SECOND LANGUAGE SOCIALISATION EXPERIENCES OF TURKISH EFL TEACHERS: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY WITH AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC COMPONENT

İSA BEKTAŞ

JUNE 2022

SECOND LANGUAGE SOCIALISATION EXPERIENCES OF TURKISH EFL TEACHERS: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY WITH AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC COMPONENT

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE

GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF

BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY

İSA BEKTAŞ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR

THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

JUNE 2022

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name:

Signature:

ABSTRACT

SECOND LANGUAGE
SOCIALISATION EXPERIENCES OF
TURKISH EFL TEACHERS: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY WITH AN
AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC COMPONENT

Bektaş, İsa
Master's Program in English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Dr. Ufuk Keleş

June 2022, 131 Pages

This thesis explores how six different EFL teachers from Turkey (one being the researcher) working at a preparatory school of a foundation university in İstanbul viewed their language learning experiences before, during, and after university, and how these views were manifested in their teaching careers. While doing so, second language socialisation theory was utilised as a theoretical lens. Being a qualitative study, data were collected over two main tools throughout the study: journal entries and semi-structured interviews. Each participant was asked to write three journal entries and do three consecutive semi-structured interviews. The journal entries were analysed for themes and used as the basis for the consecutive interviews. The findings revealed that second language socialisation and related communities of practice were absent before university for the participants. In addition, the participants viewed their language learning experiences as mediocre at best until university. During university, they were introduced to academic discourse socialisation and related communities of practice to mitigate the lack of previous second language socialisation. Moreover, after university, as part of the participants' career, it was found that participants' language learning experiences affected not only how they taught but also their beliefs in teaching

English. The findings of the study provided pedagogical implications to improve the field of EFL and raise awareness on language learning experiences.

KEYWORDS: Second Language Socialisation, Learning Experiences, EFL, Academic Discourse Socialisation, Narrative Inquiry

ÖZ

TÜRK EFL ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN
İKİNCİ DİL SOSYALLEŞME DENEYİMLERİ:
OTOETNOGRAFİK BİLEŞENLİ ANLATI ARAŞTIRMASI

Bektaş, İsa
İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı
Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Ufuk Keleş

Haziran 2022, 131 sayfa

Bu tez, İstanbul'da bir vakıf üniversitesinin hazırlık okulunda görev yapan, biri araştırmacının kendisi olmak üzere, altı farklı İngilizce öğretmeninin üniversite eğitimi öncesinde, sırasında ve sonrasında dil öğrenme deneyimlerini nasıl gördüklerini ve bu görüşlerin öğretmenlik kariyerlerine nasıl tezahür ettiğini ikinci dil sosyalleşmesini teorik bir mercek olarak kullanarak araştırmıştır. Çalışmadaki nitel veriler, her bir katılımcının tuttuğu günlükler ve yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Bu görüşmeler her bir günlüğün ardından gerçekleştirilmiştir ve görüşmelerde tematik olarak analiz edilen günlükler esas alınmıştır. Bulgular, katılımcılarda üniversite eğitiminden önce ikinci dil sosyalleşmesinin gerçekleşmediğini ve ilgili uygulama topluluklarının bulunmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Buna ek olarak, katılımcılar, dil öğrenme deneyimlerini en iyi ihtimalle üniversiteye kadar vasat olarak görmüşlerdir. Üniversite öğrenimleri sırasında, üniversite öncesi ikinci dil sosyalleşmesi eksikliğini azaltmak için akademik söylem sosyalleşmesi ve ilgili uygulama topluluklarıyla tanıştırılmışlardır. Ayrıca, katılımcıların üniversite öğrenimi sonrasında dil öğrenme deneyimlerinin yalnızca İngilizce öğretme yöntemlerini değil, aynı zamanda bu dili öğretmeye yönelik inançlarını da etkilediği bu çalışmanın bulguları arasındadır. Bu çalışma ile Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce

alanını geliştirmekte ve dil öğrenme deneyimleri konusundaki farkındalığı artırmakta kullanılabilecek pedagojik çıkarımlara ulaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İkinci dil sosyalleşmesi, dil öğrenim deneyimleri, EFL, akademik söylem sosyalleşmesi, otoetnografi, anlatı araştırması

To Ecem

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest thanks and gratitude to my fiancée, Ecem Köz. She has been a beacon to my perseverance. Being with her has given me all the power I need to continue. I would also like to extend my gratitude to her for helping in proofreading the Turkish translation of the abstract of this thesis. Without her incommensurable love, precious insights, and soothing positivity, I would not be able to overcome this seemingly insurmountable task.

I wish to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor Dr Ufuk Keleş for being the teacher he is. He offered phenomenal support and spot-on feedback with extraordinary patience throughout the study. I cannot thank him enough for introducing me to autoethnography, teaching me how to learn about myself, and making my thesis meaningful, instead of a hurdle to be overcome.

I wish to extend my gratitude to the participants of this study who are not only my colleagues but dear friends, for their patience, care, and diligence towards my endless requests. I would like to thank Berke Altun, my close friend, for his helping hand in transcribing the interviews and proofreading the manuscript.

I would like to thank my teachers and instructors who made a profound impact on my personality, furthered my knowledge in the field of teaching, and made me a better teacher, and hopefully, a better researcher. I would like to specifically thank Asst. Prof. Mustafa Polat, Assoc. Prof. Enisa Mede, Assoc. Prof. Nihal Yurtseven Rukiye Özlem Öztürk, and Neşe Uyanık for everything they have taught me during my bachelor's and master's degrees. I would also like to express my gratitude to TÜBİTAK and 2210 National Graduate Scholarship programme for their financial support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADS	Academic Discourse Socialisation
AE	Autoethnography
C&I	Curriculum and Instruction
CoHE	Council of Higher Education
CoP	Community of Practice
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELL	English Language and Literature
ELT	English Language Teaching
EMI	English Medium of Instruction
ESL	English as a Second Language
INT	Interview
JE	Journal Entry
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
LPP	Legitimate Peripheral Participation
LS	Language Socialisation
MEB	Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MoNE)
MoNE	Ministry of National Education
PD	Professional Development
PLC	Professional Learning Community
SLS	Second Language Socialisation
TMI	Turkish Medium of Instruction
UEE	University Entrance Exam

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

> *"Do not let the schools make a fool out of you because the teachers may be fools too. When their [teachers'] prejudice lets us down, we stand firmly on our ground."* (Jinjer, 2009)

Getting into one of the best high schools in İstanbul at that time almost ruined my future. I had careless and incompetent teachers, but the worst of all was those who were prejudiced and unaware, in that, unaware of the effect they have on us, their students. I have always believed that the coursebooks, class size, methodology, the pedagogical framework, or the seeming quality of schools are not of much importance when the teachers are unaware of their responsibility.

Even though I majored in the Turkish and mathematics strand in high school and enrolled in the English language teaching (ELT) department of a foundation university with a high score on the university entrance exam, neither had I felt it was my calling to study there, nor had I felt English was my calling. This unawareness of what the future will bring, combined with a lack of guidance, and economic and familial problems, I was left with only one *option*: English. ELT was what was left for me to try as a last resort to have and build a life that I could only imagine. Over time, I realised that although English was my last resort, teaching was a conscious decision, a way to compensate for what I lacked throughout my education.

Keeping in mind that everyone has their perspectives and lenses that they see life through, I could, without a doubt, say that I had a mediocre education until university. Having a mostly below mediocre education led me to extracurricular activities. Gaming was my favourite pastime activity, music was a means to find who I was, and watching TV series in English was a way to understand the people of the world. To understand the theme of a video game, the lyrics of a song, or between-the-lines of a TV series, I needed to learn their language, English. Exposing myself to English over the years led me to acquire it. Over a couple of years in high school, and four years in university, I have finally found myself in a master's program on ELT,

writing this thesis on the language learning experiences of my fellow teachers and mine.

As a relatively inexperienced – less than two years – English as a foreign language (EFL) teacher from Turkey and a prospective autoethnographer, systematically reflecting on my own past brought about some emotional memories regarding my experiences as a language learner with all the challenges, emotions, thoughts, and beliefs I have undergone over the years along with the commitments I have had, relationships I have made and built, and progress I have made so far. However, with this recall came the realisation of why I am where I am now, how I arrived at this point, and why I am the language learner, teacher, and user I am now. These personal self-reflective sessions and realisations, coupled with the emergence of an opportunity to tell my narrative that puts me in the centre of the social context through autoethnography, paved the road to this study (Reed-Danahay, 1997).

