and deconstructed based on individuals' negotiation of symbolic power which emanates from various forms of symbolic capitals such as economic capital (economic wellbeing), social capital (status, position, and reputation in a particular community or society) and cultural capital (knowledge, skills, educational qualification, etc.) (Bourdieu, 1991). By drawing on these metaphors, Norton (2000) argued that L2 learners learn the target language with the aim of acquiring "a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which in turn increase the value of their cultural capital" (p. 10). She viewed the concept of investment as follows:

> The concept … signals the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language, and their often ambivalent desire to learn and practice it. .... If learners invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which in turn increase the value of their cultural capital. Learners expect or hope to have a good return on that investment—a return that will give them access to hitherto unattainable resources. (p. 10)

Morita (2002, 2004) also emphasized the important role of investment, goals, desires and interests of participants who negotiate membership in a certain context. She maintained that studying in a foreign country is a huge investment on the part of graduate students. Duff (2010, p. 170) therefore acknowledged that "academic discourse is … a site of internal and interpersonal struggle for many people, especially for newcomers or novices. Considerable emotional investment and power dynamics may therefore be involved."

2.5 Theoretical Framework

The present study was carried out within the theoretical framework of language socialization theory which has been informed by first and second language

socialization research as well as other sociocultural theories such as community of practice.

2.5.1 First Language Socialization Theory

Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin initiated research on language socialization, in Western Samoa and Papua New Guinea. They conducted extensive studies on Samoan children's language acquisition and observed that the language acquisition process takes place through socialization of novices (children) becoming linguistically and socio-linguistically competent members of the community which is directly influenced by socialization practices and ideologies. The scholars also maintained that language acquisition and culture acquisition are inseparably intertwined and that socialization can take place in two forms: socialization through the language and socialization into the language (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a). Also, Ochs (1988) noted that to acquire the linguistic and sociocultural norms, values and knowledge of a community, one needs to participate in different language-mediated and socio-culturally related activities.

Subsequent studies of L1 socialization focused on how children were socialized into their communities by their adult caregivers through the use of their first language (e.g. Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). These studies focused on the children's interaction at school and on workplace mostly in small communities. However, some large scale studies were also carried out in the United States and Japan and concentrated on homogenous and monolingual communities.

For example, Heath (1983) conducted an ethnographic study on three communities, the focus being on how the children from two working class communities were socialized through their language. The results indicated that the

children experienced a lot of difficulties and did not perform well at school because the school language norm was different from the language norms of the two working-class communities. Subsequently, Heath offered a macro-level analysis framework for the inconsistency between the home and school socialization norms.

In another study, Cook (1999), through a micro- perspective, carried out a study on Japanese children's acquisition, through interactions with their classmates and teachers, of attentive listening which is a significant part of their communicative competence and culture. The findings showed that the interactions between the teachers and the children differed significantly from those of American classrooms in terms of the teacher's role, participants' structure and knowledge source. The results also indicated that the Japanese children preferred a multiparty participation structure rather than a dyadic structure which helped them to be socialized into the attentive listening norms of their culture.

However, it should be noted here that the research on language socialization has mostly been rooted in first language socialization and it is only recently that Applied Linguistics has started conducting research on second language socialization being a new area in the field (Duff, 2003, 2007a) having much in common with first language socialization in terms of principles and objectives.

2.5.2 Second Language Socialization Theory

Duff (2007b, p. 310) defined language socialization as "the process by which novices or newcomers in a community or culture gain communicative competence, membership, and legitimacy in the group". Thus, it is a complex process through which novices and newcomers gain membership and competence through interactions with members of a community in various language-mediated social activities (Duff, 2002; Ho, 2011). However, second language socialization involves participants who already

are proficient in at least another language and culture and have different expectations, motivations, and experiences (Duff, 2007b).

It is noteworthy that second language socialization process is bi-directional, in that both novices and expert users of language are apprenticed into the sociocultural norms of a given context; it is not only novices who benefit from the interaction with experts, but experts also gain benefits from interaction with new members of a sociocultural community (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Ochs, 1990; Rogoff, 1990). The studies carried out on first and second language socialization somewhat unanimously point to the fact that through constant negotiation and interaction, experts and novices benefit from each other's support. For example, Ochs (1990, p. 304) contended that "questions by novices to members may reorder the thinking of both, despite their differences in knowledge and power" and Morita (2000) maintained that "novice members actively seek and structure the assistance of more competent members; as a result, competent members also learn from novices" (p. 282). The bi-directionality aspect can also be viewed as guided participation (Rogoff, 1990) or legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

It should also be mentioned that membership negotiation in the community of practice is an important aspect of socialization. This process involves "negotiating discourses, competence, identities, and power relations" (Morita, 2002, p. 44) which is challenging for participants in the community; also, it is considered essential for graduate students "to participate and be recognized as legitimate and competent members of their classroom communities" (Morita, 2004, p. 573). Classroom community is the most immediate academic community in which students negotiate their membership, identities, and competence (Morita, 2002), and as a result of interaction and negotiation, participants engage in different discourses to exchange

information. Because of the nature of academic discourses, participation might sometimes even lead to tensions, apprehension and alienation when participants in the graduate classroom community negotiate their membership. In this regard, elements such as students' goals and investments (Norton Peirce, 1995), their personal histories and backgrounds (Morita, 2002), knowledge, culture, positionality and agency (Morita, 2004) need to be taken into consideration and dealt with cautiously.

Discourse has played a crucial role within the socialization theory framework. Language socialization theory considers discourse as "a set of norms, preferences, and expectations relating linguistic structures to context, which speakers/hearers draw on and modify in producing and interpreting language in context" (Ochs, 1988, p. 8). Morita (2002) contended that academic discourse is not monolithic, stable or value-free and is not a process of straightforward assimilation; rather, it is a process of constant struggle of negotiation of membership and identity. This view of discourse is in line with Bakhtin's (1981) and Lave and Wenger's (1991) sociohistoric theories and Canagarajah's (1999) poststructuralist orientation to language and discourse who considered discourse as ideologically-oriented, heterogenous hence subject to tensions, conflicts, and negotiations involving membership establishment, identity construction (Morita, 2002, 2004) and positionality.

2.5.3 The Community of Practice and Participation

It is noteworthy that language socialization theory also draws on the community of practice (CoP) concept introduced in the 1990s by Lave and Wenger. The scholars viewed learning as a situated practice specifically as "an integral and inseparable aspect of social practice" (1991, p. 31) rather than as cognitive internalization of knowledge.

They reviewed a number of profession apprenticeships that new-comers experienced before becoming old-timers. The scholars formulated the concept of legitimate peripheral participation and argued that "the concept provides a framework for bringing together theories of situated activity and theories about the production and reproduction of the social order" (p. 45). Lave and Wenger argued that their theory of social practice:

> ….emphasizes the relational interdependency of agent and world, activity, meaning, cognition, learning, and knowing. It emphasizes the inherently socially negotiated character of meaning and the interested, concerned character of the thought and action of persons-in-activity. This view also claims that learning, thinking, and knowing are relations among people in activity in, with, and arising from the socially and culturally structured world. (1991, pp. 50-51)

Further, both scholars advocated their theory as a critical theory in that it reviews practice, cognition and communication in its social setting "situated in the historical development of ongoing activity" (1991, p. 51). Lave and Wenger also held that legitimate peripheral participation:

> ….refers both to the development of knowledgeably skilled identities in practice and to the reproduction and transformation of communities of practice. It concerns the latter insofar as communities of practice consist of and depend on a membership, including its characteristic biographies/trajectories, relationships, and practices. (1991, p. 55)

Furthermore, Lave and Wenger also argued that community of practice involves conflict between different forces, those helping the process of learning and those preventing that process, and that learning within this community is not just a transfer or assimilation process rather it is implicated in and intertwined with change and transformation process. In addition, in community of practice, legitimate peripheral participation is considered the initial form of membership, interaction and acceptance by the more knowledgeable members or practitioners who make learning valuable and legitimate.

Importantly, the terms of legitimacy and peripherality need to be clarified in that peripherality was viewed as "an opening, a way of gaining access to sources for understanding through growing involvement" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 37) while subsequently peripherality and legitimacy were considered as two types of modifications which make actual newcomers' participation possible (Wenger, 1998), specifically:

> Peripherality provides an approximation of full participation that gives exposure to actual practice. It can be achieved in various ways, including lessened intensity, lessened risk, special assistance, lessened cost of error, close supervision, or lessened production pressures.... No matter how the peripherality of initial participation is achieved, it must engage newcomers and provide a sense of how the community operates. (Wenger, 1998, p. 100)

On the other hand, the concept of legitimacy was viewed as follows:

> In order to be on an inbound trajectory, newcomers must be granted enough legitimacy to be treated as potential members.... Granting the newcomers legitimacy is important because they are likely to come short of what the community regards as competent engagement. Only with legitimacy can all their inevitable stumblings and violations become opportunities for learning rather than cause for dismissal, neglect, or exclusion. (Wenger, 1998, p. 101)

Community of practice theory has come to be used extensively in socialization studies. For example, Morita (2002) considered the graduate classroom as the community of practice because in such a community, newcomers try to seek membership and "participate in multiple, overlapping academic communities simultaneously" (p. 43). The author listed the following reasons in this regard, on the one hand graduate courses can prepare graduate students for their disciplinary community, and on the other hand, graduate courses provide communities in which graduate students try to seek membership by participation in different activities. Morita argued that graduate classrooms provide both of the processes, however noted that the distinction between these processes is not easy.

Thus, the present study was conducted within the framework of second language socialization and it also drew on the community of practice framework in order to explore how a cohort of PhD candidates socialize to the oral academic discourse in the graduate classroom as their community of practice.

2.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature on second language socialization as well as academic language socialization. First, it introduced the scholarship on the relationship between language, thought, and culture and reviewed the literature on the sociocultural theories and language socialization. Further, the chapter presented the research to date on second language socialization and especially academic language socialization and concluded with the theoretical framework of the study.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the methodology of the study. It describes the research design, context, participants, and research procedures for data collection as well as data analysis. Finally, the chapter presents limitations and delimitations and discusses some ethical aspects of the present study.

3.2 Research Design

The present research on the socialization of a cohort of the doctoral students to academic discourse at Eastern Mediterranean University in Northern Cyprus was designed as an ethnographic study. It is noteworthy that "Whereas language socialization provides a helpful theoretical perspective of the construction, negotiation, and transformation of knowledge, identity(ies), and difference(s) in and through educational discourse, the ethnography of communication … provides a set of methods for conducting the research." (Duff, 2002). Ethnographic research was traditionally defined as "the study of people's behavior in naturally occurring, ongoing settings, with a focus on the cultural interpretation of behavior" (Watson-Gegeo, 1988, p. 576). Subsequently, four approaches to classroom ethnography were developed comprising ethnography of communication, micro-ethnography, discourse analysis, and critical ethnography (Watson-Gegeo, 1997).

Ethnographic research "emphasizes the importance of obtaining multiple perspectives by collecting a variety of data (e.g. through participant observation,

interviews, assembling relevant documents…) and using these to describe and understand common patterns of behavior" (Ellis, 2012, p. 43). Accordingly, the present study collected comprehensive data also from multiple perspective, including the "emic" perspective (Van Lier, 1988; Watson-Gegeo, 1988), specifically the study participants' insights to the socialization phenomena in the context.

According to LeCompte and Preissle (1993), the high internal validity of ethnographic research can be attributed to four factors:

> First, the ethnographer's common practice of living among participants and collecting data for long periods provides opportunities for continual data analysis and comparison to refine constructs; it ensures a match between researcher categories and participant realities. Second, informant interviews, a major ethnographic data source, are phrased in the empirical categories of participants; they are less abstract than many instruments used in other research designs. Third, participant observation—the ethnographer's second key source of data—is conducted in natural settings reflecting the life experiences of participants more accurately than do more contrived or laboratory settings. Finally, ethnographic analysis incorporates researcher reflection, introspection, and self-monitoring that Erickson (1973) calls disciplined subjectivity, and these expose all phases of the research to continual questioning and reevaluation. (p. 342)

In order to ensure the credibility and internal validity of ethnographic studies, triangulation strategy has been advocated. Denzin (1978) proposed four types of triangulation: the use of multiple methods, multiple data sources, multiple investigators, or multiple theories to account for emerging findings. Also, Patton (2015) argued that "triangulation, in whatever form, increases credibility and quality by countering the concern (or accusation) that a study's findings are simply an artifact of a single method, a single source, or a single investigator's blinders" (p. 674). In this study, triangulation through multiple methods and data sources was used to enhance the credibility and internal validity of the research findings.

It has been noted that "ideally, language socialization theory needs to marry a broad scope of explanation with a narrow, linguistic focus" (Ellis, 2009, p. 335). Accordingly, a macro-perspective addresses "sociological aspects of language

51

development" by exploring "processes that are evident in a wider sociocultural context", while a micro-perspective focuses on the "linguistic aspects of language development" (development of academic knowledge and skills in the present study) or processes that "are realized in particular local circumstances" (Duff & Talmy, 2011, pp. 98-103). The researcher therefore examined from the micro-perspective the "attested"-oral academic discourse data collected from a graduate classroom and from the macro-perspective the interview data on the students' socialization experiences in the graduate context, specifically related to interaction with peers and professors and engagement in other discursive activities and practices of their community. Since the research focus in the present study was on the socialization aspects, the transcripts on oral academic discourse were analyzed for the pertinent evidence in the participants' initiations, responses to and follow-ups (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992) in the academic exchanges of the graduate class. Subsequently, the interview transcripts were content analyzed (Patton, 2002) for the evidence of similar aspects in the participants' insights to their socialization experiences in the graduate context. Finally, in order to ensure the consistency of the analyses, the qualitative data sources in the present study were triangulated (Patton, 2002).

3.3 Research Question

In accordance with the ethnographic tradition, following the data collection and topic-oriented stages, the study focused on the socialization experiences and practices of the PhD ELT candidates in the graduate context under investigation by addressing the following question:

How do the graduate candidates socialize to and through the oral academic discourse in the context of the study?

   a. micro-perspective (identity work, stance display, agency manifestation)

b. macro-perspective (identity work, stance display, agency manifestation)

3.4 The Context

This study was conducted in the ELT Department (currently the Department of Foreign Language Education) of the Education Faculty at Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU). At present, EMU is an international tertiary institution with a population of around 17,500 undergraduate and graduate students from 110 different countries as well as 1,100 academic staff from 35 countries. Over the past years, the University has produced a large number of graduates with knowledge, skills and competence to qualify for academic, professional and personal success in life. With its multicultural student and teacher population, EMU offers a unique educational as well as socio-cultural environment for all the stakeholders who can meet, share, discuss, learn and benefit from mutual knowledge, ideas, and experiences (EMU, 2020).

In line with its current vision and mission, the University provides a contemporary education based on quality teaching, scholarly research, as well as a range of educational, social and cultural activities. Therefore, the university environment is conducive to students' realization of their overall potential to the maximum, promotion of their independence, creativity and confidence, and to acquisition of required academic knowledge, professional skills and competence indispensable in today's globalizing competitive world. It is noteworthy that according to 2011 Webometrics Rankings of World Universities, EMU has been placed within the top 1.500 universities among the 20.000 universities. Moreover, it has been ranked as the 4th among the private tertiary institutions in Turkey and as the leading university in Northern Cyprus. The university has also received various accreditations from different prominent international accrediting bodies. Currently, EMU comprises 12 Faculties and 5 Schools which provide contemporary education through 108

undergraduate and school programs and 96 graduate and doctoral degree programs (EMU, 2020).

A range of Masters' and PhD graduate programs in EMU faculties and schools are coordinated and administered by the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research. The Institute also deals with issues concerning graduate student admissions, examinations, thesis proposals, supervision and defense in accordance with the University by-laws and regulations. The graduate programs are required to maintain quality by following universally accepted academic principles and criteria. The graduate programs also aim to equip graduate students with sufficient academic background, knowledge and skills in order to become competent members in the academic world, industry or the service sector. Graduate students are also encouraged to exercise their academic freedom within the ethical guidelines of the university (EMU, 2020).

The aim of the graduate programs in general is to train and develop well-educated and communicatively competent graduates who can continuously keep abreast of the latest trends and developments in their area of specialization and can contribute to the well-being of their society. Moreover, the academics at the graduate level in different faculties and schools possess a range of specialty and expertise and are capable of supervising their graduate students in both interdisciplinary and classical research areas. The graduate programs at EMU are accredited by YÖK (Higher Education Council of Turkey) as well as YÖDAK (Higher Education Council of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus) and recognized by international academic associations.

The Department of Foreign Language Education (formerly English Language Teaching Department) is one of the oldest departments in EMU and also the founding department of the Education Faculty; in 1999-2000, the department established the Education Faculty at EMU. Since 1995, the department has trained over 1.000 BA,

MA and PhD graduates from 14 different nationalities. The Department's main aim is to provide high quality education for its students in teaching and research at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in order to meet the ever-increasing challenges of a globalizing world (EMU, 2020).

The FLE Department also offers one Bachelor degree, 2 master's programmes (with Thesis and Project-based), as well as a PhD program in English Language Teaching. The department has always offered high quality education at both graduate and undergraduate levels for the enthusiastic, eager and curious minds who play significant roles in today's ever-increasing globalized world. It is worth noting that in 2014 the BA program was accredited by AQAS-Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programmes based in Germany (EMU, 2020). Furthermore, Department of Foreign Language Education has offered advisory and training services to the community of English language teachers working in the university as well as in the national education system. Most of the English language teachers working in the university and its affiliated institutions have received their degrees from the department. Candidates intending to enter the ELT PhD program are required to have a relevant MA degree and have to meet the admission requirements of the Institute of Graduate studies and Research of EMU. The PhD program in the department provides candidates with advanced theoretical background and research in English language teaching. PhD candidates are required to take 8 courses, pass a Qualifying Examination and submit a thesis in order to complete their PhD studies in the department. The research interests of the department academic staff comprise a range of Applied Linguistics areas (EMU, 2020).

3.5 Participants

The present study involved 7 PhD students who gave consent to participate in the research. They represented different nationalities such as Iran, Kazakhstan, and North Cyprus. Of 7 participants 2 were male, 5 female, their age ranged between 24-30 years. However, one of the participants had to leave the program in 2 months for family and medical reasons. The demographic information about the participants (GCs) is presented in Table 3.1. Of the remaining 6 participants, 3 were newly registered, 2 were in their second semesters, and 1 in the third semester of the graduate studies. Two of the participants completed their Masters degrees in Iran, 2 in the United Kingdom, 1 in North Cyprus, and 1 in Kazakhstan. Most of the participants had teaching experience across a range of English proficiency levels, 2 participants completed School Experience and/or Teaching Practice in their previous academic studies.