As part of a master's degree course that I took, named Qualitative Research Methods in ELT, I was assigned to write two autoethnographic papers on my experiences of learning English as a student before and after university. These assignments helped me understand that I neither knew how I learnt English nor what affected my learning. I recognised that I did not learn English, but mostly acquired it through informal endeavours in my past such as reading music lyrics, watching movies and TV series, and playing video games. I kept doing these as hobbies, along with the desire to learn new things and succeed in life. This desire, as Motha and Lin (2014) explored, was at the centre of my English language learning journey. Such an awareness, coupled with the desire, led me to think whether my colleagues, teacher friends, teacher acquaintances, students, or even people in general, were aware of their language learning stories, and how such stories affect and are affected by their lives, or how it relates to their current ease on certain topics or current hardships on certain skills. Moreover, my accumulating desire to see whether EFL teachers share any common experiences, and at what point their stories divert from others' regarding their language learning experiences have led me to seek language learning stories in the EFL contexts of Turkey. Particularly, this interest has grown in me to do research on the EFL teachers around me so that I am able to compare my experiences with theirs;

so that I may have a profound understanding of what language learning means for me and others as well.

Specifically, this present study aims to, by using second language socialisation as a theoretical lens, explore the language learning experiences of EFL teachers from Turkey in preparatory schools, and how their experiences influence their current personal, academic, and professional lives as well as their prospects. One of the best ways to do so is incorporating narrative inquiry (Barkhuizen, Benson, & Chik, 2014) and autoethnographic research, which is the process of exploring and inquiring into oneself to understand or widen their understanding of themselves, their beliefs, and values compared to others (Starr, 2010).

1.1 Theoretical Framework

Being an interdisciplinary theory of sociolinguistics, psychology, and sociology (Duff, 2010; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008; Shi, 2006; Watson-Gegeo, 2004), language socialisation (LS) is concerned with not only the language acquisition but also the acquisition of other types of knowledge via social involvement (Duff, 2010). LS research explores the language-related experiences of people who are learning their first (L1) or second language (L2) (Duff, 2010). Based on the works of Ochs, Schieffelin, and others, Duff (1995, 2010) defines LS as a continuous process where novices (or newcomers) are initiated into certain domains that can be accessed and constructed through communication and interaction.

While these language learning experiences can be encountered through formal or informal environments of learning (Krashen, 1981), LS is concerned with both "socialisation to use the language and socialisation through language" (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, p. 163). Both of which may occur in formal or informal settings of learning. The former, socialisation to use the language, refers to the process of gaining knowledge (Ochs, 1988) via steps of interactions where novices are given specific directions to use the language properly (Poole, 1994). Socialisation through language is concerned with using the language to produce cultural meaning (Poole, 1994). Hence, socialisation through language focuses on how language learners develop from the linguistic perspective of the target language community while socialisation to use the language focuses on the development of language (Altun, 2017).

On the other hand, even though LS and second language socialisation (SLS) have similarities, SLS is more complex since learners of an L2 have already experienced LS, and consequently, have L1-related cultural and communal ties (Duff, 2007). Specifically, SLS is a process where speakers of a foreign language aim to be competent in a second language while attempting to become members to legitimately participate in the communities of practice of the language community (Duff, 2012). These communities of practices (CoPs) can be found anywhere and are everything (Wenger, 1998). According to Wenger (1998), people belong to many CoPs; for some CoPs, we are at the centre of it while for others, we are merely there peripherally. Hence, the language learning experiences of EFL speakers may be in various contexts and CoPs, from an additional language to a language merely used by a minority of a specific population (Duff, 2012). These CoPs and contexts, secondary socialisation environments as Ochs (2001) calls them, may range from hobbies – gaming, watching TV shows and movies, music – to workplace and education, i.e., university, school.

Moreover, LS is a lifelong process (Duff, 2012; Zuengler & Cole, 2005; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008; Hornberger & Duff, 2008); consequently, it allows the exploration of various contexts of language learning while allowing the analysis of a person's life course, which encompasses the language learning experiences as a crucial part. Furthermore, having already undergone LS, novices, or newcomers of an L2 are naturally required to adopt new codes, registers, practices, and identities (Hornberger & Duff, 2008) through the mediation and expertise of people who are more proficient in L2 and its culture, namely "experts or old-timers" (Duff, 2012, p. 566). These experts, or old-timers, may be teachers, tutors, friends, family, colleagues, caretakers, and so forth. They are not merely the experts on the linguistic aspect of the language but also on the culture, values, stances, identities of the language, and the CoP.

Furthermore, being a socially situated activity (Lave & Wenger, 1991), learning a language necessitates participation in CoPs. The newcomers of a CoP go through legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) which is the process by which the newcomers become a part of a CoP (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Newcomers mostly begin their learning as peripheral members of a CoP, taking on passive activities (i.e., observing). However, over time, they take on fewer peripheral tasks as they become a legitimate

member (Eberle, Stegmann, & Fischer, 2014); being a member requires learning, and learning progresses through membership (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

As L2 requires the adoption of new codes, registers, practices, and identities, the adoption of these may result in hybrid and/or socially discursive practices, identities, values, and ideologies, as opposed to solely having the L2 counterparts of which (Hornberger & Duff, 2008; Altun, 2017). Nevertheless, two possibilities emerge from SLS. First, it may lead to having new or hybrid identities by accepting the norms and culture of the L2 community (Duff, 1995; Norton, 1997). Secondly, the learners may completely reject the practices, norms, and culture of the L2 community and knowingly refuse to be a part of the community (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Being a broad framework to understand the improvement of various language competencies by interacting with people who are more proficient (Duff & Talmy, 2011), SLS examines more than the development of linguistic knowledge and proficiency; it explores various aspects of knowledge that is learnt through the target language, such as culture, social knowledge, ideologies, epistemologies, identities, affect, and so on. These, and many more, aspects of the language affect not only how people learn an L2 but also how they function in contexts where the L2 is used. Meaning that SLS is a way of exploring how socially acquired CoP is constructed, reconstructed, adjusted, and transformed during the process of socialisation (Ochs, Solomon, & Sterponi, 2005).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

As opposed to the various concerns about the competency of people entering the ELT profession in Turkey (Çakar, 2009; Uztosun, Skinner, & Cadorath, 2014; Uztosun, 2017), there have not been many autoethnographic studies which utilise second language socialisation as a theoretical lens on this issue of language learning experiences of in-service preparatory school instructors in Turkey. Neither teacher education and training programs nor primary or middle school education take the learning experiences under consideration as part of the English language education in Turkey. Consequently, newly graduated teachers start their profession by, possibly and relatively, lacking awareness and being unable to make self-reflections. Such a deficiency may affect EFL teachers' careers negatively, which in turn, may affect their students' language learning experiences (Yang, 2000; Diab, 2009). On the other hand,

there has not been a study which incorporates the autoethnographic approach to examine and/or explore language learning experiences and the effects of which on teachers' lives. Since this study will use language socialisation theory (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a) as a theoretical lens, it also adds to the field of EFL. Language socialisation theory is overwhelmingly used as an across borders theory while this study utilises it within borders (i.e., Turkey). Similarly, academic discourse socialisation research was prodigiously utilised in contexts where English was the dominant language. Consequently, there has been a call to research beyond these settings as well (Friedman, 2021; Duff, 2010; Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, & Duff, 2017; Moore, 2017). To address these gaps in the field, this study draws attention to the importance of understanding the effects of language learning experiences of in-service Turkish teachers of English on their personal and professional lives. These effects may range from teaching/learning styles and strategies to skill deficiencies and strengths.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This study aims to explore the language learning experiences of six different Turkish teachers of EFL in a preparatory school in Turkey, the sixth participant being the researcher. While narrative inquiry will be utilised for the participants, I will incorporate autoethnography to understand the effects more clearly. As a relatively new method, there is a wide gap in autoethnographies in the field of ELT in Turkey. While this study incorporates an autoethnographic approach, it will also explore the long-term effects of the language learning experiences of EFL teachers on their professional careers as learning/teaching styles, understanding of languages, or on their personal lives as acquired strengths and personal beliefs. As the world of EFL constantly changes and evolves, the need to explore the long-term effects of the language learning experiences of EFL teachers on their professional and personal lives becomes more crucial.

To this end, this study aims to shed light on the status quo of the current generation of EFL teachers in Turkey from various backgrounds, and therefore, analyse, interpret, crucially and righteously represent the topic at hand (Chang, Ngunjiri, & Hernandez, 2013); it is vital to do so for the improvement of the field of

EFL in Turkey, both from a cultural and an educational perspective, and convey the findings to change, reform, or clarify the status quo.

1.4 Research Questions

By incorporating an autoethnographic approach to juxtapose and compare the language learning experiences of six different Turkish EFL teachers, this study aims to address the following research questions:

1. How do six EFL teachers from Turkey working at a preparatory school at a foundation university in Istanbul view their language learning socialisation experiences?
2. How are their views regarding their own language learning socialisation manifested in their current teaching practices?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is expected to provide crucial information on the effects of language learning experiences on language teachers' personal and professional lives. The findings of this study should raise the awareness of teachers in their personal and professional lives and comprehend the conceived effects of their language learning experiences on their careers. On the other hand, raising awareness on such issues should help in creating a framework of suggestions to improve the field of ELT by taking the needs of teacher trainees into consideration. Most student teachers do not have enough proficiency in certain skills because of limited exposure, personal problems, educational deficiencies, and/or lack of awareness. Starting with this deficiency results in not having the means to improve them since they are, mostly, not covered in their teacher education; student teachers are expected to be, almost, completely proficient in English. To break this vicious cycle of unawareness and deficiency, this study is expected to provide pedagogical implications as well, by using language socialisation theory as a theoretical lens to carefully represent the participants.

1.6 Definitions

Autoethnography: Being both a method and a text, an autoethnography is the narration of self. It aims to locate the self within a social and communal context (Reed-Danahay, 1997). It utilises personal experience to explore cultural practices (Ellis,

2004). However, the inclusion of self, and social and cultural contexts is not definitive of an autoethnography. A paper becomes an autoethnography under four conditions, these are (a) reviewing the culture and related practices with purpose, (b) filling the research gap by contributing to the field, (c) purposefully accepting fragility and susceptibility, and (d) aiming to induce a response from the audience via a corresponding relationship (Adams, 2016).

Narrative Inquiry: Being not only a research methodology but also a way to view people's experiences (Clandinin & Conelly, 2000), researchers of narrative inquiry collect non-narrative data on and through people to narrate their personal experiences (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). As Creswell (2012a) states, one of the best ways to collect a story is being told the story, which can be achieved through written recordings, personal conversations, interviews, photographs, or any other artefacts. Through the collection of field texts, a researcher can inquire about and study experience to, primarily, understand it.

Community of Practice: A community of practice (CoP) consists of people who are a part of a certain domain. While they may have different ideas, they collaboratively practice something (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Being a CoP does not require learning or practice to be intentional (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015). A CoP requires the development of a domain, a community, and practice. The existence of a domain requires a commitment to a shared domain (e.g., teaching). The existence of a community requires interactivity and collaboration. On top of domain and community, members of a CoP need to practice over time with relatively regular interaction (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015).

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, this study was introduced through a statement of the problem, research questions, and significance. Moreover, a brief overview of the literature on the theoretical framework of the study, the theory of socialisation, was provided. The next chapter will review the related literature on language socialisation theory. The third chapter will present the methodology of the study, including the setting, participants, tools, data collection and analysis procedures, and methods. In the fourth chapter, analysed findings will be qualitatively reported. Finally, in the fifth chapter,

the findings of the study will be discussed, followed by pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

In this chapter, I introduce the literature related to this study which examines how six English language teachers working in a preparatory school in Turkey view their language learning socialisation experiences and how their views are manifested in their current teaching practices by using language socialisation theory as a theoretical lens. In the first section, I provide a general overview of the language socialisation theory, followed by the second language and teacher socialisation theories. In the second section, I present a brief history of English as a foreign language (EFL) and English language teaching (ELT) in the Turkish context. In the third section, I review literature related to the university entrance examination. Lastly, in the fourth section, I provide the literature on English Medium of Instruction (EMI).

2.1 An Overview of Language Socialisation Theory

> *"Language is a great force of socialisation, probably the greatest that exists."* (Sapir, 1933, p. 159)

Broadly defined, socialisation is how people become members of a group. During this process of socialisation, people are assisted to become members of these social groups (Grusec & Hastings, 2015). This assistance refers to the process of new members being taught the necessary skills and values to become competent individuals of the social group at hand (Maccoby, 2015). Socialisation consists of varying outcomes, from acquiring what is being conveyed (on the cognitive, emotional, and personal domains) to acquiring the side effects (e.g., anger, aggression, and so on; Grusec & Hastings, 2015). Moreover, socialisation is an ongoing process. One can socialise into a group with the assistance of different people (i.e., family members, teachers, friends, colleagues) or institutions (i.e., schools, workplaces), as well as media and the Internet (Grusec & Hastings, 2015). In other words, there is no limit on the number of social groups one may join.

Arising from the tenets of socialisation and the belief that a language is an essential tool for the cultural and social development of children, language socialisation (LS) is a concept that theorises the process of language learners becoming competent language users via the already-proficient users of the language at hand.

Being an interdisciplinary theory of linguistic anthropology (Hymes, 1972; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b), sociolinguistics, sociology (Bourdieu, 1977), developmental psychology (Rogoff, 1990, 1995), and education (Duff, 2010; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008, Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a; Shi, 2006; Watson-Gegeo, 2004; Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2011), theory of LS is concerned with the process of newcomers acquiring membership and legitimacy into a community (Duff, 2007). Aiming to acquire more than linguistic competency, the newcomers (i.e., novices) learn the culture, norms, beliefs, and representations of a community (Duff, 2012). The multi- and interdisciplinarity of LS permit researchers to explore how newcomers make meaning out of their social learning that varies in amount and occasionally conflicts while viewing the aspects that inform newcomers such as social structures, cultural interpretations, practices, and ideologies by combining discourse and ethnographic methods.

On the other hand, since the 1960s, first language (L1) acquisition scholars have been examining the order and sequence of acquisition (Ellis, 2021) while debating that language competence was the result of an innate structure within our brain (Chomsky, 1965), of verbal input (Krashen, 1985), or of both (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2011). Meanwhile, the fundamentals of LS were being set by Gumperz and Hymes' Ethnography of Communication (1964). LS is different from L1 acquisition on a fundamental level, in that it brought the social factors into the field of language learning. Language acquisition studies would assume a mother-child conversation is to be observed; however, LS expands the analyses to the communicative collaborators (i.e., old-timers, experts) with whom newcomers regularly participate in communicative actions in a sociocultural context (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2011). Setting interrelated, yet separately researched inquiries (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2011), LS theory eventually emerged around the 1980s. It socioculturally considered the communicative practices of children (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2011). In LS theory, scholars explored what is said to children, by whom, and how it is said (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2011). As opposed to L1 acquisition theories, the importance is not merely on the order of acquisition.

Even though research on learning was not uncharted territory, there was a gap to be filled between the academic fields of psycholinguistic and sociocultural theories of acquisition – two schools of thought that address different ways of acquiring

knowledge. Drawing from Gumperz's speech community (1968), Gumperz and Hymes' Ethnography of Communication (1964), and communicative competence (Hymes, 1972), a community of psychologists, linguists, and anthropologists created an agenda to research language acquisition (Slobin, 1967). This research agenda was the first systemic attempt at connecting the research dots. It served as a guide for those who wanted to collect cross-linguistic and cultural data on the development of communicative competence, leading to the emergence of a new research field on children's communicative competence, namely language socialisation.

Through the late seventies, empirical studies on children's communicative competence in their L1 have begun to take shape as organised in this manual. Crucially, during the late 70s and 80s, Schieffelin's longitudinal study on the L1 acquisition of Kaluli children (1985), Ochs' study on Samoan children (1985), Heath's study on the African American community (1983), and Watson-Gegeo's study on the Kwara'ae (1992; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986) paved the way towards the contemporary LS theory. By conducting these studies, Ochs and Schieffelin were, individually, aiming to create and analyse a corpus of children's utterances that are periodically recorded while uncovering the rooted beliefs, social order and practices, ideologies, and sentiments that affect the physical and linguistic growth of children as a member of the contexts they were in (2011). Eventually, Ochs and Schieffelin (1984) collaboratively proposed that acquiring language and sociocultural knowledge were interconnected processes. In that,

> (a) the process of acquiring language is embedded in and constitutive of the process of becoming socialised to be a competent member of a social group and that (b) socialisation practices and ideologies impact language acquisition in concert with neurodevelopmental influences. (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2011, pp. 3-4)

The first part of the proposition coincides with Hymes' communicative competence being a crucial part of linguistic competence while the second part, crucially, states the intersection of linguistic and sociocultural development of language learning. It was this proposition that led to the birth of the LS scholarship.

Various LS scholars conducted cross-cultural and ethnographic studies in several societies of the world, aiming to explore the effects of language learning on

children's socialisation into a community (see Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b, 1996; Ochs, 1985; Schieffelin, 1985). Over time, LS started to encompass anthropology, applied linguistics, education, psychology, and human development. Today, the field, also, includes second language, literacy, media, and heritage language socialisations as an established theory.

Being an established theory with a firm background, LS scholarship paved the way for second language socialisation (SLS). While LS theorises the socialisation of newcomers as children into their L1 society (Leung, 2001; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a), SLS refers to the cultural and linguistic socialisation of a person who is learning an additional language. The word *second* in SLS may be open to controversy for people living in multilingual societies since they would have more than two languages and may have varying sequences of learning these languages (Duff, 2012). In this paper, SLS refers to any type of LS beyond someone's L1.