Table 3.1: The Demographic Information

Graduate candidate (GC)	Gender	Age	Semester into the program	Teaching experience	Country of birth	Master's degree
GC1	F	30	3rd	4 years	Iran	ELT, Iran
GC2	F	25	2nd	1 year	North Cyprus	ELT, North Cyprus
GC3	M	24	2nd	1 year	North Cyprus	Education, UK
GC4	F	29	1st	3 years	Kazakhstan	Philology, Kazakhstan
GC5	F	30	1st	4 years	Iran	ELT, Iran
GC6	M	25	1st	2 years	North Cyprus	UK, TESOL
GC7	F	30	3rd	4 years	Iran	ELT, Iran

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

The ethnographic data for the present study were gathered in the scheduled sessions of one of the compulsory PhD courses - Applied Linguistics. The data were collected through multiple methods including audio-recordings, from the start to the end of the course, of routine classroom discussions, a final-roundtable discussion prepared and held by the PhD candidates on their own, as well as oral academic presentations of each graduate student. In addition, the data collection also involved conducting interviews with volunteer PhD students, the course instructor, as well as collating the graduate course documentation. The multiple sets of the comprehensive data were triangulated in order to obtain a reliable picture of the socialization process of the PhD candidates into academic discourse.

Prior to the data collection, the researcher approached the department administration in order to request permission to conduct research in one of the compulsory PhD classes, Applied Linguistics, and in accordance with the research ethics, requested their consent (see Appendix B). Since the researcher previously took this graduate course, he was familiar with its requirements. Therefore, he approached the course instructor and secured her permission to audio-record the course sessions over one semester. The researcher also contacted the PhD candidates enrolled on the course and secured their consent to participation. It is noteworthy that all the students expressed their willingness to participate in the study (see Appendix A).

The Applied Linguistics course is one of the compulsory courses offered at the start of the PhD studies. According to the course instructor, the course is intended to provide graduate students with a solid foundation in Applied Linguistics. It revisits the early work and considers the current developments in the field. The course focuses on the most significant theoretical issues and practical concerns relevant to second

language education. It establishes the key terms, concepts and analytical techniques in Applied Linguistics. PhD candidates are encouraged to explore and critically review new developments in the field, and draw pedagogical implications relevant to their professional concerns. The course was held as a seminar involving weekly routine discussions of extensive reading assignments monitored by the course instructor, a final-roundtable discussion monitored by the PhD candidates, their oral academic presentations, as well as it required a written critique of a research paper, and administered a written final examination.

The PhD course was held every Monday from 1:30 to 5:00 pm with a break between the sessions. Every week the graduate students were required to study various chapters and articles from the applied linguistics textbooks and journals. They were also required to reflect their work in portfolios, and prior to each session to e-mail the course instructor questions related to the assigned readings as contribution to the agenda of weekly discussions. According to the course instructor, she would process all questions, subsequently select and include into the weekly discussion agenda the most successful – relevant and challenging questions from each candidate. At the start of each session, printed discussion agendas were given to each candidate, and the course instructor or sometimes volunteer graduate candidates made a brief introduction to the weekly topic, which was followed up by the discussion of a given agenda.

Over one semester, the researcher attended and audio-recorded the sessions of the Applied Linguistics course. The data on the classroom academic discourse were obtained over the 14 weeks of the entire semester involving the audio-recording of the classroom instructional and interactional process during the class time, once a week for 3 hours (the first 2 weeks' audio-recording was not included in the study as the

students were still registering to the course). Moreover, the researcher observed the classes by taking a backseat position and taking down notes to complement the recordings. Since he knew most of the participants from his previous encounters or studies he had a good rapport with them. With everyone's consent, each week the researcher placed an audio-recorder in the middle of the classroom on a large oval-shaped table around which all the graduate students and the course instructor sat. This classroom arrangement allowed all participants to face each other; also they had their reading materials, portfolios, stationery and laptops on the table.

At the start of the course, the instructor informed the GCs about the course objective, weekly instructional plan, requirements and expectations. The first eight recorded sessions were devoted to routine weekly whole-group discussions on the basis of a given agenda jointly prepared by all graduate students. The ninth session-a final roundtable discussion was monitored by three volunteer graduate candidates, and the last three sessions were devoted to the participants' oral academic presentations and follow-up discussions. During the last four sessions, the course instructor was mostly an observer and offered her general feedback at the end of discussions. Since participation in the classroom discussions was one of the course requirements, the course instructor encouraged every graduate student to contribute. Towards the course completion, the candidates' participation was evaluated in terms of the quality and relevance as well as amount of contributions. Moreover, three PhD students volunteered to participate in interviews and they were interviewed on their socialization experiences twice over the graduate course.

The ethnographic framework adopted by the present study necessitated a focused approach to multiple aspects of the graduate candidates' involvement in their routine academic studies, participation in the graduate program in general and the course in

particular. Therefore, in order to explore the 'discourse-in-use' within this particular cohort, the oral academic discourse produced by the PhD students was carefully analyzed on the basis of the classroom transcriptions as well as interview accounts which contributed to the emerging picture of the socialization process on the part of the graduate students.

3.6.1 Field Notes

The researcher, with the course instructor's permission, attended the course sessions over one semester; he took part as a silent observer in a backseat position of the classroom and used a voice recorder. During the first introductory sessions the researcher handed out Consent Forms to the participants and collected the course related documentation (course outline, weekly syllabus, learning outcomes, resources). All the graduate candidates enrolled in the Applied Linguistics course gave their consent to take part in the research. They were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of prospective research data. Also, outside the classroom, the researcher met and interacted with some participants who occasionally requested his advice and recommendations on the university, department and program information, rules and regulations. At request, the researcher shared with the study participants some materials, articles and books that he had acquired in his academic studies.

3.6.2 Audio-recording of Routine and Final Academic Discussions

Each session of the graduate Applied Linguistics course was audio-recorded by the researcher using an audio-recording device placed on the table in the middle of the classroom in order to record the oral academic discourse. The attested data comprised the brief introductions to the respective topic, either by the course instructor or volunteer graduate candidates, subsequent whole-class academic discussions,

including a series of exchanges of the participants' initiations, responses to and follow-ups (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992) in the graduate classroom.

Audio-recording of the final-roundtable discussion took place during the ninth session; the discussion was based on such global issues as Philosophy, Methodology of Applied Linguistics, Critical Applied Linguistics and other issues. The final discussion was monitored by 3 volunteer experienced students who prepared, through their classmates' contributions, the respective discussion agenda. The recording lasted for about two hours, the course instructor being an observer this time. At the end of the final discussion, she shared with the participants her related feedback.

3.6.3 Audio-recording of Oral Academic Presentations

Oral academic presentations and their concomitant discussions were audio-recorded in the last three sessions of the PhD course. The criteria for the presentations were provided by the course instructor online to all graduate students prior to the activity. Accordingly, each graduate student was required to suggest three pertinent articles from the applied linguistics journals, to confer these with the course instructor, and jointly decide on one article as a basis for the academic presentation. Subsequently, the graduate students were supposed to present a summary of the article as well as its critical review. The follow-up discussions of each oral academic presentation involved mostly the graduate candidates who would familiarize themselves with the presenter's article in advance. The time allocated for each presentation was twenty to twenty five minutes, with the remainder of the session time for discussion. The course instructor monitored the discussion and provided each student with brief feedback after respective presentation. Each presentation was assessed, by the whole audience, not only the course instructor but also the other graduate candidates.

3.6.4 Interviews

Three PhD students volunteered to be interviewed twice over one academic year, towards the graduate course completion as well as towards the end of the next semester. The procedure involved a newly-registered, a somewhat experienced and an experienced graduate candidates. The interviews were scheduled at everyone's convenience; the first interviews took place in the morning and were held on the departmental premises, in the graduate seminar room. In order to ensure reliability of data collection, the three participants were interviewed in succession, without any intervals. The interview guide (see Appendix C) was prepared on the basis of the pertinent studies on academic discourse socialization (Duff, 2003, 2007a, 2010; Morita, 2000, 2002, 2004). The second interviews were conducted towards the end of the next semester in order to elicit the participants' new insights to their socialization experiences over one academic year. Consistently, the interviews were scheduled at everyone's convenience and conducted on the departmental premises. The second interview guide was mostly adapted from Morita's (2002) study (see Appendix D). In addition, the interview with the graduate course instructor was conducted following the course completion (see Appendix E). The interview guide was also based on Morita's (2002) pertinent study on academic discourse socialization.

Thus, in order to ensure collection of the comprehensive ethnographic data the researcher gathered pertinent institutional and departmental documentation, graduate course documents, and participant students' academic record sheets.

Table 3.2: The Summary of Data Collection Methods

Method of data collection	Data collection period	Data collected
Observations and Field Notes	One semester	face-to-face or telephone conversations between the breaks, after the lessons, and

		informal chats and meetings with some of the participants, as well as field notes over one semester
Audio-recording of weekly discussions	One semester	Audio-recording and transcription (25 hours and 10 minutes)
Audio-recording of roundtable discussion	One session	Audio-recording and transcription (3 hours)
Audio-recording of academic presentations	Three sessions	Audio-recording and transcription (5 hours)
Interviews with students	Twice, one towards the end of the first semester, and one towards the end of the second semester	Audio-recording and transcription of interviews • 6 interviews in total (97 minutes)
Interview with course instructor	Once towards the end of the course completion	Audio-recording and transcription of interviews • 1 interview in total (30 minutes)
Documents	One semester	Course outlines Weekly discussion agendas Presentation Handouts

3.7 Data Analysis Procedures

The present study exploring socialization experiences to oral academic discourse of a cohort of PhD students collected comprehensive ethnographic data comprising transcriptions of twelve sessions (thirty two hours) of the graduate classroom routine academic discussions, final-roundtable discussion, six end-of-the-semester oral academic presentations and subsequent discussions. The data also included the interview accounts from three graduate candidates as well as the graduate course instructor.

The ethnographic data were analyzed from the macro-perspective for the evidence on the "sociological aspects of language development" specifically the "processes that are evident in a wider sociocultural context"; the data analysis from the micro-

perspective focused on the "linguistic aspects of language development" (development of academic knowledge and skills in the present study) or processes that "are realized in particular local circumstances" (Duff & Talmy, 2011, pp. 98-103). We therefore examined from the micro-perspective the "attested"-oral academic discourse data collected from a graduate classroom and from the macro-perspective the interview data on the students' socialization experiences in the graduate context, specifically related to interaction with peers and professors and engagement in other discursive activities and practices of their community as well as other related documents. Since the research focus in the present study was on various socialization phenomena, the transcripts on oral academic discourse were analyzed for the evidence of feedback, modeling, identity and agency construction in the participants' initiations, responses to and follow-ups (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992) in the academic exchanges of the graduate class. Subsequently, the interview transcripts were content analyzed (Patton, 2002) for the evidence of the manifestation of the socialization phenomena in the participants' insights to their socialization experiences in the graduate context. Finally, in order to ensure the consistency of the analyses, the qualitative data sources in the present study were triangulated (Patton, 2002).

Initially, the audio-recorded discourse data were transcribed following Atkinson and Heritage's (1984) transcription conventions. The transcriptions on 12 sessions (amounting to 32 hours) of the routine weekly and final-roundtable academic discussions as well as oral presentations and related discussions were analyzed for the evidence of feedback, modeling, identity and agency negotiation and (co)-construction. The unit of the transcription analysis was exchange(s), comprising initiation-response-follow-up (I-R-F) (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992). Specifically, the analysis focused on how the participants engaged in the negotiation of feedback,

modeling as well as negotiation and (co)-construction of identity (e.g., old-timer, newcomer, emerging scholar, facilitator, expert, novice) (Duff, et al., 2019), (discourse, situated and transportable) (Zimmerman, 1998), and agency (e.g., making choices, taking control, self-regulating, pursuing goals) (Duff, 2012) while initiating an academic discussion, responding to the previous contribution and/or following up with related feedback/evaluation.

Subsequently, the interview data were content analyzed (Patton, 2002) by searching the transcripts for recurring references to the major themes of feedback, modeling, identity work and agency manifestation. Specifically, the analysis identified the participants' insights related to their identity work (e.g., old-timer, newcomer) and agency expression (e.g., decision making, self-control in academic learning) over their academic studies in the graduate context. In addition, the content analysis revealed another emerging theme, the novelty of the challenging socialization experiences. Finally, the qualitative data sources were triangulated (Patton, 2002, 2015) in order to compare and cross-check the consistency of the classroom and interview transcript evidence on the socialization phenomena as well as corroborate the overall findings on the socialization experiences of the participants in the graduate context.

Thus, the analysis of the ethnographic data was undertaken in order to capture the socialization process of the graduate candidates. In this regard, the focus was on the exploration of the complex multiple and varied socialization phenomena; specifically, how these were invoked, manifested, negotiated and (co)constructed through the graduate students' participation in the oral academic discourse of the graduate classroom as well as various discursive practices of the graduate context. Overall, the analysis of the classroom data revealed that the graduate students "behaved" somewhat differently throughout the course. At the beginning, the analysis provided evidence of

few interactions, mostly between the participants and the course instructor; in the interim, as the semester progressed, the analysis revealed an increase in the students' participation in the whole-class academic discussions. The attested evidence on the last four sessions demonstrated their active contributions to the oral academic discourse through their respective presentations and management of the follow-up discussions. Also, the transcription analysis revealed that towards the course completion, the instructor mostly provided guidance to the participants and only intervened for the organizational purpose. In addition, the analysis of the attested data on the last three interim sessions (session 7, 8, 9) demonstrated multiple instances of intertextuality and text appropriation. Instances of intertextuality were identified in the data by tracing how the GCs directly or indirectly used or appropriated academic texts and how they referred to their content knowledge while discussing various issues in the classroom discussions.

The transcription analysis from both perspectives revealed that throughout the graduate course, the participants went through various socialization experiences through identity work and agency manifestation. The socialization evidence on identity was analyzed by identifying pronoun use, use of metaphors, categorical noun phrases, and critical incidents or interactions (Duff, 2012) as well as discourse, situated, and transportable categorization (Zimmerman, 1998). Moreover, we also employed the constructs of position and positioning (Carbaugh, 1999) and epistemic stance (Ochs, 1996) to analyze the linguistic and discursive means by which social identities were indexed and formed in the classroom discussion. Further, various instances of feedback provision and modeling by the course instructor as well as the graduate candidates themselves were identified in the evidence on the various stages of oral academic discourse socialization. Furthermore, the content analysis (Miles &

Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002) of the interview data for the emerging themes and patterns contributed to the 'thick' description of the socialization phenomena in question. Finally, the graduate course documentation as well as the researcher's field notes from the classroom observations were employed for the triangulation of the ethnographic data in order to obtain a comprehensive reliable picture of the socialization process of the graduate candidates in the context of the study.

3.8 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

One of the limitations of the present study was that it involved seven graduate PhD students. Another limitation was that the study was conducted over one semester, in one compulsory graduate course. Yet another limitation of the present research was that it conducted interviews with 3 volunteer participants. However, the study had some delimitations as well in that it collected and triangulated comprehensive ethnographic data from multiple perspectives.

3.9 Trustworthiness of Inquiry

The credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative studies has been a concern for many researchers and scholars (e.g., Creswell, 1998; Edge & Richards, 1998). Instead of traditional concepts of internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity concerning quantitative studies, Lincoln and Guba (1985), introduced such concepts as credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability to assess the trustworthiness of qualitative studies.

The credibility of the present study lies in its thick description and data and method triangulation (Patton, 2015) yielding multiple data sets such as the attested-classroom oral discourse transcripts, interviews, observations and field notes creating multiple realities, perspectives and views (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, as in other qualitative studies, in terms of transferability or generalizability we cannot generalize

our findings to a larger population   (Firestone, 1993; Stake, 1994). In this study, by employing thick description and data triangulation, efforts were made to overcome this limitation especially through the use of naturalistic data and contextualization of data (Duff, 2002), because such research features can justify its transferability to a large extent.

It is noteworthy that dependability or reliability, the extent to which the research can produce consistent results over repeated occasions, is a problematic concept in qualitative social and educational studies (Merriam, 2009) in that learning is a socioculturally and contextually situated phenomenon (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978). However, Merriam (2009) also maintained that the reliability of qualitative studies can be determined through the compatability of data and results which the present research provided by analyzing the attested-real classroom oral academic discourse.

Finally, confirmability or "whether the findings of the study could be confirmed by another" (Marshall & Rossman, 1995, p. 145) in this study was ensured due to the participants' acceptance of the researcher as an "insider" in their class who was part of the graduate community and also went through the various challenging and demanding stages of the socialization process as well as member-checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3.10 Chapter Summary

This chapter described the methodology of the present study. It introduced the research design, the study context, participants, and the research procedures for data collection as well as data analysis. Finally, the chapter presented limitations and delimitations as well as discussed some ethical aspects of the present study.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the comprehensive data analysis. First the chapter describes the data obtained from the micro-perspective, then it presents the results from the macro-perspective.

4.2 Micro-perspective

The micro-perspective focuses on the "linguistic aspects of language development" of academic discourse or processes that "are realized in particular local circumstances" (Duff & Talmy, 2011, pp. 98-103). In the present study we therefore examined from this perspective the "attested"-oral academic discourse data collected from the graduate classroom. Since the research focus was on the socialization aspects of power, membership, identity and agency, the transcripts on oral academic discourse were analyzed for the pertinent evidence in the participants' initiations, responses to and follow-ups (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992) in the academic exchanges of the graduate classroom. Thus the analysis of the attested data on oral academic discourse were presented in accordance with the core socialization aspect of participation in general, as well as other socialization aspects at the course start, interim and towards the course completion.

4.2.1 Participation

Initially, the analysis of the oral academic discourse transcription collected from the graduate course revealed that the GCs negotiated their participation in the routine

classroom, roundtable as well as the post presentation discussions. The participation rates and percentages provided preliminary evidence of the power relations in the graduate classroom. The pertinent data on the different academic discussions across the graduate course were tabulated and quantified accordingly.

At the start of the course, it was the course instructor (CI) who mostly initiated the routine discussions and followed up the graduate candidates' related contributions. The students usually took fewer turns, choosing just to respond to the instructor's initiations during the academic discussions. However, in the interim, they gradually started participating more actively, self-regulating their contributions to a different degree though (see Table 4.1). We are aware that the quality of the graduate candidates' contributions to the academic discussions should also be taken into account. However, whether it was the instructor who assigned turns or encouraged the students to join in the academic discussion, or the candidates themselves who chose to self-initiate, the overall increasing frequency of their turns, with some exceptions (one student was absent for few sessions due to family reasons) seemed to indicate that the participants were developing their strategies to negotiate their participation in the oral academic discourse.