SLS is the process through which people learn an additional language aiming at achieving competence, membership, and ability to participate in communities of practice (CoP; Lave & Wenger, 1991) of a language (Duff, 2012). Moreover, although SLS shares commonalities with L1 socialisation, it differs from L1 socialisation with the addition of newcomers (be it children or adults) who have already undergone L1 socialisation (Duff, 2007; Duff, 2010; Hornberger & Duff, 2008). Furthermore, SLS encompasses two main tenets: "socialisation to use the language and socialisation through language" (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, p. 163; Leung, 2001). *Socialisation to use the language* refers to the situational dimension (Leung, 2001) where novices gain knowledge (Ochs, 1988) through interaction in accordance with experts' directions and mediations (Duff, 2012; Poole, 1994). On the other hand, *socialisation through language* refers to the utilised language behaviour which encodes and produces cultural meaning (Poole, 1994), and how language enables newcomers to participate in socialisation (Leung, 2001).

Also, the newcomer/old-timer (novice/expert) relationship in LS is valid for SLS as well. Newcomers of a language are guided by old-timers (i.e., experts) who are not only more experienced in the culture but also more competent in the language (Duff, 2012). On the other hand, Langman, Bayley, and Caceda (2015) found that a learner may be recognized as a newcomer or an expert by a specific interlocutor. Meaning that

a significant part of socialisation (be it LS or SLS) occurs amongst peers and other newcomers (Bayley & Langman, 2011). Moreover, Heath and Kramsch (2004) claim that socialising influences are moving towards peer-to-peer, rather than adult-to-peer. Presuming the accuracy of these claims, Bayley and Langman (2011) suggest that there is a need to re-evaluate who counts as an expert and/or novice. From a different perspective, Duff (2007) and Garrett and Baquedano-Lopez (2002) state that novices, from a certain perspective, teach their 'experts' what they need. Such conveyance implies that the socialisation process is bidirectional, if not multidirectional (Duff, 2007). Meaning that the newcomers may convey their communicative, social, or cultural needs to the old-timers, teaching them what they need in order to successfully socialise into language.

Moreover, since people who try to learn an additional language are bound to experience SLS, they, consequently, participate in communities of practice (CoP) as well (Duff, 2012; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Being coined long after the actual phenomenon, CoP refers to something quite old (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015). According to Lave and Wenger (1991), a CoP is any relation amongst people, interests, and world, over time and in connection with other CoPs. Meaning that a CoP consists of people who, while having different ideas, have a similar understanding of their practice. They share meaning, domains, and roles while collaboratively practising something, such as a group of authors developing a new genre of writing, a group of workers fixing a pipeline, a family trying to get by, and so forth. The frequent interaction and engagement between the members help them learn how to do something better in a specific CoP.

Even though a CoP incorporates the necessary conditions that are required for learners to obtain the targeted skills and knowledge through participation, a CoP does not assume that learning is necessarily intentional (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015). A community may come together to learn, or learning may occur because of the members' unintentional interactions. Moreover, not every community is a CoP. Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner (2015, p. 2) state that three elements make a community, a community of practice: the domain, community, and practice. Firstly, a CoP goes beyond friendship or connections since it requires a shared domain to which membership requires a commitment. That shared domain (or competence)

separates members from others. While the kids of a neighbourhood would be a community, a youth gang would be a CoP since they have a shared domain of identity. Secondly, if the members do not work, interact, and learn together from time to time, being a part of a community (having the same job, living in a specific neighbourhood, going to a specific college) does not make a CoP. Members need to interact in cooperative activities, have discussions, help, and share information. They need to have relationships and care about each other. Finally, the existence of a common domain of interest and a community do not make a CoP. Members of a CoP collaboratively practise and gather resources such as experiences, stories, tools, and so forth. A CoP requires a shared practice which requires time and relatively regular interaction.

2.1.1 Second language socialisation. As Duff (1995) aptly defines, SLS is a process where individuals – namely novices – are introduced to certain domains of knowledge, affect, beliefs, selves, roles, acts, and social representations which are accessed and created through language practices, collaboration, and interaction to gain membership to a language and/or culture. To gain such memberships, newcomers are required to move between various linguistic contexts (Ochs, 1996). Moreover, SLS is a never-ending, lifelong process (Duff, 2012; Zuengler & Cole, 2005; Hornberger & Duff, 2008; Ochs, 2001; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008; Duff, 1995; Duff, 2010). Being a lifelong process implies that not only children but also adults go through socialisation (Duff, 2010). Adults participate in school, religion, community, family, and work-related activities in various contexts which requires them to use and socialise into or through language in varying ways.

In a university context, Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner's (2015) suggestion on the required elements of a CoP would be applicable for university departments as well. Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner state that a CoP requires a domain, community, and practice. From the perspective of a university department, it can only become a CoP if there is frequent interaction and learning between the participants (students and teachers) with a shared domain in which they can practise. More specifically, there have been various studies on university departments as CoPs, such as medical education (Cruess, Cruess, & Steinert, 2018), engineering (Rover, Moderator, Smith, Kramer, Streveler, & Froyd, 2003), computer science (Hodgkinson-

Williams, Slay, & Siebörger, 2008), and ELT (Yıldırım & Şeker, 2013). In their research on the implementation of a CoP in an ELT department, Yıldırım and Şeker (2013) found that CoPs provide the environment required to learn through support and reflection.

Moreover, SLS processes in academic discourses of ELT departments are referred to as academic discourse socialisation (ADS; Duff, 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2017). So far, ADS research has been focusing on the socialisation of English as additional language speakers in various levels, contexts, and communities (see Duff, 2010; Duff & Anderson, 2015; Kobayashi et al., 2017; Morita & Kobayashi, 2008). However, the previous research focused on international students in contexts where English was the dominant language. Consequently, in recent years, there has been a call to research beyond these settings (Friedman, 2021; Duff, 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2017; Moore, 2017). The research on these contexts started by focusing on the academic writing skills of students (Morita & Kobayashi, 2008). Later, the focus shifted to speech events and multimodal practices (i.e., oral presentations, speech acts, group discussions, and so on; Kobayashi et al., 2017). For instance, in Kobayashi's (2016) longitudinal study on oral presentations, it was found that the dynamic process of preparing a presentation (i.e., watching others present, reflecting, reading, researching, and so on.) and continued engagement in the CoP (i.e., classroom) with old-timers (i.e., other students) were agents of socialisation. In the end, Otome, the participant, was socialised into the socioculturally valued methods of the community, such as giving intertextual references and delivering interactively rather than monotonously reading from notecards. Correspondingly, in a more recent qualitative study, Dumlao (2020) found that undergraduate ELT students in Thailand were progressively socialised into the academic discourse of oral presentation by observing, preparing, performing, and reviewing the material at hand. Moreover, in their study on request speech acts realisation, Şanal and Ortaçtepe (2019) found that due to the lack of authentic interaction and engagement in the CoP, EFL learners in a Turkish university's preparatory school failed to generate appropriate speech requests. They claim that the above-mentioned failure may have stemmed from the lack of SLS opportunities and the consequent L1 socialisation transfer. On the effects of small-group discussions on ADS of ten postgraduate students (six of whom were non-native),

Ho (2011) found that group discussions created a context where students had the opportunity to socialise into their field-specific ADS.

When it comes to classrooms functioning as a CoP, Sugihara (2006) suggests that a classroom may be a CoP if knowledge is formed via learning, collaboration, and interaction of the members; meaning that it is not merely teachers transferring knowledge and students accepting it. This suggestion, also, supports the idea that not every classroom is a CoP. On the other hand, Sugihara (2006) states that knowledge formation is not only the acquisition of knowledge and skills but also the acquisition of personal traits. Since education institutes can be CoPs where various people with different knowledge, cultures, interests, aspirations, and ideas participate together to collaboratively acquire knowledge and skills and even alter their identities by interacting with others (Sugihara, 2006). Meaning that a CoP may lead people to adapt, modify, and change their personalities by socialising into their respective communities.

Likewise, conceptualised with Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner's (2015) three elements, a second language classroom becomes a community if the participants (students and teachers) interact with and learn from each other on a regular basis, not merely be in the classroom. Such an approach could be in the form of a group or pair work (Nagao, 2018). On the other hand, the domain of an ESL/EFL language classroom would be the goal of acquiring a language, in this case, English. To allow participation in this domain, teachers should refrain from micromanaging and interrupting the interactions; instead, they should allow them to occur spontaneously and avoid controlled discussions (Nagao, 2018). This shared domain of interest of a language learning community needs to be interconnected with practice and resource gathering and sharing. When all these are considered, it is safe to say not every language class is a CoP. For instance, a classroom can be seen as a CoP if the teacher (as well as the curriculum) creates a safe environment (Nagao, 2018). This safe environment needs to provide a situation where the participants can learn not by merely listening to a lecture but by helping each other, sharing knowledge, and having relationships.