Table 4.1: Participation Rate and Percentage in Routine and Roundtable Discussions

	Sessions								
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
GC1	27 *19%*	49 *35%*	66 *47%*	80 *57%*	43 *31%*	91 *65%*	99 *71%*	—	139 *100%*
GC2	14 *14%*	21 *20%*	40 *39%*	34 *33%*	30 *29%*	46 *45%*	44 *43%*	76 *74%*	102 *100%*
GC3	45 *21%*	68 *32%*	84 *39%*	81 *38%*	52 *24%*	—	81 *38%*	111 *52%*	214 *100%*

GC4	37 *57%*	34 *52%*	39 *60%*	—	—	—	65 *100%*	63 *97%*	57 *88%*
GC5	43 *37%*	59 *51%*	66 *57%*	47 *40%*	58 *50%*	25 *21%*	59 *51%*	40 *34%*	116 *100%*
GC6	23 *37%*	36 *58%*	34 *55%*	54 *87%*	31 *50%*	32 *52%*	62 *100%*	33 *53%*	51 *82%*
GC7	13 *32%*	17 *42%*	40 *100%*	36 *90%*	21 *52%*	10 *25%*	37 *92%*	38 *95%*	—

Note. ─: absent, GC: Graduate Candidate, the number represents the contributions each GC made to classroom discussions and percentage illustrates their participation increase/decrease over the semester.

Further, the roundtable discussion (session IX) was monitored by three experienced students (GC1, GC2 and GC3) who initiated, occasionally responded, and provided follow-ups as well as encouraged active participation of their peers (especially GC5 and GC6) through affording them opportunities to contribute to the academic discussion. Towards the course completion, the last three sessions in the graduate classroom were devoted to the oral academic presentations of the GCs. The rate and the frequency of their participation in the follow-up discussions were displayed in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Participation Rate and Percentage in Post Oral Presentation Discussions

GCs	Session			
	X	XI	XII	Total
GC1	23 39%	59 100%	15 25%	97
GC2	9 53%	17 100%	16 94%	42
GC3	43 74%	58 100%	41 71%	142
GC4	24 100%	1 4%	1 4%	26
GC5	22 100%	22 100%	10 45%	54

GC6	39 100%	26 67%	13 33%	78
GC7				—

The pertinent data on the GC's contributions to the academic discussions following up oral presentations in the graduate course showed that their participation rates varied as the students presented on different topics in their respective sessions. Across the academic discussions post oral presentations, the participation rates demonstrated that for example, experienced GC3 made the most contributions, while novice GC4 made few contributions. Thus, this evidence also seemed to indicate the students' varying strategies to negotiate their participation in the oral academic discourse in the graduate classroom.

4.2.2 Oral Academic Discourse Socialization

The attested transcription data from the graduate classroom revealed that the candidates socialized into and through oral academic discourse by negotiating knowledge, feedback, modelling, stances, positions or positioning, intertextuality, identity and agency. The pertinent data on the socialization process of the cohort were analyzed and presented across the first sessions, interim sessions, and the final sessions of the graduate course.

4.2.2.1 The First Sessions

At the start of the course, the instructor as a socializer provided feedback and modelling as and if required in the graduate classroom. However, as the semester progressed, the GCs themselves also started offering feedback and modelling to their classmates mostly in a constructive manner. The type of feedback varied from a short elaboration on a key word to a long discussion on some of the questions raised by the

GCs. In this section, the data on oral academic discourse socialization which unfolded in the first five sessions were presented on the basis of the representative extracts.

One of the strategies employed by the CI was the provision of required key terms when the GCs could not do so. The pertinent portions in the extract below were *italicized* to illustrate this. Some extracts seemed to indicate uptake of the provided feedback and modelling on the part of the GCs.

Extract 1 (session 1)
106. GC5: Problems, pedagogical or psychological problems, applied [*pedagogic problems*
107. CI: [*Real problems,* remember that we talked about in the introductory course, or language related problems *in the real world.*
108. GC5: *In the real world.*

In extract one, the CI provided a required, key applied linguistics term (*real problems*) as a model for the term used by GC5 (*pedagogic problem*) in turn 106, which was reiterated by this participant in turn 108.

Extract 2 (session 3)
49. GC1: Eh but eh there is *no outcome* for eh actually applied linguistics eh discussions.
50. CI: *No finality* maybe, [no finality, uha]?
51. GC1: [*Yes no finality*]. *No finality so* that's another problem and also as I remember in previous eh articles we talked about that the nature of language ....
52. CI: Ehem,
53. GC1: The use of language is another problem eh. A::nd you know there is no limits to the conversations and dialogs between people and eh the areas that it can be linked to that so there couldn't be any kind of explanation.
54. CI: What that might be, that might be explained *problematicity* yeah, with definitions aha sorry, sorry.

Extract two also displays how the CI provided modelling through her feedback (turn 50) on GC1's contribution in turn 49. Consequently, GC1 reiterated the key term in her new contribution to the discussion (turn 51) and carried on elaborating on the issue. Subsequently, the course instructor provided another feedback and modelling (turn 54).

Extract 3 (session 3)

12. GC2: Throughout the chapter, it is always emphasized that as GC5 also said linguists and applied linguists differ in the way they look at these.=
13. CI: Yes.
14. GC2: =They have *different viewpoint* and,
15. CI: Or *vantage point yeah or vantage points,* Davis said *vantage points or perspectives* as well as eh GC2, GC5 mentioned those are purposes
16. GC2: Purposes,
17. CI: *Or stance*, so thank you. In addition to what eh GC5 noted here so purpose, the difference in purpose, *the difference in (x) perspective or vantage point and the difference in stance, stance* like the kind of position that you take are also important
(deleted lines)
25. CI: =And then eventually may e::h make use or e::h explore a particular theory yeah. Yeah very good, so once *again purposes are different, stances are different eh vantage points are different, e::h concerns are different, e::h roots are different* right now because GC3 has already mentioned the role I think we may want to go to ….

In extract three, GC2 used the term '*different viewpoint*' in her contribution to the academic discussion (turn 14) on which the CI provided related feedback (turn 17) which she subsequently reiterated (turn 25) indicating the importance of discipline-specific key-terms hence socializing the participants into their course content knowledge.

Furthermore, the course instructor employed various elicitation strategies in order to involve the GCs in the classroom discussions hence socializing them into the graduate course practices. In extract four from the fourth session, the course instructor consistently elicited the participants' contributions to the unfolding discussion and elaborated on the questions only as a last resort. These strategies afforded the GCs opportunities to participate in the academic discussion and also benefit from the classmates' feedback.

Extract 4 (session 4)
11. CI: … so what does stylistics literary stylistics mean to you? (4.0) Literary stylistics, what is it about? Ehm?
12. GC7: Eh in literature I think it is the style of saying something, the rhyme, tone, intonation
13. CI: Ok
14. GC7: Is it working and

15. CI: A preferred method for metonymy, synecdoche, irony, oxymora, and hyperbole, there are too many right stylistics devices and specific (x), but so what about those things say it a poet, use so many successful metaphor, what does it tell us? What would literary stylistics look at?

16. GC7: Eh if a poem for example uses a lot of metaphor,

17. CI: For example it can be eh something else for example,

18. GC7: Eh it show about the eh I think the how it is, it is something valuable or eh it is which kind of liter, literature,

19. CI: Let me reword my question, I am trying to say it again, GC7 why would the poet use metaphors?

20. GC7: In order to convey meaning but in a more h,

21. CI: In order to convey meaning and ultimately to do what?

22. GC7: E : : h maybe eh in order to make something more interesting and more eh eye catching,

23. CI: Ok to achieve certain effects yeah let's see what GC5 has got to say,

24. GC5: Eh I think eh they do metaphor because they want to e expand the meaning to the whole people, they [don't want to individual

25. CI: [Expand meaning or?

26. GC5: Expand one situation to all situation and eh they want to give freedom of interpretation to audience and audience can interpret it and make a connection between the poem and themselves and,

27. CI: This is a current thinking of the role of the reader but the traditional, thank you ladies both of you for your contributions, the traditional eh (2.0) view of literary stylistics and literary stylistics is traditional and only later we talked about Kramsch's stylistics and all this we talk about applied stylistics, would be to relate (2.0) a particular choice of language like metaphors for example or metonymies eh or irony for example to the effects of that literary work. That's why I ask you, why would the poet use so many metaphors? So literary stylistics is all about the choice of certain language (2.0) and the effects of those choices on the reader or the audience yeah?

In extract 4, in turn 11, the CI initiated a discussion, in response to which GC7 made a contribution in turns 12 and 14. Subsequently, in turn 15, the CI rephrased GC7's earlier contribution and posed another related question, to which GC7 chose to respond in turns 16 and 18 thus foregrounding her discourse identity. The CI, in order to ensure this participant's comprehension of the question, reformulated it in turn 19. Through this feedback and modelling, GC7 provided a more adequate contribution in turn 22. Subsequently, the CI involved another, GC5 to participate in the unfolding academic discussion in turn 23 and through similar strategies guided this participant's contribution; the CI offered her related feedback in turn 27.

Overall, the course instructor frequently provided modelling and feedback on the GCs' various contributions to the oral academic discussions. In this regard, she emphasized the role of the required key terms by encouraging the GCs to employ these in the whole-class discussions of a range of the applied linguistics issues hence socializing them to the academic discipline knowledge and discourse. Importantly, the attested classroom data provided evidence of the GCs' uptake on the course instructor's feedback and modelling.

It is noteworthy that through their participation in the routine academic discussions, the GCs not only negotiated their knowledge and membership but also displayed and expressed their positions, stances and identities and as such exercised and enacted their agency by choosing to contribute, align or misalign with other members of the cohort. Owing to different academic, linguistic, professional and sociocultural backgrounds, the GCs took on various stances and thus invoked different, discourse, situated, and transportable, aspects of their identity. Two representative extracts from the course start provided evidence on how the participants socialized to the oral academic discourse in the graduate classroom.

One of the session was devoted to *the issue of the common core in language teaching-learning*. Two experienced students (GC1 and GC2) and 2 novice students (GC4 and GC5) contributed to a whole-class discussion as reflected in the extract below:

> Extract 5 (session 1)
> 37. CI: …. do you remember the common core we talked about, what is the best setting for a common core to be provided?
> 38. GC1: Classroom setting,
> 39. CI: Classroom setting, let's listen to GC2 first, she was the first one to react to me in a good sense of the word yes GC2? Why?
> 40. GC2: … it is a combination of both, the classroom setting and the natural environment is necessary because without the (unintelligible) learning the classroom one wouldn't be able to communicate in a social setting, especially for beginners, formal instruction is necessary.

41. CI: Right aha?

42. GC5: I think selection of items is something which is dependent on the particular group of learners as my friend GC2 said and we,

43. CI: Sorry, GC5, but we said that the common core doesn't depend on eh learners' individual characteristics. Remember, those are the basic elements of knowledge which most if not all learners seem to require, basic things, all of them regardless of their what? Motivation, beliefs or strategies or personality or aptitude, or whatever. Right? So then as GC2 noted, language classroom may be a better place,

44. GC5: But here I think the student, that the problem of selection is one of determining the relative utility to the particular group of learners of particular linguistic forms in the light of the situations in which they will use the language and the communicative purposes they will have for the language.

45. CI: GC5, we res, respect the classics and etc. but one of the aims of this programme is also for you to critically reflect, you may not necessarily agree with one thing one hundred percent, you may want to justify kind of. … I want you to approach things analytically and critically. OK this is what Corder says but apparently here we see this emerging what, perspective that formal setting may be a better place, we do not say best, better place for learners to acquire the common core and naturalistic settings, GC4, to the what?

46. GC4: I ((laughing)) agree with GC1 and GC2 that both of them are involved because as we said to acquire the common core=

47. CI: =You do not necessarily have to agree with everything that they say

48. GC4: To acquire the common core, it is necessary to be in the classroom because in the classroom knowledge is structured=

49. CI: And formalized.

In this extract (5), experienced GC1 promptly provided a response to the instructor's initiation (turn 38). The socializer (CI) followed up by reiteration of this contribution, and afforded another experienced student-GC2 an opportunity to contribute (turn 39). This participant somewhat aligned her response with the contribution from GC1 while resorting to her transportable teacher identity and expressing her stance on the issue through the reiterated evaluative adjective (*"necessary"*, turn 40). At this point, in response to the socializer's positive follow-up and another initiation (turn 41), novice GC5 joined the discussion and indexed her position through the epistemic marker and adjective (*"I think", "dependent"*, turn 42). She aligned her contribution with GC2's previous proposition and for the sake of credibility resorted to the generic pronoun ("*we",* turn 42). However, since the CI did not provide a positive feedback (turn 43), GC5 was positioned to negotiate her

knowledge; she contested the instructor's feedback while foregrounding her discourse and transportable identities. In the process, this socializee attempted to reformulate her stance through the epistemic marker, categorical nouns and evaluation adjectives (*"But here I think the student, that the problem of selection is one of determining the relative utility to the particular group of learners", turn 44*).

Subsequently, the socializer CI partially acknowledged this participant's contribution and encouraged all students to approach the issue critically (turn 45). At this point another socializee-novice GC4 was positioned to display her stance on the issue and she chose to align with experienced GC1's and GC2's previous contributions through the epistemic marker, personal and inclusive pronouns (*"I ((laughing)) agree with GC1 and GC2, as we said", turn 46*), while implicitly misaligning herself from GC5. The instructor contested this contribution too (turn 47), however, here GC4, similar to GC5, maintained her discourse identity, negotiated knowledge and reformulated her stance through the categorical noun and evaluative adjective (*"To acquire the common core, it is necessary to be in the classroom", turn 48*). The CI complemented this contribution in her follow-up (turn 49).

Thus, through their participation in the whole-class discussion, both old-timers and novices had the opportunities to negotiate their knowledge, and enact their respective discourse, situated and transportable identities. In the process, their multiple identities intersected and shaped their participation in the unfolding oral academic discourse as they chose to participate in the oral academic discourse and hence expressed and enacted their agency.

In extract six, from one of the subsequent sessions, novice GC5 and experienced GC7 participated in a whole-class discussion *on the everlasting pedagogic issue of correctness and error correction.*

Extract 6 (session 4)

66. CI: … So there is a range of questions related to correctness here; feel free to undertake any of these but we are not going to discuss this Old Shiboleths example not yet right. We will discuss this issue at some length yes eh GC7 ehem,

67. GC7: Eh as it is mentioned here eh correctness means obeying the rules and conventions but there is a question of standard languages, can be considered one language as in a standard language we can have a flashback to world Englishes=

68. CI: Aha,

69. GC7: =And is there eh one standard language? Is it a language which, we can consider it as a standard English which can be a model and we can say that this is the correct use of English and all the speakers eh should obey this rule?

70. CI: Ehem,

71. GC7: Eh I am just wondering how can we have a criteria in order to say eh we have just used English as a correct way in,

72. CI: Right but what kind of English, there are so many Englishes yeah nowadays, thank you for this introduction aha OK?

73. GC5: I think eh the currency of alternative forms are very important for eh accepting it as a standard language or not, for example some sentences are correct but they are not current in spoken language therefore this is the role of applied linguistic and even eh teachers,

74. CI: Ehem,

75. GC5: To mention the eh currency of these alternative forms,

76. CI: Ehem if the teachers themselves know ((someone knocks at the door)) come in, if the teachers themselves know about what's current or not; right, this is very challenging and this suggests that teachers should themselves be kind of abreast of what's current and what's not yeah? What is acceptable and what is not; but GC5 mentioned something very important you said alternative forms yeah or options yeah? So, let's talk about this, who would like to continue? Who would like to continue? Right aha (2.0).

Following the instructor's initiation (turn 66), experienced GC7 resorted to one of the academic sources and made connections with the content of another graduate course, specifically on the issue of World Englishes (turn 67). In response to the socializer CI's follow-up backchannel (turn 68), the candidate foregrounded her discourse identity, and started contesting some of the related propositions through the categorical nouns, reiterated generic pronoun, modals and epistemic verbs, as well as evaluation adjective (*"standard language/English", "the speakers", "this rule", "we", "can", "should", "consider", "say", "correct"*, turn 69). Subsequently, after the CI's another follow-up backchannel (turn 70) the socializee continued in a similar vein and attempted to construct the identity of a relative expert (turn 71). At this point,

the socializer acknowledged and thanked GC7 for her contribution, however, somewhat contesting it in another initiation (turn 72).

In response, novice GC5 joined the discussion by negotiating her knowledge and manifesting her stance on the issue. In the process, she also attempted to construct the identity of a relative expert through the epistemic verb, categorical nouns, and evaluation adjectives (*"think", "the currency", "alternative forms", "standard language", "spoken language", "the role", "applied linguistics", "teachers", "important", "correct", "current",* turn 73). After the CI's follow-up backchannel (turn 74), the participant completed her contribution (75). At this point, the socializer provided additional input, acknowledged the novice's contribution through an evaluative adjective (*"very important"*, turn 76), and initiated another discussion. In this extract, the experienced and novice participants not only accessed their respective discourse identities, but were also afforded opportunities to temporarily shift their situated identity, from the socializee to the relative expert and hence to express their agency.

Furthermore, multiple instances of intertextual trajectories of participation or interdiscursivity as an inherent socialization aspect were frequently identified in the attested classroom evidence. In this graduate course concerned with contemporary Applied Linguistics issues as well as theories, models and projects, there was constant reference and cross-reference to different textbook readings, authors, their works, different quotes from the prominent scholars in the field, journals, and articles. The GCs would refer and cross-refer to the course related texts and materials with different purposes and in different ways. One purpose of actually referring to the texts was to make their contributions more relevant and to the point and in so doing validate what they were discussing, hence legitimize their stances/positions.

Nevertheless, some of the GCs resorted to intertextuality in an effort to be able to take part in and thus they appropriated academic texts in order to make contributions to the demanding whole-class discussions. In some cases, the appropriation enabled the GC(s) to gain the self-confidence and resort to the necessary language to perform in the oral academic activity. Regardless of the purpose of intertextuality, the GCs referred constantly to their previously encountered readings in the applied linguistics course or other graduate courses as well as to their background knowledge by recalling what they had discussed or studied earlier, thus, affording the novice GCs socializing opportunities. In extract seven below, two experienced GCs, GC7 and GC2, cross-referred to various readings and content knowledge that they appropriated and acquired respectively through their previous academic studies.