2.1.2 Teacher socialisation

"*The transformation of the social person, the persona, can be sudden. On the other hand, the inner or protected self is less subject to abrupt change and*

retains the ability to project itself through a variety of personae into a range of social situations." (Lacey, 2012, p. 9)

Lacey, with his words, lays upon us the changeability and adaptability of the people. Even though we are certainly adaptable and prone to change in certain personas and acts, the same may not be appropriate for our inner self, in that, our beliefs, principles, and understanding. Yet, we are social creatures; hence, it would be unfair to deny the existence of communities of practice (CoPs) in not only personal but also professional contexts. It is our nature that requires us to be social. As nature follows its path, so does research. There have been many studies on the CoPs' role in language in the workplace since the early 2000s (Holmes & Marra, 2002; Holmes & Stubbe, 2003; Mullany, 2008; Schnurr, 2009). The very first systematic research on this topic was by Holmes and Stubbe (2003). Their work became the backbone of many studies on language in the workplace from a CoP perspective since they theorised contextual similarities and differences between teams, workplaces, and members of specific workplaces.

More specifically, teacher socialisation, unlike primary or language socialisation, is a subpart of secondary socialisation, similarly to second language socialisation (SLS). Teacher socialisation refers to a teacher developing a set of beliefs, perspectives, and acts based on the social situations they participate in and encounter (Lacey, 2012). Moreover, teacher socialisation is rather complex and quite communicative (Staton, 2008). Teachers socialise into the teaching profession and their institution, and the culture, by obtaining the respective manners, beliefs, customs, and knowledge of their workplace (Staton, 2008). Teacher socialisation, even though it is regularly assumed to span the beginning of the teaching career (Staton, 2008), continues throughout teachers' careers as they change roles, jobs, and environments.

According to Staton (2018), teacher socialisation begins with the newly graduated teachers' (newcomers') acknowledgement of the teaching role and requirements (i.e., content knowledge); followed by the organisational socialisation (i.e., learning the institution's social practices, culture, norms, and so forth). Teacher socialisation is a process that takes place in three phases: anticipatory, entry, and continuance (Staton, 2008). The anticipatory phase, as its name suggests, refers to the decision of wanting to become a teacher and choosing an educational setting to work.

Secondly, the entry phase occurs when a newly graduated teacher starts the first teaching position or when a teacher (be it newly graduated or not) enters a new institution or role. The entry phase may also be referred to as institutional (organisational) socialisation, which is mostly found in induction programmes (Pogodzinski, 2012). Even though induction programmes aid in the organisational socialisation process, Flores (2019) found, in her qualitative study of two beginner teachers in Chile, that induction programmes may aid in the socialisation process more if the newcomer has previously participated in that institution. In the study, the participation is in the form of previous practicum experience. However, this aid in socialisation was valid for one of the participants; the other participant had a negative practicum experience; therefore, hindering his socialisation into the organisation and the profession. Lastly, the continuance phase refers to a novice or veteran teacher experiencing and adapting to a new situation to successfully socialise into the situation, profession, or institution. In her study on newcomer teachers in a university, Viskovic (2006) found that teachers were learning in an informal way as well, socially through the context of work with a collegiate community of teachers. Viskovic (2006) recommends that there is a need to focus on informal learning for teachers' professional development. In addition, she states that focusing on generic professional development activities as a group or pair work is less important when compared to improving and encouraging the concept of CoPs in the school context (Viskovic, 2006).

2.1.2.1 Apprenticeship of observation. While socialising into their profession, role, and institution, teachers may suffer from the concept of apprenticeship of observation. Coined by Lortie (1975), the apprenticeship of observation is a phenomenon where students function as an apprentice in teaching while having prolonged face-to-face and far-reaching interactions with grounded and experienced teachers. In other words, student teachers start to study in their teaching departments with thousands of hours of previous observation as schoolchildren (Borg, 2004). Lortie (1975) suggests that the apprenticeship of observation leads to teacher candidates' establishing presumptions about teaching. Even though the word presumption does not necessarily connote negativity, these presumptions, Lortie states, are created merely by seeing the foreground of teachers' behaviours, not as a whole (i.e., as a combination

of fore- and background behaviours, responsibilities, and activities of teachers; 1975). These learnt presumptions are instinctive and derivative as opposed to purposeful and original (Lortie, 1975). Buchmann (1987, p. 161) calls these presumptions "folkways of teaching" which are the pre-made techniques and formulas for teaching-related action and interpretation. The use of folkways of teaching provides recognizable results to teachers without any analytical approach (Buchmann, 1987). The apprenticeship of observation, then, suggests that a teacher candidate or inexperienced teacher's socialisation to the teaching profession through traditional schooling as rigid and unchangeable that functions as an agent of continuity as opposed to change (Smagorinsky & Barnes, 2014; Lortie, 1975).

While some studies support the apprenticeship of observation (Johnson, 1994; Richards & Pennington, 1998; Cancino, Duran, & Solorza, 2020), others do not (Smagorinsky & Barnes, 2014; Mewborn & Tyminski, 2006; Moodie, 2016). In her study of four student teachers of ESL, Johnson (1994) found that the participants failed to reflect their teaching beliefs on their practice. Even though they were aware of the implications of not having a teaching style that is reflective of their beliefs, they stated that they felt powerless and unable to remove themselves from their habitual folkways of teaching. Moreover, Richards and Pennington's (1998) study of four Korean student teachers demonstrated that, even though they were in a class where a communicative approach was promoted, they reverted to their imitative and intuitive ways which were focused on rote learning and teacher-centred approach. Finally, Cancino et al. (2020) emphasised the need to be aware of teachers' prior learning experiences since, in their qualitative study, they found that the participants either imitated or avoided what they have observed in the past, as opposed to applying what they believed in and learnt. On the other hand, in a qualitative study of nineteen student teachers, Smagorinsky and Barnes (2014) found results that contradict the apprenticeship of observation; the participants reflected their beliefs and ideals on their teaching, as opposed to following what they have observed for thousands of hours. Furthermore, Mewborn and Tyminski (2006) state that apprenticeship of observation is not a one-size-fits-all justification for student teachers' actions. They state that this cycle of apprenticeship should be disrupted as part of teacher training. Crucially, the contradicting research can be summarised by what Moodie (2016, p. 33) calls the "anti-apprenticeship of

observation." Anti-apprenticeship of observation suggests that the teacher candidates create new teaching beliefs based on their negative experiences as learners contrasted with simply imitating what they have observed over the years.

Furthermore, apprenticeship of observation is one of the hardest obstacles to be overcome while learning to teach (Darling-Hammond, 2006). According to Conner and Vary (2017), apprenticeship of observation presents three challenges. First, teacher candidates' ideas about teaching are established on their own experiences. Hence, according to Conner and Vary (2006), teacher candidates are likely to lack the theoretical understanding of students who may not only have different learning styles but also may need distinct types of teaching practices. Second, teacher candidates are bound by the activities they have experienced as learners. They may lack the knowledge of alternative approaches to teaching, and quite possibly, they may even be unaware of the existence of other practices. Their observation of their teachers over the years merely presents them with an incomplete view of the teachers' job; they are unaware of the backstage preparations, i.e., choice of materials, lesson plans, assessment, differentiation, implicit acts based on theoretical knowledge of learners' preferences and needs, and so on. (Conner & Vary, 2006). Moreover, when teacher candidates leave their faculty as prospective teachers, they quickly learn how to adapt to their new environment (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Consequently, they imitate what they have seen rather than utilising what they have learnt (Glazier & Bausell, 2018). Therefore, awareness is a crucial tool for overcoming the effects of apprenticeship of observation.

To this end, prior studies (Boyd, Gorham, Justice, & Anderson, 2013; Knapp, 2012; Mewborn & Tyminski, 2006; Gray, 2020; Botha, 2020) have suggested two ways of mitigating the effects of apprenticeship of observation. First, teacher candidates should intentionally reflect on their teaching beliefs during their teacher education. Such reflections may help teacher candidates discover their internalised and fossilised beliefs about teaching, which are based on their own experiences. Second, reflexive discussions between instructors and teacher candidates are crucial. Such discussions may help teachers be more intentional and aware of the reasoning behind their decisions. However, Gray (2020) found that even with these ways of mitigating apprenticeship of observation, some students returned to their old ways of imitating

what they have experienced when they leave the faculty and start in their first classroom. To further mitigate, or at least, disrupt the effects of apprenticeship of observation, Gray (2020) suggests that teacher preparation programs should stay connected with their graduates for further support during their first year. The first year is the time when teachers find themselves in a position to criticise and analyse their own teaching style.

2.1.2.2 Professional communities of practice. Developed by Lave and Wenger (1991) Communities of Practice (CoPs) are one of the foremost professional development strategies in management and education (Richard et al., 2014). For Lave and Wenger, while developing the notion of CoP, their attention was on sharing knowledge. As knowledge and knowledge management are of importance for many organisations, it is natural that professional CoPs have emerged. Although many CoPs are informal and self-organising, it would be false to say that CoPs do not need a leader (or rather, a coordinator) and organisation (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015). There are not many organisations that do not utilise CoPs in one way or another (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015) since CoPs allow for professional organisation and leading, finding use in many workplaces, from businesses to governments.

Over the years, there have been many studies on CoPs in various fields and workplaces. In their qualitative study of thirteen resident doctors in Colombia, Olmos-Vega et al. (2019) found that most of the newcomers of the university hospital were accepted into the already-existing CoP by the old-timers (nurses, practitioners, assistants, therapists, physicians, and so on). They also found that to utilise all learning opportunities, the newcomers needed to negotiate their participation with the experts. Similarly, Cruess et al., (2018) found that CoPs in medical fields may function as the facilitator of development, making medical education more effective for not only the newcomers but also the experts. In their report on the employment of veteran soldiers from Chicago, Miller, and Sorenson (2017) stated that a professional CoP, namely Veterans Working Group, was not only successful in its objectives but also replicable in other parts of the country to aid veterans' acclimatisation to civilian life. Moreover, Lee-Kelly, Turner, and Ward (2014) conducted research on a professional CoP in Hewlett-Packard Enterprise Services. They found that this CoP was beneficial in terms

of raising awareness, increasing practical work knowledge, improving the chance of recognition and development, and creating a sense of belonging. Furthermore, Regan and Gold (2010) conducted research on a company, namely LPL Financial. They found that the CoP in LPL Financial was structured purposefully for several goals. Even though entrance to this community was not easy, the ones who managed to enter benefitted from it in terms of improving practices across the company, quickly sharing knowledge, creating relationships, and innovating within. Expectedly, the CoP not only helped its members but the company itself by increasing the number of referred customers and a certain amount of cost-saving (Regan & Gold, 2010). In her dissertation on the value of professional CoPs, Carter (2018) found that the community members of a leadership and communication education company, Toastmasters International, were able to evaluate their improvement and state that the CoP led to personal improvement.

Similar to the above organisations and workplaces, over the years, the professional development (PD) of teachers has become more important (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008) as a means to enhance teaching practices and improve student learning (Armour, Quennerstedt, Chambers, & Makopoulou, 2017) in schools. This shift towards PD has moved beyond acquiring new knowledge and skills. Nowadays, reflexiveness, in the form of rethinking practices, and being capable of not only teaching but also learning has become more important. Such focus led to the ability to understand what, when, and how teachers themselves need to learn (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). To this end, professional learning communities (PLCs) have evolved. At first, PLCs were popular in the business sector (Vescio et al., 2008). Over time, the business sector's PLCs were tailored to suit educational contexts and became collaborative learning communities for teachers (Thompson, Gregg, & Niska, 2004). The first educational use of PLCs was by Myers and Myers in their 1995 book. Hord's white paper on PLCs (1997), and Dufour and Eaker's book (1998) led to a great amount of research on PLCs. Over time, PLCs and CoPs started to be used as interchangeable terms. Furthermore, schools started to incorporate teacher learning into CoPs not only to improve students' learning but also teachers' professional learning via collaboration and examination of daily practices. In other words, PLCs help improve the learning processes of students by improving teachers' practices.

Based on the characteristics of PLCs that Newmann (1996) has suggested, Bolam, McMahon, Stoll, Thomas, and Wallace (2005) state that PLCs are communities that are able to foster and sustain learning for every stakeholder in a school environment while collectively and consequently aiming to improve and enhance student learning. Furthermore, Dufour and Eaker (1998) state that PLCs are groups of teachers promoting an environment that nurtures cooperation, support, and personal development via cooperation to succeed in their common goal. Even though there are various definitions as these ones, the interpretation of PLCs is quite contextual in the literature, which leads to having no broadly accepted definition (Stoll, Bolam, Mcmahon, Wallace, & Thomas, 2006; Stoll & Louis, 2007). Yet, a PLC is, in general terms, a team of teachers exchanging ideas on a regular basis (Blitz, 2013) while reflectively, collectively (as a community; Stoll et al., 2006), and inclusively inquiring into their practice to promote growth (Mitchell & Sackney, 2000; Toole & Louis, 2002). Stoll & Louis (2007) highlights that PLCs focus on the professional learning and development of a cohesive group of teachers who emphasises knowledge sharing as opposed to an individual teacher's learning. PLCs, also, require care amongst participants. In their study of the relationship between PLCs, school culture, teacher characteristics, and school effectiveness in a Turkish public-school context, Tabak and Şahin (2020) found that a school culture which is achievement and task-oriented is needed for increased school effectiveness. Consequently, these norms are crucial for the implementation of PLCs, and in turn, they make schools more effective. Similarly, in their quantitative study on the effects of PLCs on instructional quality, Doğan and Yurtseven (2018) found that PLCs generated statistically significant effects on the quality of instruction. Educational PLCs improve teachers, and in turn, teachers improve the school quality and learning.

Over the years, with the popularity of digitalisation and technological improvements, it has been found that online PLCs have been becoming more popular due to the greater flexibility of online environments (Blitz, 2013). With the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, this shift towards online PLCs has accelerated. In general, online PLCs create an environment where sharing, collaborating, and learning are less time-consuming (Reading, 2010) by not requiring additional time for commuting with fewer costs (Beach, 2012). PLCs, online or offline, provide the required engagement.

On the effects of the pandemic on the adoption of the PLCs in a university, Tucker and Quintero-Ares (2021) merged the formal technology training for the faculty members with weekly PLC meetings. Consequently, they found that what was, at first, merely a group sharing tools and asking how-to questions evolved into a group of people who have discussions around the pedagogy of online learning. The faculty members moved from learning how-to-use technicalities to having authentic discussions on online teaching and learning. Moreover, in their exploratory research on an online teacher community on a social media platform, namely Twitter, Goodyear, Parker, and Casey (2019) found that this Twitter-based community represented the characteristics of a PLC.

Regarding the context of Turkey, Ekoç (2020) found that amongst the participants who use social media platforms as PLCs (Facebook, WhatsApp groups, Twitter, Instagram, Pinterest, blogs, and so forth), 40.7% used these groups to obtain information, 32.5% used it to follow trends in ELT. Merely 5.3% of the participants have never used social media to consult on their inquiries.

2.1.2.3 Coursebooks as socialising agents. In the EFL classroom, coursebooks are the agent of socialisation for both students and teachers. Coursebooks compensate for the lack of CoPs and authenticity. They are the main tool in the EFL classroom that shapes language learning and teaching (Kramsch, 1988). They not only expose learners of English to other communities and cultures (Keleş & Yazan, 2020) but also the content of a coursebook borders what the learners will be exposed to while learning. Moreover, coursebook publishers spend time and money to provide PD courses and programs for teachers, mostly free of charge, such as Macmillan, National Geographic Learning, and Oxford University Press (Holliday Hughes, 2019).

As coursebooks compensate for the lack of CoPs, they act as an agent of socialisation for both EFL teachers and learners (Gulliver, 2010). Over the years of language teaching studies, it has been shown that coursebooks have a crucial role in the language socialisation of newcomers (Curdt-Christiansen, 2017). Even though coursebook companies are aware of this crucial role in socialising learners and teachers into the culture, community, and language, socialisation through coursebooks occurs through text-based experiences and it mostly depends on how the teachers make use of the coursebooks' socialising agency (Curdt-Christiansen, 2017). On the awareness

of culture and implementation of coursebooks as socialising agents by Japanese primary school teachers, Horii (2015) found that even though teachers were aware of the importance of socialisation, they neither had the time nor opportunity to go beyond what their coursebook offered. As significant as teachers' views, how students perceive coursebooks is crucial as well (Curdt-Christiansen, 2017). Even though a teacher is aware of the socialising agency of coursebooks and implements it purposefully, students have different experiences, values, beliefs, and lives. Hence, they may interpret, say, a cultural text, in a completely different way, and consequently, reject it. Even though coursebooks are not the sole tool to learn the culture and socialise into a community or language in the era of technology, they are, most certainly, the primary source of language socialisation.

2.2 History of EFL in Turkey

Turkey is a part of the "expanding circle" (Kachru, 1985), meaning that, even though English has no official bearing, it is still utilised to communicate with the rest of the world (Doğançay-Aktuna & Kızıltepe, 2005). Turkish is the official language of Turkey, yet Turkey has a diverse linguistic situation where millions of its citizens speak different languages. Arik (2020) listed the distribution of native languages in Turkey by their approximate number of speakers as seen in Table 1:

Table 1

Distribution of Native Languages in Turkey

Language	Number of speakers
Kurdish	8 million
Arabic	2.3 million
Zazaki	1.5 million
Kabardian	1 million
Azerbaijani	540,000
Turkish Sign Language	400,000

Note. Adapted from Arik (2020).

As can be seen in Table 1, there are several languages which are spoken by thousands, if not millions, of people as their first languages (L1). For these people, Turkish

functions as the lingua franca for the minority groups of Turkey (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1998) as English is the lingua franca in some countries.

Over the years, especially since the 1980s, English has been observed in the daily life of the people who live in Turkey (Arik, 2020). The presence of English is most visible in education, starting from the second grade. Until 2012, English was taught after the fourth grade (age 9); however, as the language education policies changed, and 12 years of education became mandatory, it was reduced to second grade in public schools. Arik (2020) provided an approximation of hours per week for different levels of language education in the public schools of Turkey as seen in Table 2:

Table 2

English Education in Public Schools of Turkey

Level	Hours
Grades 2-4	2 hours/week
Grades 5-6	3 hours/week
Grades 7-8	4 hours/week
Grades 9-12	3 hours/week*

Note. The number of hours/week in high schools spans between 2-5/week. The average is 3 hours/week. The table is adapted from Arik (2020).