> Extract 7 (session 4)
> 67. GC7: Eh as it is mentioned here eh correctness means obeying the rules and conventions but there is a question of standard languages, can be considered one language as in a standard language we can have a flashback to World Englishes=
> 69. GC7: =And is there eh one standard language? Is it a language which, we can consider it as a standard English which can be a model and we can say that this is the correct use of English and all the speakers eh should obey this rule,
> (deleted lines)
> 76. CI: … What is acceptable and what is not; but GC5 mentioned something very important you said alternative forms yeah or options yeah? So, let's talk about this, who would like to continue? Who would like to continue? Right aha (2.0)
> 77. GC2: Hocam in pragmatics class we also last semester discussed that=
> 78. CI: Yeah.
> 79. GC2: =As teachers we have to offer our students many options of=
> 80. CI: Ehem, ehem,
> 81. GC2: =conveying some meaning if may not only with standard way but other options may be provided [to
> 82. CI: [Options as well as GC2?
> 83. GC3: Appropriateness,
> 84. CI: E : : h yeah options as to what would be appropriate, where, in which context, or what occasions, because learners should also know the implications of their choices if they decide on one form which may not be appropriate in a particular eh remember we discussed with politeness and impoliteness as well, … OK, very good what else? Eh I am glad that we can interrelate what you learned across different courses,….

In extract (7) on the *everlasting problem of the teaching profession-correctness and error correction*, a somewhat experienced GC7 not only resorted to one of the academic sources (*"Eh as it is mentioned here"*, turn 67) but also made connections with another graduate course, specifically on the issue of World Englishes (*"we can have a flashback to World Englishes=*, turn 67). In a subsequent turn, this socializee negotiated intertextuality by contesting some of the related propositions through the categorical nouns, reiterated generic pronoun, modals and epistemic verbs, as well as evaluation adjective ("*standard language/English"," we", "can", "consider", "say", "correct", "the speakers", "should", "this rule"*, turn 69) thus foregrounding her discourse and situated identity. In a similar vein, a more experienced GC2 also negotiated her knowledge on the issue from another course-Pragmatics, she expressed a strong stance by resorting to her transportable teacher identity (*"As teachers we have to offer our students many options"*, turn 79*; "other options may be provided"*, turn 81), this turn was somewhat elaborated by the course instructor in turn 84. This extract is an indication of how through intertextuality the GCs were socializing as well as being socialized into the discipline-specific knowledge and academic discourse.

Overall, the attested data on the first sessions of the graduate course indicated that the course instructor as well as the more experienced GCs socialized the members of the cohort through offering feedback and modelling, hence self-socializing and other-socializing into their disciplinary and academic knowledge. The CI used a variety of feedback types and strategies such as elaboration/non-elaboration, explanation, exemplification, utilization of peer support and feedback, elicitation, clarification request, questioning, etc. to enable the graduate students to make their respective contributions to the oral academic discussions.

In addition, engagement in cognitively difficult and argumentative academic discussions in this stage afforded the GCs multiple opportunities to construct various stances and identities hence enacting their agency. Furthermore, intertextuality was another socialization aspect of the oral academic discourse as the GCs were constantly involved in referring and cross-referring to various content knowledge, experiences, sources and resources. Text appropriation also afforded some of the less confident graduate candidates the opportunities to participate in whole-class discussions hence self-socialize into the oral academic discourse.

4.2.2.2 The Interim Sessions

As the semester progressed, the GCs started engaging more actively in self- and other- socialization. The participants seemed to become better aware of how to contribute quality questions to the weekly discussion agendas and how to make adequate contributions to the academic discussions in the graduate course resorting to intertextuality, the academic texts and articles as well as different scholars and their works.

It is noteworthy that similar to the first four sessions, the most salient aspects of the interim sessions were again modelling and feedback, intertextuality, identity construction and agency enactment. In the process, the GCs also displayed various stances, took on different positions, and contested being positioned by others throughout the oral academic discussions. The less experienced GCs carried on appropriating academic texts although in the interim sessions they seemed to exhibit more confidence.

In extract 8 below, the CI (turn 52) initiated a discussion and invited the GCs to compare the view of applied linguistics across three relevant works by Corder, Davies and McCarthy.

Extract 8 (session 5)

52. CI: = …. if we compare this view of applied linguistics with eh Corder and Davies (2.0) how would you compare three different views, Corder classic, Davies and McCarthy right there are three if we can kind of cross-refer different views, different ideas about what being and doing applied linguistics are all about (4.0). Let's start with Corder, let's start with Corder what was Corder's source and target? Remember GC1?

(deleted lines)

55. GC3: Eh I remember he excluded the social factors in his first (languages) and he was being criticized by Davies that he ignored social aspect of language,

(deleted lines)

58. CI: =… but again if we go back to source and target by Corder, GC1 and everyone else, for Corder applied linguistics equal what? [Language

59. GC6:   [Language   [teaching

60.CI: [Teaching or mostly. Remember? Yes GC6 you wanna add,

61. GC6: Eh I think also in the comparison to the Widdowson and McCarthy=

62. CI: Ehem, OK.

63. GC6: = There is a more for example in McCarthy applied linguists also focus on theories I think,

64. CI: Do they focus on theories? Or do they take theoretical stance?

65. GC6: Yes they take [theoretical stance,

66. CI [Stance, yeah?

67. GC6: Aha,

68. CI Not focus on theories but they instead of being theoretical they take a theoretical stance=

69. GC6: Ehem,

71. GC7: Eh he thinks it is a partnership not a top-down or a bottom-up process=

72. CI: OK.

73. GC7: =Which Wilkins 1982 *said bottom-up levelled by partn eh by practitioners against theoreticians, then both sides of the linguistic and applied linguistic relationship ought to be accountable* so it means that it's a bidirectional and have a partnership not a top-down or.

As the extract demonstrates, in turn 55, GC3 made a contribution to the classroom discussion by negotiating the course content knowledge (*he excluded the social factors in his first (languages) and he was being criticized by Davies that he ignored social aspect of language*). Subsequently, novice GC6 in turns 59, 61 (*Eh I think also in the comparison to the Widdowson and McCarthy*), turn 63 (*There is a more for example in McCarthy applied linguists also focus on theories I think*), and turn 65 foregrounded his discourse and situated identity by negotiating the content knowledge and displaying his stance; the socializer CI guided this participant towards the adequate

response through modelling and elicitation strategies. Another participant, GC7 in turn 71 (*Eh he thinks it is a partnership not a top-down or a bottom-up process*), chose to address the issue under discussion from another perspective and in turn 73, validated her contribution through resorting to direct quotation from the relevant academic text (bolded and highlighted section), hence intertextuality.

This extract is an example of how novice and experienced GCs negotiated their content and discipline-specific knowledge through their respective participation and contesting each other's views mostly implicitly in the unfolding oral academic discourse. The students' contributions to the whole-class discussions, in addition to the CI-socializer's input, afforded the classmates additional socialization opportunities to the graduate course content.

In another extract below, the CI initiated another academic discussion, on the issue of *ideology, text and being critical,* which afforded both novice and experienced students' opportunities to participate in the whole-class discussion by contributing their views and sharing their insights.

> Extract 9 (session 7)
> 178. CI: ….. can we subject all of them to critical analysis? (2.0) eh, are they all ideology invested? e : : h do you need to (2.0) (share) particular ideology in order to be critical? Or can you be apolitical or a-ideological or non-ideological and still read text critically? So what would you say? (12.0) for example, a text which gives you instructions as to how to deal with a particular equipment or what to do with in kind of emergency situation etc.? Can you subject it to critical analysis? Is it ideologically invested or motivated? Eh (2.0), OK, GC5?
> 179. GC5: Eh, page 338, the last paragraph, it says that *all texts equally encode the ideological positions of their producers*. If we place, and in the middle, *if we place a text in its context of production or reception, the point might be more readily taken.*
> 180. CI: Ehem,
> 181. GC5: And the,
> 182. CI: So then we have to go back to the producer and only then decide whether the text is the idologically, ideologically, sorry eh ((laughingly)) the one, motivated or invested. Thank you, GC5, GC1?
> 183. GC1: Hoca, here it discusses about eh eh three different viewpoints, for example, according to Widdowson, as far as I remember, he gives an example of eh technical text and=

184. CI: OK.

185. GC1: =So that there is no, eh, there is nothing critical here that you want to talk about it, but, eh the one that GC5 says Kress is, eh eh, you know, he has a kind of eh critical view toward the text like eh Fairclough=

186. CI: Ehem,

187. GC1: And they believe that all texts have some kind of critical viewpoint; but eh if we take a look at page 339, Eagleton mentions that, eh there are some, some degree of criticalization let's say exists in different text. So I think we have different ideas.

188. CI: OK, your ideas, OK, we have different ideas, your ideas; is every text ideologically motivated?

189. GC2: Hocam, the case with manuals or instructions, I don't think they are (3.0)

190. CI: Ehem, GC5 reminded us to go back to the producer, producers of those manuals and instructions, what was their (2.0) ideological eh motivation or investment? (2.0) (that's/those) kind of a more commercial nature yeah, maybe not a specific ideology but commercial ideology, I don't know if we can talk about commercial ideology, eh GC5,

191. GC5: Eh, I think all texts are eh ideologically concerned but the degree is different and eh especially the native speakers' writing, eh it is certainly more ideologically concerned than when, for example, I as a foreign language learner eh write because when I   [write (x)

192. CI: [Write about what GC5?
          [The topic is important

193. GC5: [Write about their language or their eh eh everything or when I see, every written word, when I write, because because I'm not native speaker, I'm eh I'm not eh concerned with political, or ideologically concerned and   [therefore

194. CI: [But some non-native speakers are concerned with political issues ((laugh))

195. GC5: But less than native speakers eh (2.0),

196. GC3: How do you generalize?

197. CI: OK, OK, so then what is the consensus here that, eh there are degrees of what, ideological investment in different texts, is this the consensus here? Ha

198. GC2: I am confused about the manuals or directions.

199. GC6: We should also look at the relationship between the receiver and the producer,=

200. CI: Ehem,

201. GC6: =I think and the contexts.

202. CI: Ehem, OK, can we, (yeah/here) the manual with instructions, OK, GC2 is the receiver, the text is the ((laughs)) intermediary ((laugh)) producer is what, …, for example I should call a ((laughs)) text which is a manual of instructions, how to operate the washing machine,

203. GC2: Yeah how can that text be ideological?

204. CI: How shall she approach it critically with a suspicious eye ((laughs))

205. GC3: politically,

206. CI: OK, I want you to think about it, think about it because, we'll be going back to this at critical applied stuff in our next discussion; ….

In this extract (9), following the CI's initiation of another academic discussion on some critical issues (turn 178), a novice GC5 provided a response resorting to intertextuality by quoting from the text (turn 179, bolded and highlighted lines). The socializer CI briefly elaborated on this contribution (turn 182); subsequently an old-timer GC1, referred to one of the authors and his works to validate her contribution to the unfolding discussion (turn 183) while explicitly misaligning herself with GC5's contribution (turn 185, *So that there is no eh there is nothing critical here that you want to talk about it but eh the one that GC5 says …*) by referring to a scholar in the academic text. At this point, the CI reformulated the contributions from these two participants (turn 188); subsequently, another participant-GC2 chose to implicitly contest the earlier contributions by GC1 and GC5 (turn 189,…*the case with manuals or instructions, I don't think they are*). This was also confirmed by the socializer CI who again followed-up by a brief elaboration on the issue and positioned GC5 to elaborate on her respective contribution. At this point, GC5 displayed her epistemic stance on the issue and foregrounded her non-native speaker identity (turn 191, *I think all texts are eh ideologically concerned but the degree is different and eh especially the native speakers' are writing, eh it is certainly more ideologically concerned than when for example I as a foreign language learner eh write because …*). In her follow-up, the CI again contested GC5's contribution and positioned this participant to provide clarification, which the CI did not align with (turn 194, *But some non-native speakers are concerned with political issues*); while GC3 contested the GC5's contribution by raising a related question (turn 196, *How do you generalize?*). Subsequently, the socializer CI chose to reconcile different contributions (turn 197) in response to which GC2 expressed her confusion (turn 198) and GC6 made a comment on through reference to the GC5' earlier contribution (turn 199, *We should also look*

at the relationship between the receiver and the producer, and turn 201, *I think and the contexts*). At this point, the CI again briefly elaborated as well as contested the issue yet another time and invited all GCs to critically reflect on the issue in their future discussion on critical applied linguistics agenda.

This extract provides evidence of how the GCs were afforded and afforded socialization opportunities for classmates (self- and other-socialization) and how classroom discussions led to contestation and argumentation, thus promoting the participants' critical thinking. Moreover, through engagement in discussion with more experienced and knowledgeable peers, the less experienced GCs also foregrounded their discourse and situated identities through their contributions and took on various stances. Further, socialization was not only initiated by the more experienced GCs, but also the less experienced GCs exercised their agency and contested the contributions, as such affording socialization opportunities for each other.

Assuming socialization roles through oral academic discussions and thus taking on expert identities was another socialization aspect of the cohort in question. Extract 10 is an example from session nine, the round-table discussions which was monitored by three experienced GCs, GC1, GC2 and GC3, showing how the more experienced GCs afforded socialization opportunities for themselves and their peers to the oral academic discourse. The extract below demonstrates how the moderators GC2 and GC3 and novice GC5 were discussing the scope of applied linguistics in the round-table discussion.

Extract 10 (session 9)
29. GC3: And the what do you think about this? Do you think an applied linguistics is too wide and vague?
30. GC5: It's eh something wide and broad and maybe it's vague but we can eh study and cover these areas because eh according to eh the writer it is like the oyster and it can include and it can eh concerd eh every everywhere, the science of everything and eh (2.0) every aspect of life, it can include even literacy, culture, foreign language acquisition.

31. GC3: Yes while including, what do you mean how including? Like addressing directly each and every thing on this world?

32. GC5: E :h,

33. GC3: What (GC5 says) where is the limit of applied linguistics do you think in your opinion?

34. GC5: All of these disciplines which are related to language for example psychological aspects which are related to language not,

35. GC3: Ehem,

36. GC5: Those parts of psychology which are divided from language.

37. GC3: Aha yeah GC2 did you want to say something?

38. GC2: Eh in the previous session we have discussed that it is not possible to claim that applied linguistics is the science of everything.

39. GC3: Ehem,

40. GC2: It is conceived as this because it is good, applied linguistics is related to eh language problems in many areas but in ery, every area of course there can be problem related to language but we cannot claim that applied linguistics can address every problems of every field just because language they deal with language.

41. GC3: OK, (do you agree/agree)? Eh anyth, anyone else like to speak up before we move on to the second question? …. eh so do you think applied linguistics is a subject or a discipline why? (3.0)

Here (extract 10), in response to moderator GC3's initiation (turn 29), novice GC5 negotiated her knowledge, however somewhat mitigating her proposition and contesting it at the same time (*"maybe it's vague but we can eh study and cover these areas",* turn 30). In the process, she aligned herself with the related proposition from the academic source (*"according to eh the writer", "it is the science of everything",* turn 30). However, the moderator contested this contribution, positioned her peer to revisit the issue through clarification requests and temporarily shifted to the identity of a socializer (turns 31 and 33). GC5 hesitated briefly (turn 32), then resumed negotiation of knowledge (turn 34) and in response to the moderator's follow-up backchannel (turn 35), she completed expressing her stance on the issue (turn 36). GC3 acknowledged this contribution and invited another moderator-GC2 to provide feedback (turn 37). At this point, GC2 also contested the novice's contribution through the inclusive pronoun, categorical nouns and evaluative adjective and temporarily shifting to the socializer identity (*"we" "not possible", "claim", "applied*

linguistics", "the science of everything", turn 38). After GC3's follow-up backchannel (turn 39), moderator GC2 resumed socializing her peers through her contribution with the generic pronoun, categorical nouns and a modal (*"but in ery, every area of course there can be problem related to language but we cannot claim that applied linguistics can address every problem…",* turn 40). Subsequently, moderator GC3 took over and initiated another related discussion (turn 41). This extract from the round-table discussion reflected the dynamic nature of the various identities evoked by the graduate candidates, the socialization opportunities for the novice GC to negotiate her knowledge and express her stance, and for the experienced students to position themselves as socializers to and through the unfolding oral academic discourse.

Importantly, intertextual trajectories of participation or interdiscursivity as another inherent aspect of academic discourse socialization process increased especially towards the end of the interim phase. Sometimes, the GCs appropriated academic texts also for a variety of reasons, to validate their contributions, exhibit the necessary competence or gain confidence to participate in whole-class discussions. Thereby, the participants were afforded socialization opportunities to the course contents and academic discourse. Another two representative examples are presented below. Extract 11 illustrates another whole-class academic discussion on the issues of *the native speaker and expert language user*:

Extract 11 (session 8)
249. CI … So, should it be native speakers that language pedagogy must target or expert users? Who should be the (3.0), what kind of (x) should we be promoting in the language classroom? And by, by all means you should take into account all those recent geopolitical, sociocultural and historical changes that have been happening on the globe? Yeah, aha, GC2?
250. GC2: Hocam in our previous discussion we talked about the native speakersim becoming a myth,
251. CI: Aha,

252. GC2: And the, not only these speakers are expert users of language and not all of them can be modeled=
253. CI: Ehem,
254. GC2: =Or should be modeled.
255. CI: Ehem,
256. GC2: And we concluded eh our discussion, last, last discussion eh saying that we should opt for a partial proficiency between ne native speakers and expert users and we also looked at some criteria=
257. CI: Ehem,
258. GC2: =Eh and eh we saw   [the
259. CI: [And some of them are reflected here again, right GC2, some criteria like first language (2.0) criterion, or like acquisitional or developmental criteria remember?
260. GC2: Yes.

In this extract, in response to the course instructor's initiation, GC2 chose to validate her contribution to the academic discussion by foregrounding her discourse and situated identity and reiterating the highlights of the previous discussions (turns 250, 252, 254, and 256). In her follow-up, the socializer course instructor complemented the participant's contributions (turn 259). Thus, this classroom discussion afforded GC2 to refer and cross-refer to the relevant academic content which provided socialization input for the other participants.

In another extract below (12), two participants, GC4 and GC7, appropriated the academic terms (the *italicized* lines) in order to adequately contribute to the academic discussions on the applied linguistics research paradigms.

Extract 12 (session 8)
126. GC4: And usually … research *is accompanied by eh techniques and associated with eh harder sciences* and eh it is *synonymous with eh:: investigation* and the word studies as well; and eh they are usually *taken place in classrooms or in laboratory-type settings.* And eh another view is of *British tradition* a : nd it tends to *attach a wider scope to the word research,* eh it embraces such kind of acti, the *activities as corpus linguistics, and textual analysis, historical research, lexicographical research, research materials* for descriptions and *pedagogical grammars* and etc. (2.0) eh em so em the definition of research is eh somehow synonymous with eh oriented empirical studies (4.0).
129. GC7: I think, to what GC4 said, eh there are three major eh … in research with eh the first one is qualitative research with emphasis eh *observation and close contact and cooperation with the target participant, case study and critical insights,* the other one is quantitative research with concern with measurement.