As can be seen in Table 2, as of 2020, the English language lessons that students received per week steadily increased until high school. In the public high schools of Turkey, these numbers ranged between two to five hours per week, depending on the type of school. Nevertheless, these regulations stand only for public schools. Private elementary schools have been accustoming students to English for 3-4 hours per week since either the first grade or kindergarten (Doğançay-Aktuna & Kızıltepe, 2005). Moreover, some private schools, also, offer a preparatory year where students learn English before they start high school (Arik, 2020). As a result of language learning prospects, the demand for private schools is quite high.

The increase in the presence of English in Turkey is seen in higher education as well, resulting from the internationalisation of higher education (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Karakaş & Jenkins, 2022). Under the administration of the Council of Higher Education (CoHE), Turkish universities and their departments are allowed to choose between English Medium of Instruction (EMI), Turkish Medium of Instruction (TMI),

or a mixture of both (Kırkgöz, 2009a). While the government of Turkey favours EMI since it seeks membership in the European Union, students choose to enrol in EMI departments to acquire a higher proficiency in English (Kırkgöz, 2009b). On the other hand, higher education institutions prefer EMI for practical (i.e., revenue, rankings, prestige, and so on) and educational purposes such as staff and student mobility (Karakaş & Jenkins, 2022). However, British Council (2015) reports that, as opposed to TMI, EMI and mixed medium instruction are not functioning as they should, presenting low proficiency levels. This finding is supported by Kırkgöz's (2009a) research on the language policies of Turkey where she found that there is an unconformity between the aimed macro-level policies and objectives and the real-life situation in micro-level teaching contexts. Kırkgöz states that,

> Turkey's national policy at the macro level has been constructed to serve the political and socioeconomic ends, and the role of English as the most prominent foreign language in the school curriculum has been to function as a mediating tool for Turkey to achieve its globalisation goal. (2009a, p. 681)

As opposed to British Council's (2015) and Kırkgöz's (2009a) reports, the number of EMI universities has been increasing from four EMI universities in the 1990s to 36 out of 184 (20%) EMI universities in 2013 (Arik & Arik, 2014). In 2016, 110 out of 178 (61.7%) universities in Turkey were using EMI (Dearden & Akıncıoğlu, 2016). Currently, there are 127 public and 73 private universities in Turkey with EMI, TMI, and/or mixed medium instruction (Council of Higher Education, 2022). Furthermore, Middle East Technical University has been the first university to provide EMI since 1956, followed by Boğaziçi University since 1971, and as the first foundation university, Bilkent, since 1984 (Selvi, 2014; Karakaş & Jenkins, 2022).

2.2.1 English language teaching policies and practices. It is not possible to isolate foreign language education policy and planning and the medium of instruction from social, geographical, and historical contexts (Kırkgöz, 2017). Therefore, to comprehensively understand the language education policy choices of the governing bodies of Turkey, there is a need to, first, understand the geographical, historical, and sociocultural situations. Geopolitically speaking, Turkey is situated in a crucial part of the world, bridging the continents of Europe and Asia. While, geologically, it is a bigger part of the Middle East, many policies tend to be on the European side since the

western part of the world is idealised more by the people of Turkey in general. English in Turkey is crucial as a way of communicating and interacting with others, increasing trade relations, advancing its tourism businesses, and managing individual job prospects (Kırkgöz, 2017).

Moreover, aiming to become a global economic power, Turkey is aware of the importance of learning additional languages (mainly English) and has been responding to global changes around the world since its foundation (Kırkgöz, 2017). In addition to its goal to become a global economic power and open up to Europe, Turkey is motivated to promote English language education to improve human capital as a nation (Staub & Kırkgöz, 2014) through the internalisation of education (Kırkgöz, 2017). English language teaching (ELT) policies were shaped around similar goals of improvement during the 1960s (Selvi, 2021). In 1955, the Ministry of National Education (*Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı,* MoNE) initiated the expansion of ELT by adopting English as the first foreign language to be taught, which was previously French (Selvi, 2021). From 1955 onwards, English was either taught supplementarily or used as the medium of instruction in some schools (e.g., Robert College); some schools, on the other hand, established preparatory programs prior to high school.

With one of the most recent reforms, the 2013 Education Reform, MoNE revised the curriculum by highlighting the importance of communicative competence,

> There is no question that the key to economic, political, and social progress in contemporary Turkish society depends on the ability of Turkish citizens to communicate effectively on an international level, and competence in English is a key factor in this ability. (MEB, 2013, p. ii)

However, this policy has not become a reality yet; even though the students had 1000+ hours of English classes until the end of high school, their progress was quite basic, as opposed to the expected B2 level (Kırkgöz, 2017). MEB has acknowledged the issue where students view learning an L2 as an academic requirement as opposed to a way of communicating (MEB, 2013). Moreover, in addition to the students' perspective on L2 being an academic requirement, teachers are not different; they view and teach English as if it is Mathematics, with rules and formulas, as opposed to a communication tool. On the other hand, another goal was the internationalisation of education and responding to the EU's requirements of the Bologna Process, which

aims at improving the European higher education institutions since 1999. After signing into the Bologna Process in 2001, Turkey started to use the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), improve academic mobility and exchange, set up accreditation, and ensure the quality of teacher education (Kırkgöz, 2017). Turkey's awareness of the language learning needs, and motivation to internationalise education to become global are quite visible in their policymaking. However, policies are yet to become reality and practice.

2.3 University Entrance Examination in Turkey

Life = 180 minutes? (Turkish Education Association, 2005)

In Turkey's educational context, the university entrance exams are conducted by the *Ölçme, Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi* (Measurement, Selection, and Placement Centre in English; ÖSYM) every year. Currently and since 2018, the process of examination is threefold and is called *Yükseköğretim Kurumları Sınavı* (The Higher Education Institutions Examination; YKS). Firstly, candidates sit for an exam on their basic proficiency in Turkish, liberal arts, mathematics, and science (TYT). TYT is the only exam required to enrol at a university. The second one is the 180-minute-long *Alan Yeterlilik Testleri* (Field Qualification Tests; AYT). The last one is the *Yabancı Dil Testi* (Foreign Language Test; YDT). Even though the participants of the paper at hand have taken a different exam; the biggest difference was the name of the exams (YGS-LYS). YGS and LYS were utilised between 2010 and 2018. YGS is equal to TYT, and LYS to AYT. YDT was a subsection of LYS. The YDT exam consists of grammar, vocabulary, cloze tests, sentence and dialogue completion, translation, and reading. It does not test listening and writing, but it indirectly tests speaking skills with "what would you say in this circumstance?" type of questions. Overall, the university exam assesses the accuracy of test-takers' language knowledge rather than their fluency.

Moreover, there is a constant increase in the number of high-stakes tests, which affect the future of students, teachers, administrators, schools, and so forth. (Madaus, 1988; Choi, 2008; Hatipoğlu, 2013). Almost in every setting where these exams are utilised, they are the sole criteria that decide if test-takers can enrol in the department or program in which they want to enrol (Yıldırım, 2010). Most times, educational policies and systems, curricula of any kind, and methods of teaching are based on these

tests. Such an approach to testing and assessment results in the narrowing of the curricula (Cheng, 2005). Moreover, course objectives (Cheng, Watanabe, & Curtis, 2004), learning styles (Shih, 2009), and teaching methods (Spratt, 2005) are affected by these tests as well. Overall, ELT is imbued with the notion of a teaching-to-the-test approach.

Consequently, having a system that is exam-oriented, Turkey suffers from "washback" (Hughes, 1989). A great number of learning activities and all teaching materials are designed by the exams. The importance put on the exams results in the evaluation of the students, teachers, and schools based merely on their exam performance (Hatipoğlu, 2017). In her review of the examination system in Turkey from the perspective of English teacher candidates, Hatipoğlu (2016) states that Turkey's examination system changes too frequently. As a bigger problem, these changes, for her, are not based on educational research, theories, or contemporary models of assessment; they are merely political and practical decisions, which are not taken on the basis of prospective imposition of positive effects. Consequently, the language proficiency of a student is solely determined by their exam scores. Being a high-stakes exam, it decides what is taught, resulting in exams being the "de facto curriculum in Turkey" (Hatipoğlu, 2016, p. 143). Therefore, students (teachers as well) only focus on what the exams test and ignore the rest (listening, speaking, and writing). Out of fifty participants, Hatipoğlu (2016) found that all participants view the exam as detrimental. Currently, even though there are private schools that attempt to teach English in a communicative way, English education in the primary and secondary institutions (be it private or public) is still, widely, based on passing an exam. Resulting from washback, EFL teachers are not teaching how to be proficient in English; they are teaching how to easily pass the exam by using memorised information and independent units of language with almost no focus on speaking, listening, or writing since the test-takers focus on these more than improving their language skills (Külekçi, 2016). 208,165 language students have taken the exam in 2021; yet only 43% of them managed to be enrolled in a language department (ÖSYM, 2021). Such a statistic shows the direness of the situation.