91

133. GC7: Which concerns as Henry Widdowson and Bernard Spolsky mention eh *have done much to map out the philosophical* theorot eh *territory in which the practice of applied linguistics takes place.*

In this extract (12), GC4 (turn 126) and GC7 (turns 129 and 133) resorted to the academic terms from the relevant sources in order to assume (GC4) and foreground (GC7) their discourse and situated identities respectively in the unfolding academic discourse on the applied linguistics research. It is worth noting that it was not only the GCs who benefitted from intertextuality, the course instructor also employed this in order to afford opportunities for the GCs' socialization to the academic and discipline-specific knowledge and promote their contributions to prospective academic discussions.

Overall, across the interim sessions, the rate of intertextuality increased significantly as the GCs chose to actively negotiate their academic knowledge, to legitimize their positions and memberships in the graduate course context. Across these academic discussions, the GCs took various stances, were positioned and positioned themselves, and constructed various aspects of their identities thus exercising and enacting their agency in the process.

4.2.2.3 The Final Sessions

In the final-oral academic presentation sessions, the GCs also moderated the classroom discussions and provided feedback and modeling accordingly. The presentations usually followed a fixed format, a summary of the article to be presented, its critique of the article, and a follow-up discussion. The socialization aspects of feedback, modeling, and uptake varied in the oral academic presentations by the GCs and in their accompanying discussions. Overall, similar to the initial and interim stages, stance display, identity construction and agency manifestation on the part of the cohort in question were also evident in the final stage. Especially, the academic

and professional content knowledge gained through their participation in the course afforded the GCs the opportunities to transport respective identities to the unfolding academic discourse by referring to their connections or identification with the outside social as well as professional world. Two representative extracts from the final session data are presented below.

Extract 13 demonstrates a follow-up discussion following GC1's oral academic presentation on identity which led to a discussion on how the participants developed and constructed their identities through academic discourse socialization in the context of the study.

Extract 13 (session 11)
114. CI: ... Let's move on to institutional, professional identity, eh:: you taught before, you had taught before, now you are involved in professional learning (1.2) PhD program so how about ↑this identity or this dimension of your ↓identity?
115. GC1: Hocam . ⌈eh::
116. CI: ⌊how do you feel about this identity
117. GC1: (1.2) Hocam, I feel like, eh:: you know I feel if I had experienced the::se days befo:re I would have (1.8) eh:: you know, behaved in another form in my classrooms.
118. CI: these you mean If you had=
119. GC1: =the PhD classes=
120. CI: =if you had eh:: ⌈known⌉ =
121. GC1:   ⌊yes⌋
122. CI: =the things that you have been learning in our program befo:re, you would have done what?
123. GC1: eh:: I would have behaved in another way, with more self-confidence.
124. CI: Aha:
125. GC1: I wouldn't have actually paid attention more to the professional aspect of my job.
126. CI: so ⌈the:n
127. GC1:   ⌊and authorities ⌈and⌉ actually supervision I would have ignored them
128. CI: ⌊aha⌋
129. CI: so the:n ((laugh)) your professional learning has been gaining you: self-↓confidence Is this what you are trying to say?
130. GC1: Yes.
131. CI: OK, interesting, GC3 is a different case, GC3 did his masters' in education in UK so the:n you can carry on=
132. GC3: =yes I started my undergraduate studies in Cyprus actually and my studies were in Turkish=
133. CI: your BA was in Turkish? And you did masters in English?

134. GC3: yes, and then, eh:: also I have been a part of an international student organization for the last six years and from there and from my experience in England and from friends I gained here, I have been using English more than I used to, used ((cough)) before my master's actually before even joining this ⌐thing ((PhD program))

135. CI: └let's talk about your ⌐identity

136. GC3: └yes, I will come to that, eh:: when it happens you don't eh realize that you are changing step by step, it is not conscious, but at the end of the day when you eh:: look at it from that aspect (1) I sometimes think that I have changed quite a lot when I compare myself with myself like eight years ago, culturally, linguistically even the language I use, both in Turkish and English, is becoming more for example because of this PhD is becoming academic and more professional I find myself using words that eh:: eh:: academic language words and my:: Turkish is influenced a lot because of this as well, because using English in my daily life is like fifty-fifty for me now, because almost more than half of my friends on my social networks they are from people, they are people from abroad, so I don't use English on campus I also use it in my social life. So it is becoming a:: larger part of my life and it has influenced my Turkish and I have started using code-switching, I borrow a lot of words from English into my Turkish speech, and while speaking, if the one that I am talking to gives me responses in that language, me, I sometimes switch to English without realizing that I am speaking English=

137. GC1: =Hocam, I have the same problem with GC3, I try to speak with him in Turkish he answers me in English=

138. GC3: =but then without control we switch to English and then we switch to Turkish, and also in my culture I observe this, my habits, my tastes my eh: even my nutrition like eh: it is changing, it is changing ⌐a lot ⌐ it is therefore changing my identity who I am.

139. CI: └ and it is changing┘

140. CI: so to kind of conclude, thank you for sharing with us, by the way you kind of admit that   English: has been playing a very important ro:le in your identity development and change, is that ↑right GC3 over the past six years or seven ⌐years or┐ so, GC3? And you feel good about it?

141. GC3: └ six years or seven years┘   yeah, I became more aware of other cultures, other people because English is the medium that I get to know about those people, and when I learn about their culture in a way it influences me, I, I for example, I try something and then it becomes a habit because I like it=

142. CI: =right and finally let me ask GC2, if you can, GC2, your identity I am asking GC2 because eh:: GC2:: did her bachelor's and master's in this context ,right eh: So and eh:: she continues within the same context but with a somehow new identity, right, GC2? So how do you feel about (2.0), OK, since you have been involved in graduate studies, let me put it this way, right? ….

143. GC2: Similar to GC1 and GC3, I also have observed eh:: an improvement in academic sense of course and language as well, maybe, but because I don't have any teaching experience I don't know ⌐eh:

144. CI: └like apart from teaching practice, school experience that you did at the bachelor's level, you cannot talk much about ⌐teacher┐ state identity, right? Not the teacher, not the classroom identity, not yet?

145. GC2: └ the teacher identity┘

146. CI: ah:: But ah:: in terms of professional learning, °like you started as master's, you did your classes, you did your thesis°, you defended your thesis and now you are engaged in, ah … this is your second semester right? Do you see the difference, do you feel the difference? And how do you feel about it and what it is gaining you?

147. GC2: I do, Hocam, and it's eh, also reflects on my social life as well, for example when I am presented with something new I don't know it's because we are always trying to (1.1) evaluate things with a critical eye and see the reflection in my social life as well. For example, when I am watching a movie or when I am reading a book, I think it has affected my way of thinking in a good sense ⌐of course.

148. CI: └right, thank you for sharing, the reason for my asking ah:: in addition to the fact that it is related to our ah:: discussion is ah::: this ….

In this extract (13), the socializer-course instructor initiated a discussion on graduate student identity (turn 114) in response to which the participants shared their unique experiences and insights. In several contributions, GC1 pointed to her experience gained through her graduate program, mostly 'self-confidence' (turns 117, 119, 123, 125, and 127) thus foregrounding her academic identity. Subsequently, GC3 resorted to his previous academic studies and English language learning experiences and shared their impact on his lifestyle, habits and most importantly academic and social identity (turn 136, *even the language I use both in Turkish and English is becoming more ... academic and more professional ...I sometimes switch to English without realizing that I am speaking English*; turn 138, *… also in my culture I observe this my habits my tastes my eh: even my nutrition like eh: it is changing …*; turn 141, *yeah I became more aware of other cultures…*). Another participant-GC2, who was well familiar with the context of the study from her previous bachelor's and master's experiences, shared how her doctoral studies changed her perspectives and attitude towards her life in general, by affording her the insight to approach things critically and develop her academic identity (*turn 143 and 147 ... I also have observed eh:: an improvement in academic sense of course*). As the extract demonstrates, the GCs

transported various aspects of their identities while contributing through and to the oral academic discourse in the graduate classroom.

In the final extract below from towards the course completion, GC2 gave a presentation on *redefining multi-competence for bilingualism and ELF* (the critique portion of the presentation is *italicized*).

Extract 14 (session 12)
16. GC2: The article that we are going to discuss is titled redefining multi competence for bilingualism and ELF. It's by Cem Alptekin … and ELF in culture in English are among his research interests. Because when I was writing my thesis I always came across his articles on English as a lingua franca. .... *And regarding critiques, eh first of all, for me, it was from time to time very difficult to follow up because it was always talking about abstract contents, concepts but the positive thing I can say … is throughout the course we have all discussed how an applied linguist may, might behave and here when offering a new perspective in defining multicompetence in light of the recent changes we can say that Alptekin is, in a way, fulfilling the responsibilities of an applied linguist. Because he is eva re-evaluating concepts in light of the recent political as well as social changes, and also the topics he talks about eh we have already discussed these in Alan Davies' and McCarthy's* articles as well and in lang, these researchers, Alptekin also emphasises that eh according to the roles of the learners, they should be guided to mediate between the native speaker or the expert user and again these are the topics that we discussed in our previous sessions as well. That's all.
18. GC6: Considering the growing number of bilinguals and also the spread of world Englishes ah:: Where do you think we are at the stage of acculturation process – when you look at acculturation?
19. GC2: what do you mean by acculturation?
20. GC6: By, I mean uh, that like uh, in the globalized world – as EFL students, I mean in this context? (1.1) Do you feel we are uh: as a teachers we can teach acculturation?
21. GC2: Well, I don't think students who study here, students who study English here ah:: have any problems regarding acculturation, I think it is related to those who study in the – target culture.
22. GC6: Hem, hem (3.8) so do think that there is no hem, need for teaching acculturation here?
23. GC2: here, I don't think so.=
25. GC6: [Yeah, I mean what kind of [approaches?
26. CI: [can you reword your [question?
27. GC6: [Yes, yah, ok Yes, yes, I mean that uhh: like what kind of approaches, pedagogical assumptions we can take in order to help the students in the acculturation process?
28. CI: aha, so how to promote [the acculturation] into the target [language?] Is that right? How to make their life easier?
29. GC6:   [Yes]   [Yes, yes] yes, yes, like what kind of strategies, approaches we can take?

30. CI: ok, ok, this is a question to GC2, and others can also join in if you wish. GC2, let's start with you.

31. GC2: I think that kind of preparation is necessary for students who are going to live in the target culture, so those students who: want to learn English not as a lingua franca but as English as a second language I guess, so those learners will definitely need eh to be familiar with the culture and they eh have to learn about the culture (xx) etc.

32. GC6: ehem,

33. GC3: Can I make a comment?

34. CI: yes, GC3 wants to make a comment=

35. GC3: =And also about the teaching the culture and acculturation process is, when we are talking about English as a lingua franca, which is, eh I don't think we can talk about specific culture to teach, so, because it's not a second language in a eh: specific country, when its lingua franca (1.1) maybe there is no native English speaker existence in the context eh: anyway, a Spanish person can communicate with a Malaysian in English, in that case what culture are we talking about? What acculturation we are talking about?

36. GC2: I [think,

38. GC6: [Yes]

39. GC2: im I remembered the example GC3 gave us when he was, although he was studying in [England], he was more involved with again people from other
            [countries]

40. GC3: [England] [yeah internationals] °yes international students°.

41. GC2: so even in the target culture it is possible to   [we

42. GC3:   [but I think that's because of a kind of socialisolation from the native community,

43. CI: OK, let's see what GC1 has to [say, GC1,

44. GC1: [uh:: about GC6's question, I think here in such °you know° ,situations like this university, the attitude is more important °than the acculturation° ,the attitude of the students toward the native, towards English eh:: that is something that we have to, for example, pay attention in classrooms, it's not teaching the culture but changing the attitudes because among some … students I've seen that eh: they ah a kind of resist learning the language because of their negative attitudes towards other identities, other cultures, other languages, so I think changing the attitude, and trying to make them eh:: more actually, familiar with the new culture is the first step eh to deal with it.

46. GC1: uhh, Hocam, it's a kind of, uh, because, they have, that, but we know that the students who study here, not all of them, are not perfect users of the [language] and uh: many of them are uh kind of uh, they don't do it, let's say eagerly, they don't, they are not interested in learning and improving their language.

47. CI: [OK, yeah] interesting=

48. GC1: =uh especially the ones who are at elementary level, it's most.

49. CI: ones who are still [struggling with the language,

50. GC2: [But they have to develop their language] but at the same time [you said they have negative attitude,

51. GC1: [yes because] [they have negative uh, and that's why they actually don't devote themselves wholly to the process of learning the language from different aspects.

52. CI: let's see what GC5's wants to say,

53. GC5: I want to say that it cannot be the general case, I think that, uh: as I see most …, they have enough English proficiency but something which happens here eh, they don't want to accept the, eh: acculturation process, I think, ahh, because if you see … their scores as my friends, I don't have a scientific, statistics, most of my friend even in BA courses they have passed the English proficiency with high scores but, they ha, don't like to accept the acculturation process, and in this university I think that one culture doesn't happen, we are: exposed to different culture, Nigerian culture, Turkish culture, and even Arabic culture and ehh, some students who are in here, who have enough attentin aha, enough motivation, they can adjust themselves to this university well, cope with this university well and get good scores next term, but some of them are [unintelligible] and they don't like to accept this new culture, therefore you see that for example they are depressed or their scores are not good in next semesters, it's my own [experience.

On completion of the GC2's oral academic presentation, GC6 initiated a follow-up discussion (turn 18) to which GC2 responded by requesting further clarification. GC6 complied with the request (turn 20) and negotiation of knowledge between the participants continued for a brief while (turns 21, 22, 23). Subsequently, the socializer CI mediated and invited GC6 to reformulate the original question, and GC6 achieved it through some negotiation strategies. The course instructor at this point (turns 28, and 30) chose to reformulate the question again for the sake of clarity and invited the GCs to join the discussion. Subsequently, GC2 displayed her epistemic stance and position through the use of epistemic verbs and adjectives (*I think that kind of preparation is necessary, ...as a second language I guess, ...so those learners will definitely need, ...they eh have to learn*) indexing her experienced identity as an old-timer. GC3 also chose to contribute to the unfolding academic discussion by contesting the GC6's question (*eh I don't think we can talk about specific culture to teach*), however aligning with the GC2's contribution (turn 35). Subsequently, GC2 chose to align with the GC3's contribution (turns 39 and 41) by referring to this participant's previously shared experiences (*although he was studying in [England], he was more involved with again people from other [countries], so even in the target culture it is possible to …*). At this point, the socializer CI felt the need to moderate and invited GC1 to make

a contribution to the ongoing discussion. This participant responded by contesting the issue, chose to add a new dimension to the issue of acculturation (turns 44, 46 and 48) thus foregrounding her discourse and situated identity. Subsequently, GC2 contested the GC1's contribution (turn 50) implicitly misaligning from it, to which GC1 responded in turn 51. Finally, GC5 also contested the GC1's contribution (turn 53, *it cannot be the general case I think…*), and this contribution, in addition to the previous ones, indicated yet another time the multi-directionality of the academic discourse socialization between and among the more and less experienced participants. This extract from the final sessions of the graduate course demonstrated how the GCs negotiated their knowledge, stances, and positions developing their academic competence and constructing academic identity. Additionally, the input and feedback provided by all members of the cohort through content and discipline-specific knowledge negotiation as well as intertextuality enhanced their socialization opportunities to the oral academic discourse.

Overall, the analysis of the attested academic oral discourse data revealed that not only the course instructor but also the graduate candidates afforded, through feedback and modelling, self- and other-socialization opportunities in the graduate classroom. Also, through participation across the whole-class academic discussions, the cohort constructed multiple identities and enacted agency. Further, engagement in the discussions of the cognitively difficult and argumentative applied linguistics issues promoted the GCs' critical thinking skills. The participants also referred and cross-referred to different academic sources and resources throughout their academic discussions which promoted their academic learning and competence.

4.3 Macro-perspective

The macro-perspective addresses "sociological aspects of language development" by exploring "processes that are evident in a wider sociocultural context" (Duff & Talmy, 2011, pp. 98-103). Therefore, we examined the interview data on the students' socialization experiences in the graduate context, specifically related to interaction with peers and professors and engagement in other discursive activities and practices of their community. The qualitative interview data were gathered from the volunteer students over one year of their graduate studies in the context. The interview conducted with the graduate course instructor provided additional insights to the participants' socialization process from the socializer perspective in the given academic community. The content analysis of the interviews reports reflected the graduate candidates' complex socialization experiences to the academic community.

4.3.1 Interviews

Two interviews were conducted with three focal-volunteer graduate students over one academic year, the first interview at the end of the fall semester and the second towards the end of the spring semester. Subsequently, the interview transcripts were content analyzed (Patton, 2002) for the evidence of the socialization phenomena in the participants' insights to their socialization experiences in the graduate context. Finally, in order to ensure the consistency of the analyses, the qualitative data sources in the present study were triangulated (Patton, 2002).

4.3.1.1 First Interview

The first interview was held towards the end of the fall semester of the participants' graduate studies. One of the focal students-an experienced GC1 showed a lot of interest in the present research and since this participant and the researcher had taken some graduate courses in the previous semesters, the established rapport made her feel quite

comfortable in sharing her socialization experiences in the context under study. In the initial interview, GC1 expressed that a PhD program should mainly involve discussions of theories and principles rather than the language teacher's practice. In this regard, she resorted to intertextuality by employing one of the key concepts from one of the content courses, theorizing in applied linguistics as follows: "*I think being more involved in the process of theorizing can be a PhD candidate's goal*". Further, this participant also exhibited an awareness of the aims of the graduate courses which seemed to indicate the socialization opportunities to the academic discourse afforded by the program and required graduate coursework as illustrated below:

> All of the courses have the aim of giving comprehensive picture of what is, really goes on in the field and just giving awareness, finding the philosophies behind all the materials that we have confronted with so far…

Subsequently, GC1 reiterated her growing awareness of the academic expectations of the graduate program with special emphasis on the critical discussions of current issues especially in one of the content courses. However, this participant emphasized the need for solid background knowledge in her discipline and related social sciences in order to be able to contribute to classroom discussions. Importantly, this experienced candidate expressed the importance of critical discussions and course work in her academic studies as follows:

> The discussions, ah … actually I can say the critical discussions and papers we wrote also were kind of great importance because we learned how to think and write critically, ah … that was good.

At this point in the interview, importantly, the participant resorted to her academic and social identity in order to highlight the different socio-cultural and academic norms of the new graduate context which provided insights to the complexity and novelty of her initial socialization experiences as demonstrated below:

…you know you can here see that really people are different, their cultures, the way they think ……this let's say this PhD program was really a change for me, I could see the life from another perspective…

Furthermore, GC1 further reflected on her socialization experiences and the novelty of the graduate course requirements. Importantly, the participant noted the supportive networks of peers and professors in affording her socialization opportunities as follows:

I talked with … Hoca and she told me that you need time to adjust yourself, with the new change, first day I remember the reactions of the teachers, how they try to support us, my classmates were very skillful, very professional ones; and for the first time I faced with eh : kind of … technology mediated course, Moodle.

In addition, the interview insights from this participant suggested that her professors and peers as socialization agents enabled her to construct a legitimate identity of a PhD student as illustrated in the extract: "*in … class I felt that I am a PhD student*".

Moreover, the candidate shared that her participation in various academic discussions of the core issues across different graduated courses gained her different perspectives and improved her ability to resort to and appropriate academic texts. Furthermore, the interviewee's insights manifested her agency in the academic studies as follows: *"I tried my best, I tried a lot"*.

Overall, the first interview insights from GC1 seemed to indicate that through participation in different graduate program activities such as classroom discussions, interactions with peers and professors and completion of the required course work she was gradually constructing her membership and academic identity in the respective academic community of practice.

Another volunteer participant, novice GC4, chose to provide a very brief account of her socialization experiences in the graduate context under study. The interviewee resorted to her previous academic identity in order to reflect on the academic norms of

the home and new graduate context. She shared that various courses in the program

afforded her multiple socialization opportunities to the new academic community. The

participant expressed that the graduate coursework was challenging; importantly, she

felt she was acquiring the required theoretical and practical knowledge through

participation in the courses which was crucial for her emerging identity of a PhD

student as follows:

> …so it is a kind of eh theoretical bricks in the building, so, and through [though] all the courses are vice versa like practical ones, and I also find them very relevant and very eh challenging at the same time, but I think that s I like them all because I really need a kind of ehm theoretical and practical background when I will be a eh teacher in the future.

At this point in the interview, she also exhibited an awareness of the academic

requirements for her to meet and shifted to the identity of a novice candidate as

demonstrated in the following insight: "*…so I still need much to do; still a:: ─large*

area to improve and to search". Subsequently, she reiterated the same awareness and

expressed her agency in relation to the academic work:

> I still need much improvement eh not only in the eh ELT, I mean as a teacher eh also as a: :n academician a:::s for example article writers and etc., nd so I still need much to do ─ and there is a long way to go.

Further, GC4 again resorted to her previous academic identity to highlight her

current academic commitments and felt optimistic regarding her prospective

membership in the given graduate community as follows:

> I have bee::n publishing my articles eh:: since I have been studying in the yes at the university but you know it is still a:: ─large area to improve and to search and I think I will improve it when I :: finish PhD program and then may be able to be a competent member.

Yet another participant, GC2, was not a novice, however less experienced than

GC1. This interviewee shared that she was familiar with the goals of the PhD program

and courses in that they aimed to provide candidates with the required theoretical

background as well as current issues, encourage them to critically reflect and analyze

which promoted their academic skills. Further, she believed that the graduate students enrolled in the program were expected to adhere to the academic ethics. Similar to her peers, her temporal shift to the previous academic identity allowed GC2 to reflect on her current graduate academic studies and the previous studies. At this point in the interview, she emphasized the challenges in terms of academic socialization as follows:*"…and sometimes it is difficult, more difficult especially when compared to Master's when I compare the courses…"*

Importantly, this participant expressed and reiterated that she had been engaged in academic learning since the start of the course work, and that she was aware of the related challenges: *"…but we have been learning and it takes some times to absorb the information".*

Although GC2's insights seemed to indicate socialization opportunities afforded by various courses, the challenging nature of the related experiences was also evident in the following insight:

> …is so much to absorb so much to learn, every week we are presented with new information, new concepts, we have too much to work on so sometimes it is not very easy…

Interestingly, at this stage of her graduate studies, this experienced candidate still regarded herself as a novice member of the ELT community and she felt she benefited from the intertextuality through participation in various graduate courses as follows:

> From each course we always learn something new, whether it is related to that course specifically or in general for example in and every course is related to one another in a way and overlap so when in applied linguistics class and I am presented with new information I can connect it to something that we disused in SLA.

4.3.1.2 Second Interview

During the second interview, the GCs seemed to be more confident and noted the benefits of their interaction with professors and classmates as well as engagement in

various discursive activities and practices of their academic community. Throughout their insights, the participants shared their socialization experiences to the graduate culture, as well as displayed various instances of their identity development suggesting promising changes in their academic competence.

In her subsequent interview, experienced GC1 reiterated the affordance of various socialization opportunities through her participation in the graduate coursework, hence related academic gains. The participant shared how her engagement in various activities such as project preparation and paper writing helped her to gradually establish membership in the academic community as well as construct an identity of an academic writer as follows: *"I can organize my thoughts and ideas when I want to start writing, I've learned to work based on an outline to let's say compose the text."*

The candidate also felt confident about her increasing discipline-specific knowledge as illustrated below:

> …also in applied linguistics, eh I said now I can differentiate between linguistics and applied linguistics and what are the different applications of the course, for example in designing dictionaries, in political issues you know, now I can say that, I can feel that in this humanistic science, all different areas like policy studies, educational studies, religious studies, …

At this point in the interview, she noted the benefits of the increased intertextuality across her graduate coursework as follows: *"I can feel the interconnectedness and overlap between all these lessons"*. Further, GC1 shared that her socialization experiences outside the graduate classroom space also involved meeting people from various cultures and countries. Specifically some of such encounters helped her develop her new identity-that of a learner of Turkish as demonstrated by the insight below:

> I found many Turkish friends here ((laugh)), We speak in Turkish and I could develop my third let's say language skills here.

In this regard, the participant referred to the socialization changes that she had undergone in the academic environment as follows: *"....interaction, culture exchange, culture transformation that something that you don't experience it normally in other environments..."*. GC1 felt that these socialization experiences contributed to her professional identity as follows:

> ...as a teacher, this psychological situation is experience, these psychological situations very positive because I can feel, I can understand now the students who are dealing with three languages may be in this university...

She further foregrounded her teacher identity as illustrated in: *"I, I understand these strategies they may use or eh the, the points that as a teacher we need to pay attention when we are teaching to these group of learners"*.

In addition, GC1 expressed the benefits of her participation in various discussions of critical issues across the graduate courses for her in terms of not only academic but also professional development. In this regard, she also emphasized the role of the given graduate context in her transforming knowledge.

> So these eh actually new courses, let's say opened new perspectives, new visions toward the, toward my knowledge of English language teaching aspects, different aspects, different let's say current discussions and issues, discussing the issues such as the internationalization, globalization, critical discourse analysis eh and focusing on this actually areas was very important...

In the second interview, another participant-GC4 chose to share more about her socialization experiences in the graduate context. The candidate reiterated that her graduate study raised her awareness of the need for more academic and professional knowledge. The participant also talked about the socialization opportunities afforded across the context, specifically the socialization roles of professors and peers as follows:

> ...in classroom eh, even outside the classroom, eh because most of my friends are from other countries so I have, had to interact in English language and so it improves my English a lot, interaction with my ce I mean classroom mates and professors, peers.

At this point, the candidate noted the international profile of her graduate peers, expressing her satisfaction with various interactions in English outside the graduate classroom as follows: "…*many different con, cultures, people from many different countries so eh I I had to eh I mean get acquainted with many people…*"

In this regard, GC4 felt that the graduate context with its international students contributed to her mastery of English and improvement of content knowledge. Importantly, the interviewee pointed out that her participation in various academic activities in the given context helped her notice her shortcomings and consequently make more efforts to bridge the knowledge gap. Further, the candidate highlighted the novelty of her socialization experiences and learning in the new academic context as follows: "… *everything is new and is totally different… this knowledge is totally different than what we are doing here is totally different. The organization of the classes, I mean the courses itself so very different.*"

Importantly, GC4 felt she was constructing her PhD identity as a form of academic competence as demonstrated by the insight: "*… I gained a lot from the eh project and from the eh the things I'm doing here, assignments…*"

In the subsequent interview, GC2 also reiterated that over her graduate studies she further improved her academic English and that the feedback provided by the professors on the graduate course work was beneficial as follows: "*I think most importantly the feedback is good for us*". She also noted the role of intertextuality in their academic learning:

> …for example, today we were talking about things we have learned in the … class like the post method era, they are different subjects but we are eh able to connect them together as we move along this process…

This participant shared that one of the most important challenges in her socialization experiences was the fact that she was not practicing teaching parallel to

her academic studies which she felt affected her ability to relate the theoretical background of the graduate course work to the real classroom experience. Further, she emphasized the role of interaction with peers, classmates, professors and other graduate candidates on campus in her socialization in general and improvement of her academic English in particular. The interviewee also noted the importance of participation in various academic activities for her prospective academic life as demonstrated by the insight below:

> …we (xx) are engaging in discussion so it prepares us for this academic life, so I can say that in that perspective our courses are effective because we are not just being lectured, we are always engaged in different conversations and discussions so it somehow prepares us for this academic life…

Interestingly, this GC reiterated the challenging, yet rewarding aspect of her graduate studies as well as her agency by choosing to study more as follows:

> I want to talk… about the courses I can say all of them are challenging…in PhD I feel this difficulty, and sometimes there are eh some articles that I have to read twice or three times to understand and even understand them better while discussing them in the classroom…

At this point, she expressed her academic gains as a result of her effort:

> I can say every course has been challenging for me but in the end all was rewarding because I, I really felt, I really feel that I am, I am rewarded I can, I have gained something…

Through her informal interaction with peers from other educational contexts the participant felt she was in a position to state: *"I feel that our education here is better…"*

Overall, the interview insights provided by three participants suggested that their socialization experiences throughout their academic studies were challenging yet rewarding. These insights also reflected their growing confidence as graduate candidates. The participants appeared to establish, idiosyncratically, legitimate membership and hence construct academic identity as a form of academic competence.

The socialization change that the GCs reportedly experienced was mostly in the form of increasing competence both in terms of their academic English and discipline-specific knowledge. Further, their identity development revealed an intersecting dimension in that they would invoke multiple identities of a competent writer, competent speaker/presenter, resort to the identity of educated non-native English speakers, a Turkish learner, importantly that of a graduate candidate. In addition, the participants' interview insights suggested that they exercised agency in order to cope with the cognitive challenges of the graduate coursework. Thus, the analysis of the participants' interview transcripts reflected the novelty and the challenges of their socialization experiences, identity and agency co-constructions as well as promising developments in their academic discourse competence.

4.3.1.3 Interview with the Course Instructor

In the interview conducted with the graduate course instructor, she initially provided a brief account of the content, format and requirements of the Applied Linguistics course. She noted that graduate candidates required adequate competence in oral as well as written academic discourse such as routine and round-table class discussions, academic presentations and critique work in order to cope with the coursework. The interviewee also shared the following insight:

> Since its introduction, our graduate candidates have shared that Applied Linguistics is the most difficult and cognitively challenging among the PhD courses.

Further, she briefly described the cohort involved in the graduate course and noted its international profile. The course instructor also emphasized the role of participation in academic discussions in the graduate classroom, and noted the role of portfolio requirement in this regard as follows:

> As preparation for class they are advised to note down their "reactions" (queries, thoughts, comments), as well as questions in a portfolio so that they can have a

record of their studies and a resource for their contribution to class discussion. Portfolios help them consolidate comprehension of the course content, reflect progress, and encourage their active participation.

The interviewee talked with satisfaction about how the graduate candidates in the Applied Linguistics course contributed to discussion agendas with their questions related to the assigned readings.

In addition, the course instructor expressed that certain rules were established and promoted in the graduate classroom as illustrated by the insight below:

> Norms or rules that I have always tried to promote in my graduate classes have been as follows. Systematic and hard work, critical reading of various materials; learning how to pose challenging questions, in AL spirit, to be submitted to the course instructor on-line, prior to classes, for preparation of Discussion Agenda; active, quality contribution to classroom discussion, sharing and relating academic and professional experiences to discussion; providing equal opportunities for and encouraging every graduate candidate's participation.

She thought that her role was that of initiator, guide, moderator and provider of feedback, clarification, and modelling; she would also incorporate modifications, if need be. The course instructor expressed her expectations in relation to the graduate cohort as follows:

> Graduate candidates are expected to be active participants in CR discussion, engage in collaborative learning and development so that they can improve their academic discourse competence and become professional members of the academia.

Regarding the participation in discussion requirement in the Applied Linguistics course, she noted that it was an indispensable part of the course evaluation, and candidates' contributions to class discussions were evaluated mostly in terms of quality, relevance, originality, as well as her classroom observations and notes. In this regard, the course instructor noted the positive changes in classroom discussions over the course:

> Classroom discussions have become more intense, more interesting and challenging, reflecting graduate candidates' progress and learning from peers and professors. The graduate candidates have been gaining more confidence and

gradually socializing into the academic and professional discourse of my course as well as our graduate program.

The interviewee's insights reflected the socialization opportunities afforded to graduate candidates inside as well as outside the classroom.

The instructor also noted the individual characteristics of the international students in class, as well as their different academic and professional backgrounds. She emphasized the importance of the graduate candidates' diverse identities in terms of their contribution to academic discussions as follows:

> I expect them to actively contribute to classroom discussions, make notes, ask questions, reflect on and relate to previous learning and teaching experiences, importantly, take a critical stance on various challenging issues under discussion.

The interviewee talked about the challenges facing international students owing to multiple aspects in the academic context as follows:

> Differences in familiarity and experience in academic discourse, graduate culture, different expectations in terms of course requirements, peer and professor behavior, interaction and communication.

Finally, the course instructor noted the positive aspect of the candidates' international profile as well as shared reciprocity of the socialization experiences:

> Absolutely, very rewarding, makes discussion and interaction more interesting in terms of learning from others' academic and professional experiences.
> It is a very rewarding experience since I have also been learning from my graduate students' insights and expanding my cultural horizon.

Her advice and suggestions to all graduate candidates were illustrated by the final remark in the interview as follows:

> Patience, perseverance, hard work, observing and asking for guidance and support, if need be.

Thus, the macro-perspective involving examination of the qualitative data comprising the graduate students' and the course instructor's interview reports provided interesting insights to the candidates' academic discourse socialization process over their graduate studies in the academic context under investigation. The

results obtained through the macro-perspective suggested that participation in the discursive and non-discursive activities of the given academic community was challenging and rewarding in that the PhD candidates were advancing their academic and professional competence in different ways, across various spaces and networks of the graduate context.

4.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the results of the comprehensive data analysis. First the chapter described the classroom attested data obtained from the micro-perspective analysis, then it presented the results from the macro-perspective analysis.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the major findings of the current research and their discussion, the summary, as well as the implications and suggestions for further research.

5.2 The Study

Over the past decades, there has been an increasing interest in the socio-culturally situated studies in second language contexts. This has been mostly due to a shift in applied linguistics from the individual psychological process to the social process in contexts of the target language learning. Accordingly, a range of studies conducted within the perspective of language socialization paradigm (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012) investigated the intrinsic, reciprocal connection between second language learning and its respective sociocultural context (Duff, 1995, 1996, 2002, 2009). The major premise of the socialization paradigm has been that it is through participation in language-mediated socio-cultural activities that novices socialize into the language as well as through the use of the language of a given community. In addition, the L2 socialization research has benefited from Vygotskyan socio-cultural theoretical principles (1978, 1981), Bakhtinian (1981) notions of voice and dialogue, as well as Lave and Wenger's (1991) and Wenger's (1998) constructs of communities of practice.

In academic communities, socialization of graduate students into academic discourse which requires formation, precision, analysis and argument of cognitively difficult concepts (Davies, 2005) has always been challenging, especially for international students (Morita, 2000, 2002, 2004). It is noteworthy that second language oral academic discourse socialization has not received adequate attention (Duff, 2019). The extant studies on oral academic discourse have mainly focused on oral presentations (Kobayashi, 2016; Morita, 2000; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a; Wang, 2009) whereas few studies examined actual classroom discussion data (Ho, 2011) due to the demanding nature of oral discourse data collection, transcription and analysis. Also, participation in oral academic discourse has been reported to pose various cognitive and psychological challenges for university students who require adequate academic and discipline-specific knowledge (Kim, 2006; Morita, 2000; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a). Importantly, most of the pertinent studies have investigated the oral academic discourse socialization in western settings (Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman & Duff, 2017). Additionally, the research on graduate students' socialization to oral academic discourse noted that it is "a complex cognitive and sociolinguistic experience" (Morita, 2000, p. 282) which is "due to the complexity of institutional conventions, practices, and requirements" (Ho, 2011, p. 439).

Therefore, we attempted to address these gaps in our study by exploring the socialization experiences of a cohort of graduate candidates at one of the English-medium international universities in North Cyprus which has attracted a large number of students from various countries. Thus, we adopted an ethnographic design by investigating the socialization experiences of the participants from the micro- and macro perspectives. The micro-level of the ethnographic approach involved the collection and analysis of the attested oral academic discourse data on participation of

the graduate candidates in classroom discussions over one academic semester in an Applied Linguistics doctoral course in the ELT department. At the macro-level, the study gathered and closely examined the interview reports of three volunteer graduate students from the same cohort elicited throughout one academic year, the interview report of the course instructor as well as the researcher's observations.

Thus, this research explored how the PhD ELT students socialized into and through oral academic discourse in particular and the respective academic discourse community in general inside as well as outside the classroom in the context of the study. The results of the study at the micro-level indicated that participation in the whole-class academic discussions in the graduate course invoked the candidates' multiple identities, afforded them opportunities to resort to intertextuality as well as enact their agency, hence fostered their socialization into the oral academic discourse. Moreover, the results obtained through the macro-perspective suggested that participation in the discursive and non-discursive activities and practices of the context of the study was not only challenging but also rewarding in that the graduate candidates were advancing their academic and professional competence in different ways, across various spaces and networks of the international context.

Overall, the oral academic discourse evidence as well as the interview insights in the present study seemed to indicate that throughout their academic discourse socialization experiences the graduate candidates not only co-constructed identity and agency but also developed their academic discourse competence (Duff, 2010; Duff & Anderson, 2015; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012). Thus, the results suggested that the students' membership and participation in the academic community of practice was gradually being translated into "an identity as a form of competence" (Wenger, 1998, p. 153). The different identities that the graduate candidates invoked, ranging from

novices to experts, hence their involvement in identity work (Duff, 2012) through various socializing interactions (Duff & Talmy, 2011), discursive activities and practices facilitated their academic learning and developing of the academic norms, values and repertoire in the graduate context.

Finally, the triangulation of the qualitative oral academic discourse and interview data revealed that the participants' engagement in various discursive activities and practices of their graduate community posed cognitive, emotional, and socio-cultural challenges (Zappa-Hollman, 2007a); their socialization took place in multiple ways and across different spaces (Seloni, 2012) such as through identity work and agency co-construction with socializers in the graduate classroom, other formal and informal settings and was a complex, temporal, spatial, social, and contingent process (Duff & Anderson, 2015).

5.3 Major Findings

The major findings of this study are presented from the micro- and macro-perspectives. One of the major findings related to the micro- level was identity construction on the part of the PhD students in that through their participation in the whole-class academic discussions in the graduate course they not only took on the discourse identity of responder(s) but also, towards the course completion, gradually constructed the discourse identity of feedback provider(s) as well as initiator(s). The participants' engagement in the academic discourse on the early and contemporary, occasionally controversial applied linguistics issues, afforded them to transport their academic, professional and social identities and to make contributions to the whole-class discussions. At various points of these discussions in the graduate classroom, not only the old-timers but also less experienced candidates would temporarily shift to the identity of the relative expert(s). Importantly, the intersection of multiple identities

116

throughout the GCs' participation in the whole-class discussion fostered their socialization to and through the academic discourse in the classroom space.

Another major finding in relation to the attested data analysis from the micro-perspective was the PhD student's stance accrual. Throughout their participation in the whole-class discussions on a range of applied linguistics issues, the graduate candidates were positioned by the course instructor as well as peers to express, clarify, elaborate and argue their stance on the issue under discussion. Also, at various points of the academic discourse, the participants chose to self-position and display a stance in order to effectively contribute to the classroom discussions. In the process, it was not only the course instructor but also the students themselves who provided feedback, modelling, additional input, if need be, hence performed the role of socialization agents. These opportunities afforded by the context of the graduate course also facilitated the graduate candidates' socialization to and through the academic discourse.

In addition, over the academic semester, the PhD ELT students progressively resorted to more intertextuality throughout their participation in the academic discussions in the graduate classroom. This would involve their appropriation of academic texts not only on the agenda of the applied linguistics course but also other graduate courses, as well as appropriation of academic resources and regulation of their self-study. Resorting to intertextuality thus also afforded them socialization opportunities to the academic discourse across various spaces in the graduate context.

Overall, the evidence collected from the micro-level indicated the interaction of the various socialization factors such as intertextuality, stance accrual, multiple identities, as well as socialization agency throughout the PhD ELT students' participation in the classroom academic discussions. This multi-dimensionality

characterized the candidates' engagement in the socialization process within the graduate class as well as suggested promising evidence of their construction of doctoral student identity as a form of academic competence. The graduate candidates were thus gaining legitimacy and membership to the discourse community in the academic context.

At the macro-level, one of the major findings was that the socialization experiences of the participants over their academic studies were challenging yet rewarding. Also, they were accruing stance across the discursive activities and practices and becoming more confident in the graduate context. In addition, through participation in various academic interactions in the graduate classroom as well as other spaces in the academic context, the graduate candidates appeared to undergo positive changes, mostly in the form of improving competence both in their academic English and discipline. Importantly, their identity construction revealed an intersecting dimension in that they would adopt multiple identities of socialization agents, academic writers/speakers/presenters, resort to the professional identity, importantly, make every effort to effectively perform the identity of a PhD candidate. Overall, the increasingly active participation of the graduate candidates across various spaces in the academic context afforded them socialization opportunities to gradually move from the periphery to the core membership, construct their agency and develop academic and professional identity as a form of competence.

5.4 Discussion

5.4.1 Micro-perspective

The findings of this study indicated that participation in oral classroom discussions-one of the challenging routines of the graduate classroom (Ferris, 1998; Kim, 2006) afforded the candidates opportunities to socialize to as well as through the

118

oral academic discourse of the graduate course. Also, participation in academic whole-class discussions mediated the graduate students' identity negotiation and construction (Ho, 2011; Morita, 2004) suggesting the reciprocal connection of the socializing and identity work to its respective socio-cultural context (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b). This result is consistent with the view of identity formation as a social dimension of language learning (Norton, 1995, 2000) which is integral to academic discourse socialization (Duff, 2010).

The participants' experiences of socialization to the oral academic discourse was complex, conflictual and unpredictable in that their knowledge and stance were contested, and they had to negotiate their expertise and identities (Morita, 2000). Importantly, not only the novice but also experienced candidates faced challenges in their attempts to adequately contribute to academic discussions, in other words, comply with the academic requirements of the graduate course which supported the results of Morita (2000) and Ho (2011). In this regard, the students' participation in various classroom discussions can be considered crucial to their prospective movement from periphery towards legitimate participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) which confirmed the results of Seloni's study (2012) conducted in the inner circle.

At different phases of the oral academic discourse, both newcomers and old-timers were positioned and self-positioned to perform, transport and (co)construct multiple intersecting identities. This result is in line with the research to date which regards interaction between more experienced members and novices as highly important (Duff, 2010). Throughout their participation, the graduate candidates took on the intersecting discourse identities as initiators, responders, feedback providers and evaluators. They transported unique personal, language, social and professional

identities (Ho, 2011), and (co)constructed the situated identities across the shifting continua between socializee-socializer as well as the novice-(relative) expert (Duff & Anderson, 2015).

Over the graduate course, the engagement in discursive interactions with the instructor and peers enabled the students to manifest and accrue their epistemic stance on a range of applied linguistics issues which is significant for socialization to communities of practice (Ohta, 1991, 1993). It is noteworthy that not only the old-timers but also novices often self-positioned in the graduate classroom as socializers to and through the unfolding oral academic discourse by ratifying their peers' contributions as well as expressing their respective stance(s) based on their academic and professional knowledge and experience, hence self-socializing (Anderson, 2017) into the oral academic discourse of the graduate course. This was also confirmed by Morita (2000) who reported that graduate students constituted themselves as expert or novices by manifesting their epistemic stances in social interactions and that they "expressed their stance as relative experts by drawing on relevant personal experiences, critiquing the subject of the oral academic presentation confidently and convincingly, and displaying their presentation skills" (p. 290).

Thus, the attested data from the whole-class academic discussions revealed that the graduate candidates were socialized into the academic discourse through various socialization agents. However, the process was complex in that throughout the students' participation in various academic discussions they negotiated and accommodated to the dynamic interaction with the instructor and peers, and their socialization took place in multiple ways (Seloni, 2012). This result is also in line with the pertinent research to date which considers as highly important the interaction with members who "are more proficient in the language and its cultural practices and who

120

provide novices explicit and (or) implicit mentoring" (Duff, 2010, p. 172). In this regard, the graduate candidates, in their respective ways, seemed to gradually move from the periphery towards legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) which confirmed the results of Seloni's study (2012).

In addition, the participants negotiated the multiple aspects of their identities as the classroom discussions moved in different directions which was also observed by Morita (2000, 2004) and Prior (1998) in the ESL context. Importantly, the graduate candidates' unique socio-cultural backgrounds, diverse language learning, previous academic and professional experiences, hence their transportable identities (Cho, 2013; Ho, 2011) shaped and were shaped by their participation (Morita, 2004) in academic discussions in the graduate classroom. This is in line with the observation that identity and difference are "co-constructed and are crucially linked" with "knowledge and participation in educational activities" (Duff, 2002, p. 291). In this regard, we also contend that the graduate students' differences between their "prior and current learning contexts, including the classroom discourse and interaction they engage in, can result in challenges and struggles for students…" (Duff & Anderson, 2015, p. 337).

In the present study, the students' participation in oral academic discussions and multiple identity construction interacted in the applied linguistics classroom. "Identity work" was indispensable in "the production and interpretation of academic discourse" (Duff, 2010, pp. 169-170) in the context. Thus, graduate candidates' participation in various academic discussions afforded them opportunities to express, enact and construct intersecting discourse, situated and transportable identities that fostered their socialization to and through the oral academic discourse within the academic community of the graduate class (Cho, 2013; Duff & Anderson, 2015; Morita, 2004).

121

Moreover, the participants' socialization experiences in the space of the graduate classroom were characterized by progressive resorting to intertextuality. The evidence of the graduate candidates' constant referencing and cross-referencing to different academic and professional sources and resources throughout the academic discussions suggested another dimension of their socializing process through objectification which supported the results of Ho (2011). The students drew on their theoretical background knowledge, teaching experience and adult lives' experiences while discussing a range of the applied linguistics issues which provided relevant linguistic, academic as well as professional input for peers, hence revealing the intertextual trajectories of participation as an important aspect of academic discourse socialization process (Duff & Anderson, 2015; Ho, 2011; Morita, 2000; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a).

Overall, the study results revealed how through participation in the oral academic discourse the graduate students negotiated their knowledge, expertise and multiple identities which promoted their academic discourse competence (Morita, 2002, 2004). Importantly, the graduate course appeared to enhance the opportunities for the participants' bi-directional socialization to academic discourse competence (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b), hence their self- and other-socialization (Anderson, 2017). Thus, the discursive interactions in the graduate classroom afforded the candidates the opportunities to enact their agency and socialize to "an identity as a form of competence" (Wenger, 1998, p. 153), an emerging identity of the members of their respective academic community.

5.4.2 Macro-perspective

The results yielded from the macro-perspective complemented and overall confirmed the results from the micro- perspective. At the macro-level, one of the major findings was that the socialization experiences of the participants over their academic

122

studies were challenging, yet rewarding. The participants' interview insights suggested that the graduate candidates faced a multitude of social, emotional, and cognitive challenges while socializing into the new academic community culture in general and the academic discourse community in particular across different spaces (Seloni, 2012); hence, their socialization was a complex, temporal, spatial, social, and contingent process (Duff & Anderson, 2015). The interview insights also seemed to indicate the multi-directionality of the participants' academic discourse socialization process (Talmy, 2008) through engagement in various community practices, inside as well as outside the graduate classroom.

Also, the graduate candidates seemed to accrue stance and they progressively felt more confident in their advanced studies. Through participation in various academic events and interactions in the graduate classroom as well as other spaces (Seloni, 2012) in the academic context the graduate candidates appeared to experience promising changes, specifically advancing their academic and discipline-specific competence. Hence, over their academic studies, the graduate candidates seemed to undergo, idiosyncratically, positive cognitive changes, specifically in the academic and professional knowledge, related beliefs and thoughts (Duff, 2010).

In addition, the evidence from the interview data also indicated the participants' resorting to intertextuality across various spaces which also seemed to foster their socialization process to the academic discourse in the graduate context. Appropriation of multiple academic and professional sources and resources in the classroom, as well as other spaces is one of the indispensable aspects of academic discourse socialization process (Duff & Anderson, 2015; Ho, 2011; Morita, 2000; Zappa-Hollman, 2007a).

Significantly, the graduate candidates' interview insights suggested their identity development over the academic studies, specifically its intersecting dimension in that

they would construct multiple identities of socialization agents, academic presenters and writers, as well as resort to their graduate student and teacher identity. This result corroborates the findings from the micro-perspective and is in line with Duff's insight related to the significance of "identity work" for socialization (2010, pp. 169-170).

Further, the interview insights, in line with the findings obtained from the micro-perspective, seemed to indicate the participants' socialization into the academic discourse in interaction with various socialization agents, instructors and peers, and in multiple ways (Seloni, 2012). This result also confirms the pertinent research highlighting the importance of interaction between novice and experienced members (Duff, 2010, p. 172) in the community of practice. Overall, the increasingly active participation of the graduate candidates across various spaces in the academic context seemed to afford them socialization opportunities to gradually move from periphery to the core membership (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and develop their academic and professional identity as a form of competence (Wenger, 1998, p. 153).

Finally, the triangulation of the qualitative oral academic discourse and interview data revealed that the participants' engagement and participation in various discursive activities and practices of their graduate community posed cognitive, emotional, and socio-cultural challenges (Zappa-Hollman, 2007a); their socialization took place in multiple ways and across different spaces (Seloni, 2012), through identity work and agency co-construction in the graduate classroom, other formal and informal settings, and it was a complex, temporal, spatial, social, and contingent process (Duff & Anderson, 2015).

Thus, the present study undertook the exploration of an under-researched area in applied linguistics, oral academic discourse socialization (Duff, 2019) in a non-western tertiary educational context. It contributed to the research on process-oriented

oral academic discourse socialization at the graduate level which is still scarce. Specifically, this study provided the pertinent research with comprehensive attested as well as perceptual data on academic discourse socialization from different perspectives. Finally, the oral academic socialization of the study participants through intersecting identity construction as well its interplay with agency co-construction is a novel aspect of the current study.

5.5 Implications

Exploration of the graduate students' socialization experiences through and to the oral academic discourse in one of the tertiary graduate contexts in Northern Cyprus enabled this study to offer some pedagogical implications on conceptual as well as practical levels. One of the implications for other graduate contexts is acknowledging the role of participation in academic discussions, challenges of participation in oral whole-class discussions as well as its affordance of socialization opportunities for graduate students, from various backgrounds, to academic and professional practices.

In order to make graduate programs more conducive to graduate candidates' socialization, administrators and instructors can also consider engaging international students' in various activities and practices not only in the space of the graduate classroom but also across other spaces in their respective academic contexts which can promote students' stance accrual and interaction, hence socialization opportunities afforded not only by course instructors but also other, experienced as well as novice peers.

In this regard, it is crucial to recognize the value of interactional management by candidates with different lingua-cultural identities and their engagement in various interactions for socialization to the discourse identities (as initiators and feedback providers) and situated identities (as socializers and relative experts) (Zimmerman,

1998). It should also be taken into account that awareness of international students' individual identities would allow "for a broader understanding of the potential discordances, similarities, tensions, interactions, and synergies across different contexts", also of their potential impact on "language learning/use as well as identities and membership" (Duff & Anderson, 2015, p. 339) in increasingly multilingual and multicultural academic communities of practice (Morita, 2004).

Yet another implication of this study is for program administrators and instructors across diverse contexts to scaffold international graduate students' participation in whole-class academic discussions through facilitative techniques of comprehension checks, clarification, and cyclic provision of discussion highlights. In addition, course instructors can also encourage candidates to express and accrue stance, when (self)-positioned, also take over moderation of whole-class academic discussions, when they feel ready to do so, and to transport their unique language learning, academic, professional and social identities to their respective academic communities of practice.

Also, the concerned parties can consider encouraging employment of intertextuality in graduate classrooms which can potentially facilitate candidates' effective engagement in academic discourse. Specifically, course instructors can consider providing students ample affordances to resort to and employ intertextuality across the entire graduate coursework as well as encouraging students to benefit from appropriation of academic texts, to review recurring academic and professional issues and to explore them from multiple diverse perspectives in self-study.

Finally, across similar graduate settings, those concerned can consider undertaking an ethnographic exploration of their students' socialization experiences in order to inform provision of more efficient student support services for candidates coming from diverse linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds and for tertiary institutions to

126

create a context conducive to candidates' socialization to their respective discipline-specific discourses.

5.6 Suggestions for Future Research

Prospective research can incorporate collecting attested academic discourse data from multiple graduate courses in order to gather more comprehensive evidence on candidates' participation in respective oral whole-class academic discussions. It can also consider involving more student and course instructor participants for obtaining diverse insights into socialization practices and experiences. Moreover, future research can undertake investigation of graduate candidates' written performance in academic English which would provide complementary evidence of their socialization to written academic discourse. Finally, our study suggests that prospective research should aim at collecting comprehensive emic data across various spaces in graduate contexts in order to gain insights to international candidates' socialization experiences and benefit from related insights to "better navigate their way" (Seloni, 2012, p. 58) in graduate studies.

5.7 Summary

The present study explored the graduate students' socialization through and to the oral academic discourse in one of the English-medium tertiary institutions in Northern Cyprus. Through an ethnographic design (comprising micro- and macro-perspectives) it provided attested discourse evidence and interview insights to the socialization experiences of the culturally and linguistically diverse candidates in the space of a graduate classroom, as well as across various spaces in the academic context. The results indicated that the students' participation in the whole-class academic discussions as well as outside the classroom discursive activities and practices was conducive to their gradual socialization to and through the oral academic discourse.

Specifically, the students accrued epistemic stance, employed intertextuality, and constructed intersecting identities in that they enacted various discourse and situated identities as well as transported unique personal, academic and professional identities. The findings revealed that the socialization experiences of the PhD students were challenging, however rewarding in that they learnt to cope with their advanced academic studies through exercising their agency and were constructing academic identity as a form of competence in the graduate community.

REFERENCES

Allwright, R. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *5*, 156-71.

Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 30*(1), 109-137.

Anderson, T. (2017). The doctoral gaze: Foreign PhD students' internal and external academic discourse socialization. *Linguistics and Education, 37*, 1-10.

Atkinson, D. (2002). Toward a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal, 86,* 525-545.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, D., & Ramanathan, V. (1995). Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 593-568.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Belcher, D., & Braine, G. (1995). Introduction. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic Writing in a Second Language: Essays in Research and Pedagogy* (pp. 13-31). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bell, J. S. (1995). The relationship between L1 and L2 literacy: Some complicating factors. *TESOL Quarterly 29* (4), 687-704.

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Edinburgh University Press.

Boas, F. ([1911] 1966). Introduction. Handbook of American Indian languages. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin*, 1(40), 5-83.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronson, M. C. (2004). *Writing passage: Academic literacy socialization among ESL graduate students, a* multiple case study. University of California, Davis.

Bruner, J. S., Goodnow, J. J., & Austin, G. A. (1956). *A study of thinking*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Burgess, R. G. (Ed.) (1995). *Howard Becker on education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse studies*, *7*(4-5), 585-614.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Casanave, C. (1995). Local interaction: constructing contexts for composing in a graduate sociology program. In: D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic Writing in a Second Language: Essays in Research and Pedagogy* (pp. 83-110). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Casanave, C. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carbaugh, D. (1999). Positioning as display of cultural identity. In R. Harré & L. van Langenhove (Eds.). *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action* (pp. 160-177). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Cho, S. (2013). Disciplinary enculturation experiences of three Korean students in US-based MATESOL programs. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 12*(2), 136-151.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1967). The general properties of language. In C. H., Millikan & F. L., Darley (Eds.), *Brain mechanisms underlying speech and language* (pp.73-88). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Cook, H. M. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31,* 1443-1465.

Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crystal, D. (2004). *The Language revolution*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Daily Sabah. (2019). Northern Cyprus expects to generate $1B in education revenue this year. https://www.dailysabah.com/business/2019/08/22/ northern-cyprus-expects -to-generate-1b-in-education-revenue-this-year

Davies, A. (2005). *A glossary of Applied Linguistics*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Davies, A. (2007). *An introduction to Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Deacon, T. (1997). *The symbolic species: The co-evolution of language and the brain*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dewaele, J. (2009). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *The new handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 623-646). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.

Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The Stance Triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139-182). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Duff, P. A. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 505-537.

Duff, P. A. (1996). Different languages, different practices: Socialization of discourse competence in dual-language school classrooms in Hungary. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language acquisition* (pp. 407-433). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, P. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics, 23*, 289-322.

Duff, P. A. (2003). New directions and issues in second language socialization research. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 3*, 309-339.

Duff, P. A. (2006). *Problematizing language socialization across postsecondary contexts.* Paper presented at the Joint Conference of AAAL and ACLA, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Duff, P. (2007a). Problematizing academic discourse socialization. In H. Marriott & T. Moore, R. Spence-Brown (Eds.), *Learning discourses and the discourses of learning* (pp. 1-18). Melbourne: Monash University Press.

Duff, P. (2007b). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching, 40*, 309-319.

Duff, P. (2008). Language socialization, participation, and identity: Ethnographic approaches. In M. Martin-Jones, A. M. De Mejia & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 107-119). *Vol.3: Discourse and Education*. New York: Springer.

Duff, P. A. (2009). Language socialization in a Canadian secondary school: Talking about current events. In R. Barnard & M. Torres-Guzman (Eds.), *Creating communities of learning in schools* (pp. 165-185). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 169-192.

Duff, P. (2012). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564-586). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Duff, P. (2019). Social dimensions and processes in second language acquisition: Multilingual socialization in transnational contexts. *The Modern Language Journal, 103*(S1), 6–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/ modl.12534

Duff, P., & Anderson, T. (2015). Academic language and literacy socialization for second language students. In N. Markee (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 337-352). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Duff, P., & Doherty, L. (2015). Examining agency in (second) language socialization research. In P. Deter, X. Gao, E. R. Miller & G. Vitanova (Eds.), *Theorizing and analyzing agency in second language learning: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 54-72). Multilingual Matters.

Duff, P. & Kobayashi, M. (2010). The intersection of social, cognitive, and cultural processes in language learning: a second language socialization approach. In R. Bastone (Ed.), *Sociocoginitive perspectives on language use and language learning* (pp. 75-93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duff, P., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition: Social, cultural, and linguistic development in additional languages. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to SLA* (pp. 95-116). Routledge.

Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 451-486.

Duff, P., Zappa-Hollman, S., & Surtees, V. (2019). Research on language and literacy socialization at Canadian universities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review 75*(4), 308-318.

DuFon, M. A. (1994). Input and interaction in the acquisition of L1 pragmatic routines: Implications for SLA. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL, 12*(2), 39-79.

DuFon, M. A. (2008). Language socialization theory in the acquisition of pragmatics. In E. Alcón Soler & A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 25-44). Bristol: Cromwell Press Ltd.

Edge, J., & Richards, K. (1998). May I see your warrant, please?: Justifying outcomes in qualitative research. *Applied Linguistics, 79*,334-356.

Ellis, R. (2009). The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Eastern Mediterranean University. (2020, June 20). About EMU. Retrieved June 20, 2020, from https://www.emu.edu.tr/north-cyprus-universities

Emerson, C. (1983). The outer word and inner speech: Bakhtin, Vygotsky, and the internalization of language. *Critical Inquiry, 10*(2), 245–264.

Ferris, D. (1998). Students' views of academic aural/oral skills: A comparative needs analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 32,* 289-318.

Ferris, D., & Tagg, T. (1996a). Academic oral communication needs of EAP learners: What subject-matter instructors actually require. *TESOL Quarterly, 30,* 31-58.

Ferris, D., & Tagg, T. (1996b). Academic listening/speaking tasks for ESL students: Problems, suggestions, and implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 30,* 297-317.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300.

Firestone, W. A. (1993). Alternative arguments for generalizing from data as applied to qualitative research. *Educational Researcher, 22*, 16-23.

Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied Linguistics, 28*, 440-465.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Way with word: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ho, M. (2011). Academic discourse socialization through small-group discussions. *System*, *39*, 437-450.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. London: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Metadiscourse*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes*. New York: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic socialization*. New York, NY: The Tower Building.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Johnson, K.E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 235-257.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H.G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kanagy, R. (1999) Interactional routines as a mechanism for L2 acquisition and socialization in an immersion context. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(11), 1467-1492.

Kaplan, R. B. (1967). Contrastive rhetoric and the teaching of composition. *TESOL Quarterly, 1*, 10-16.

Kim, S. (2006). Academic oral communication needs of East Asian international graduate students in non-science and non-engineering fields. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes, 25*(4), 479-489.

Kinginger, C. (2004). Alice doesn't live here anymore: Foreign language learning and identity construction. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 219-242). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *59*(3), 337-368.

Kobayashi, M. (2005). *A sociocultural study of second language tasks: Activity, agency, and language socialization* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Kobayashi, M. (2006). Second language socialization through an oral project presentation: Japanese university students' experience. In G. H. Beckett & P. C. Miller (Eds.), *Project based second and foreign language education* (pp. 71-93). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Kobayashi, M. (2016). L2 academic discourse socialization through oral presentations: A Japanese undergraduate student's learning trajectory in study abroad. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 72*, 95-121.

Kramsch, C. (1987). Socialization and literacy in a foreign language: Learning through interaction. *Theory into Practice, 26,* 243-250.

Kramsch, C. (2004). Language, thought, and culture. In A. Davies, & E. Catherine (Eds.), *The handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 235-261). USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Sociocultural theory and second language learning: Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal, 78,* 418-420.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Beckett, T. G. (2009). Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Language Teaching, 42*(4), pp 459 475.

Lantolf, J. P., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). (S)econd (L)anguage (A)ctivity theory: Understanding second language learners as people. In M. P. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 141-158). Longman.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 201-224). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I. (2001). "A narrow thinking system": Nonnative-English-speaking students in group projects across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*, 39-67.

LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J., & Tesch, R. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 37-66.

Lucy, J. (1992). *Language diversity and thought: A reformulation of the Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lucy, J. (2000). Introductory comments. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Evidence for linguistic relativity* (pp. 9-21). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In C. K. Ogden & I. A. Richards (Eds.), *The Meaning of meaning: A study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism* (pp. 451-510). London: Kegan Paul.

Malinowski, B. (1935). *Coral gardens and their magic*, vol. 2. London: Allen & Unwin.

Marshall, C, & Rossman, G. B. (1995). Designing qualitative research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Matusov, E. (2011). Irreconcilable differences in Vygotsky's and Bakhtin's approaches to the social and the individual: An educational perspective. *Culture & Psychology, 17*(1) 99-119.

McCarthy, M. (2001). *Issues in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGlonn-Nelson, (2005). Looking outward: Exploring the intersections of sociocultural theory and gifted education. *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 17*(1), 48-55.

McNeill, R. (Ed.) (1992). *Hand and mind: what gestures reveal about thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). CA: Sage Publications.

Mohan, B. A., & Marshall Smith, S. (1992). Context and cooperation in academic tasks. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp. 81-99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 279-310.

Morita, N. (2002). *Negotiating participation in second language academic communities: A study of identity, agency, and transformation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*, 573-603.

Morson, G. S., & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29,* 9-31.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change.* London: Longman/Pearson Education.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2002). Identity and language learning. In R. Kaplan (Ed.), *the Oxford handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 115-123). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nunan, D., & K. Bailey. (2009). *Exploring second language classroom research.* Boston, MA: Heinle.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village.* Cambridge: Cambridge University *Press*.

Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. W. Stigler, R. Shweder & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology* (pp. 287-308). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26*, 287-306.

Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic Resources for Socializing Humanity. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407-437). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In R. Schweder & R. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276-320). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E., and Schieffelin, B. B. (2012). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1-21). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ohta, A. S. (1991). Evidentiality and politeness in Japanese. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 211-238.

Ohta, A. S. (1993). *Activity, affect, and stance: Sentential particles in the discourse of the Japanese as a foreign language classroom.* Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.

Okuda, T., & Anderson, T. (2018). Second language graduate students' experiences at the writing center: A language socialization perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 52*(2), 391-413.

Open Doors. (2020). *Opendoors online: Report on international educational exchange.* Retrieved from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pavlenko, A, & Blackledge, A, (Eds.). (2004*). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Multilingual Matters.

Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*. London: Continuum.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Prior, P. (1995). Redefining the task: An ethnographic examination of writing and response in graduate seminars. In D. Belcher, & G. Brain (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research & pedagogy* (pp. 26-43). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Prior, P. (1998). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Renshaw, P. (1992). *The sociocultural theory of teaching learning: Implications for the curriculum in the Australian context.* Paper presented at the 22nd annual conference of Australian Association for Research in Education, Geelong, Victoria.

Richards, J., C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Rymes, B. (1997). Second language socialization: A new approach to second language acquisition research. *Journal of Intensive English Studies, 11,* 143-155.

Sapir, E. (1929). The Status of Linguistics as a Science. *Language*, *5*, 207-14.

Seror, J. (2009). Institutional forces and L2 writing feedback in higher education. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 66*(2), 203-232.

Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second language writing. *Written Communication, 21*, 171-200.

Shi, L. (2010). Textual appropriation and citing behaviors of university undergraduates. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 1-24.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986a). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986b). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15*, 163-191.

Seloni, L. (2012). Academic literacy socialization of first-year doctoral students in US: A micro-ethnographic perspective. *English for Specific Purposes, 31*, 47-59.

Shotter, J. (1993). Bakhtin and Vygotsky: Internalization as a boundary phenomenon. *New Ideas in Psychology, 11*(3), 379-390.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1992). Toward an analysis of discourse. In M., Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (pp. 1-34). Routledge.

Slobin, D. I. (2000). Verbalized events. A dynamic approach to linguistic relativity and determinism. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Evidence for linguistic relativity* (pp. 108-38). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study. *Written Communication*, *14*, 3-62.

Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information, 13*, 65-93.

Tajfel, H. (1978). Social categorization, social identity, and social comparison. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups* (pp. 61-76). London: Academic Press.

Talmy, S. (2008). The cultural productions of ESL student at Trade winds High: Contingency, multidirectionality, and identity in L2 socialization. *Applied Linguistics, 29*, 619-644.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

Vygotsky, L. ([1934] 1962). *Thought and language* (E. Hanfmann & G. Vakar, Eds. and Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 144-88). Armonk, NY: Sharpe.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1993). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky: Vol. 2*. The fundamentals of defectology. New York: Plenum.

Wang, S. (2009). *Academic discourse socialization: A case study on Chinese graduate students' oral presentations.* (Electronic Thesis or Dissertation). Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu

Watson-Gegeo, K. (1988). Ethnography in ESL: Defining the essentials. *TESOL Quarterly, 22,* 575-91.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1997). Classroom ethnography. In N. H. Hornberger & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 135-144). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4535-0_13

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal, 88,* 331-350.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Nielsen, S. (2003). Language socialization in SLA. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 155-177). Oxford: Blackwell.

Weidman, J. C., & Stein, E. L. (2003). Socialization of doctoral students to academic norms. *Research in higher education*, *44*(6), 641-656.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007a). Academic presentations across post-secondary contexts: The discourse socialization of non-native English speakers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 63* (4), 455-485.

Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007b). *The academic literacy socialization of Mexican exchange students at a Canadian university* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Zimmerman, H. D. (1998). Discoursal identities and social identities. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in Talk* (pp. 87-106). London: Sage.

Zimmerman, B., & Schunk, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Educational psychology: A century of contributions.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence, Erlbaum Associates.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Consent Letter for Research Participants

Dear Ph.D. candidates and colleagues

I am a graduate candidate in the ELT Department at Eastern Mediterranean University conducting a PhD Thesis research "The academic discourse socialization of ELT graduate (PhD) candidates at Eastern Mediterranean University."

The research to date has demonstrated that language socialization is a dynamic, bi-directional process, involving more and less experienced/competent members of a given social group/community; importantly, through participation in a range of activities, individuals develop their linguistic, cognitive and other knowledge and skills. This study envisages to explore how ELT graduate (PhD) candidates socialize into the academic discourse throughout their graduate studies. It is hoped that prospective research findings will provide valuable insights to the department and make contribution to the field.

As a graduate candidate enrolled in the PhD Programme you are invited to participate in the present study. You participation will involve audio-recording of the ELT 601 discussion sessions (14 sessions amounting to approximately 52 hours). Subsequently, some of you will be requested to participate in an interview. You can benefit from your participation through learning about research in ethnographic tradition in general and the topic of this study in particular as well as watching your progress throughout the course. You will also receive additional background information about the study.

All information you provide will be considered completely confidential; your name will not be included and only pseudonyms/coding will be used. The data, with

identifying information removed, will be kept for a period of 3 to 4 years following completion/publication of the research, after which it will be discarded.

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you are under no obligation to participate. You may withdraw at any time. Should your participation in this research at any point in time cause you any problem(s), I will end the data collection procedure.

Your cooperation and participation in this research will be highly appreciated. You are free to ask any questions about the study or about being a participant by calling me at 05338399558 or sending an e-mail to hadizadeh60@gmail.com.

_____

____

I hereby provide my consent to participate in this study.

Print Name _____

Signature of Participant _____

Date _____

Appendix B: Consent Letter to ELT Department

Date: 11 October, 2013

To: Assoc. Prof. Dr. G. MUSAYEVA VEFALI

Chair, ELT Department

From: Abas Hadizadeh (116097)

Re: Request for permission to conduct research

I am a graduate candidate in the ELT Department at Eastern Mediterranean University conducting a PhD Thesis research "The academic discourse socialization of ELT graduate (PhD) candidates at Eastern Mediterranean University." The study envisages to explore how ELT graduate (PhD) candidates socialize into the academic discourse throughout their graduate studies. It is hoped that prospective research findings will provide valuable insights to the department and make contribution to the field.

My PhD Thesis proposal was approved by the ELT Postgraduate Committee. Therefore I would like to request your permission to start collecting data in one of the compulsory graduate courses, ELT 601 – Applied Linguistics. The procedure will involve audio-recording discussion sessions (14 sessions amounting to approximately 52 hours) as well as an interview with some of the PhD candidates.

I assure you that the entire data collection procedure will be conducted in accordance with research ethics. Please find attached a copy of Consent Form for prospective participants. I should be most grateful if you could consider my request favorably.

Thank you for your consideration.

Appendix C: Interview Guide One

-Are you familiar with the goals of the ELT PhD Program/courses?

-If yes, how do you find them?

-Are you familiar with the intellectual and academic values of the PhD Program you

are enrolled in? What about its socio-cultural values?

-If yes, how do you feel about these values?

-Please reflect on your graduate studies/learning since your enrollment.

-Have you encountered any difficulties throughout your studies? Please elaborate.

-If yes, how have you been coping with these difficulties?

-Do you regard yourself as a competent member of the ELT academic community?

Appendix D: Interview Guide Two

One semester has passed since I interviewed you. Now, you have either completed your courses or are about to complete them. Therefore, I will really appreciate it if you could share with me your experience over the past semesters related to the following:

- Your academic learning/ your academic English and any related difficulties that you have experienced
- Any related difficulties
- Your inside-and-outside-the-classroom interaction with
    - Your peers
    - Your professors
    - Others

Any perceived changes since the start of your graduate studies

Reflection on your participation in classroom

What are your initial impressions of EMU, your program, your advisor, and your courses? Was anything surprising to you?

What did you enjoy about your studies/courses?

How did you participate in Applied linguistics (quantity/quality/content)? Did your participation patterns change over the term? If so, how did they change and why do you think they changed?

Have your participation patterns have changed over the semester? If your participation patterns differed across different courses, why do you think they differed?

How did you interact with your course instructors, advisor, and classmates inside and outside the classroom?

What concerns do you have about your academic skills and abilities in general? What kinds of academic skills do you feel you need to improve?

Do you feel that your English has improved over the term? What kinds of English abilities do you think you need to improve? Do you make any special efforts to improve your English skills?

What academic or English abilities do you think have been improved over the academic year? Why do you think they improved? Did you make any special efforts to improve your academic/English skills?

What opportunities do you have to use English (speak/listen/read/write) inside and outside the classroom?

What are some of the significant events that happened to you since you came to EMU?

Was your class participation evaluated in Applied Linguistics course? If so, how was it evaluated and what evaluation did you receive?

Have your class participation or attitude toward/values about participation changed over the academic year in any way?

Please describe some of your most interesting/challenging/rewarding experiences during your first year studies.

Based on your first-year experiences, what advice or suggestions would you offer to incoming L2 international students?

Do you have any advice or suggestions for course instructors/faculties, particularly in regard to issues around international students?

What kinds of institutional support do you think would be helpful for international students? What institutional support did you find helpful?

Appendix E: Interview with the Course Instructor

I. Questions about the course

Characteristics of the course and the student group:

1. What is the nature of this course in terms of content, format, and assignments? Is there anything special about this course compared to other courses that you teach?

2. How would you characterize this year's student group? Is there anything special about this year's students that has influenced the way you organized the course or class discussions?

Expectations for and evaluations of classroom participation:

3. What expectations do you have about individual students' classroom participation in this course? Is there an official requirement for classroom participation in this course? If there is, what is the purpose of such requirement?

4. Are there any norms or rules of classroom interaction/participation that you promote in this course? If there are, what are the norms/rules, and how do you promote them?

5. What do you see as your role in classroom discussions in this course? What do you see as the role of the students?

6. Is classroom participation evaluated? If so, how is it evaluated and what are the criteria for evaluation?

7. What impressions do you have about the classroom discussions you had with this class?

Challenges and strategies:

8. Have you experienced any challenges with regard to classroom interactions in this class? If you have, how did you deal with them?

Impressions of the L2 international students/focal student(s):

9. What impressions do you have about the L2 international students in this class? How do they participate in the classroom? Do you see any difference between NES domestic students and NNES international students in terms of class participation?

10. What impressions do you have about the focal student(s)? Do you have any comments about her classroom participation?

Pedagogical adjustments:

11. Have you made any pedagogical adjustments to meet the needs of the L2 international students in this class?

II. General questions on the issues of classroom communication, academic socialization, and L2 international students

Expectations for classroom participation:

12. What expectations do you have about students' participation in graduate classrooms in general?

13. Any other comments about issues of classroom participation?

Role of class discussions:

14. What role do you think class discussions play in graduate students' academic learning and socialization?

Difficulties experienced by international students/suggestions for students:

15. What kinds of challenges have you seen L2 international students face in the graduate classroom?

16. What advice or suggestions would you offer or have you offered to L2 international students who are having such difficulties?

Difficulties experienced by course instructors:

17. What kinds of difficulties or issues, if any, have you faced in having L2 international students in your classroom? How did you deal with such issues?

18. Are there any positive aspects of having students from diverse backgrounds in your courses?

Other issues:

19. Are there any other related issues you would like to comment on?