In his analysis of the English examination in Turkey (YDS), Külekçi (2016) found that the test focuses on grammar and vocabulary knowledge along with textual

comprehension as opposed to pragmatic knowledge. It disregards the communicative and productive aspects of the language (Külekçi, 2016). Even though testing grammatical knowledge is an important component of language proficiency (Rimmer, 2006), language tests should assess the grammar usage of the test-takers indirectly and integratedly in real-life speaking or writing contexts (Larsen-Freeman, 2009), addressing communicative competence (Kitao & Kitao, 1996). The grammatical focus of the language tests in Turkey results in negative washback since students mostly focus on grammar, vocabulary, and reading skills as opposed to speaking, pronunciation, listening, or writing (Polat, 2019; Akpınar & Çakıldere, 2013; Külekçi, 2016). This washback affects teachers and curricula as well. They focus on what the students want and need to learn to pass the exam. Even though all four language skills are interconnected, equally important, and should be the focus of attention, the focus is mostly on grammar teaching (Solak & Bayar, 2015). Consequently, as opposed to all the English courses they have experienced, Turkish language learners complain about their inability to express themselves in English (Solak & Bayar, 2015).

As a result of the English language tests in Turkey failing to assess language proficiency as a whole concept and rather assessing it in decontextualised pieces without focusing on listening, writing, and speaking, universities in Turkey carry out their own language proficiency tests which include all skills. If students fail to pass this proficiency exam, they are required to spend, at least, one semester in preparatory schools, making it a minimum of four and a half years to obtain their bachelor's degree at best. The language education that starts in the second grade and continues up to the last year of high school totals at 1,000 lesson hours (Kırkgöz, 2017); yet learners still complain about their inability to express themselves (Solak & Bayar, 2015).

2.4 English Medium of Instruction in Turkey

English, over time, managed to be *sine qua non* for people over the world (Ekoç, 2018). Being the lingua franca, English has affected all levels of education (Kırkgöz, 2009a), especially universities. Against this backdrop, universities in Turkey, be it for monetary gain or academic success, aim at becoming international and global (Turhan & Kırkgöz, 2018). Not only to this end but also to create student and instructor mobility across many countries, i.e., internationalisation (Macaro & Akıncıoğlu, 2018), they utilise English medium of instruction (EMI). However, EMI can be

problematic when it comes to implementation and its effects on various students and instructors separately, even though lecturers' and students' experiences of EMI are directly linked (Keleş & Yazan, 2022).

For EMI instructors, there are various problems. Özer (2020) examined the practices and problems of EMI instructors as can be seen in Table 3:

Table 3

Constraints of EMI for Instructors

Constraint	Percentage
Reluctance to speak due to proficiency	81.4
Lack of international students	77.5
Difficulty in simplifying content	58.9
Insufficient comprehension	32.4
Lack of English terminology	17.6
Lack of improvisation and spontaneity while teaching	7.8

As can be seen in Table 3, Özer found that when students fail to understand a specific content, instructors (69.6%) chose to "provide a simpler explanation" while 27.5% of instructors switched to or recapped in English. When asked about their challenges and constraints regarding EMI, while there were many other constraints (see Table 3), 81% of the instructors complained about the students' reluctance to speak English. To negate their reluctance, instructors believed that the higher the number of international students is, the higher the local students' motivation would be (Özer, 2020). Moreover, 17.6% also believed that the existence of international students in a class forced the lecturer to speak English during the lesson. In their study on the beliefs and perceptions of the academic staff on EMI, Karakaş and Jenkins (2022) found that while the staff was aware of the one-size-fits-all policy of the institution, they failed to see the disparity between policy and practice.

On the other hand, students must overcome various problems regarding EMI. These challenges may be related to the lecturers' or the institutions' EMI policies. In many studies on EMI, it is found that the two interconnected areas of problem are lack of language proficiency, and hence, low levels of lecture comprehension and

acquisition (Özer, 2020; Keleş & Yazan, 2022; Kırkgöz, 2009a; Özer & Bayram, 2019; Yıldız, Soruç, & Griffiths, 2017; Kırkgöz, 2005; Guarda & Helm, 2017). Because of unfounded policies in language education (Hatipoğlu, 2016), discrepancies between macro-level policies and micro-level practices (Kırkgöz, 2017), and the effect of negative washback in testing (Polat, 2019), learners enrol at EMI universities without sufficient proficiency to study the academic subjects. Consequently, they must attend preparatory programs (Özer, 2020) which aim to teach general English, yet students lack the necessary field-specific terminology when they start their courses (Karakaş, 2019). Moreover, even though EMI is problematic for academic content delivery, in a study with 527 fourth-year students and 87 lecturers, Sert (2008) found that EMI is effective for improving language skills.

On the other hand, since the late 1990s, there has been a strong opposition towards EMI in Turkey. Doğançay-Aktuna (1998) states that some educators are against EMI since they believe it diminishes the importance and usage of the national language (Turkish) in prestigious contexts. Among the opponents of EMI, there is a Turkish scientist, namely Oktay Sinanoğlu (1998), who stated that it would not only be a "cultural genocide" but also unconstitutional to use EMI in Turkey. For Sinanoğlu, EMI could only be utilised in colonised countries. Furthermore, Selvi (2014) linked the careless spellings of Turkish and the combination of Turkish and English to EMI.

Even though many disadvantages can be seen in the literature (see Çankaya, 2017), EMI remains to be advantageous for many. Having an EMI course increases the academic prestige, international research funds, and the number of international students (Turhan & Kırkgöz, 2018). Alptekin and Tatar (2011) cite that amongst the cognitive and affective advantages, EMI leads to globalisation and provides citizens of Turkey access to the EU. Consequently, EMI is a debate which will stay as a topic of discussion for the people in Turkey.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the related literature was reviewed and summarised within the framework of the language socialisation theory. The first section provided an overview of language socialisation, second language socialisation, and teacher socialisation theories. The second section presented a brief history of EFL and ELT in Turkey. The

third section reviewed the UEE in Turkey. The fourth and last section provided the literature on EMI and its effects in the Turkish education context.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

This study attempts to explore how English language teachers who work at a preparatory school in İstanbul view their language learning experiences, and how these experiences affect their current teaching practices. To this end, this study addresses the following research questions:

1. How do six EFL teachers from Turkey working at a preparatory school at a foundation university in Istanbul view their language learning socialisation experiences?
2. How are their views regarding their own language learning socialisation manifested in their current teaching practices?

This chapter consists of four main sections as research design, setting and participants, procedures, and limitations of the study. In the first section, an overview of the design of the study will be provided. In the second section, the setting and participants will be introduced in detail. Next, the third section will provide information on the data collection and analysis procedures, tools, and trustworthiness of the study. Finally, the fourth section will provide the limitations of the study.

3.1 Research Design

Qualitatively, the design of this study is two-fold. Narrative inquiry will be utilised to collect field texts on the participants while autoethnography (AE) will be incorporated to collect data on the researcher. The collected data will be thematically analysed with the framework of language socialisation theory (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a) in mind. Firstly, an AE attempts to combine autobiography with ethnography (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2010). It aims to analyse (graphy) personal experiences (auto) to explore cultural (ethno) experiences (Ellis, 2004). Autoethnographies, in nature, are very oxymoronic, in that they are the combination of the self with a culture, which connotes a group of people (Chang et al., 2013); autoethnographies not only try to tell a personal story but also explore social situations and realities through researcher's understanding and personal experiences (Chang, 2016). Since this study aims to delve into the language learning experiences of EFL teachers from Turkey and the culture they belong to, including the researchers', an autoethnography is a great fit

to incorporate the researcher's perspective with the participants. As Chang (2016) stated, autoethnographies are tools to examine and/or explore how people interact with, influence and be influenced by their socio-cultural contexts and experiences. The personal experience of the researcher will constitute the *auto* and the *ethno* of this study. The juxtaposition of these will provide the *graphy* of this autoethnographic study.

Secondly, being a qualitative research methodology, narrative inquiry is utilised to gather field texts on the participants through journal entries and semi-structured interviews. Narrative inquiry combines storytelling and research through either analysis of narratives or narrative analysis (Barkhuizen et al., 2014). In this study, narrative analysis is utilised, which is transforming non-narrative data into a narrative to convey the understanding of it (Barkhuizen et al., 2014).

Moreover, in traditional methods of research, there is a strict balance between the researcher and participant. In AE, however, the researcher is the, or one of the, participant(s). This emerging paradigm aids in lowering the subjectivity bias while creating the necessary environment needed to equally, both as a researcher and participant, analyse, interpret, and righteously represent the topic at hand (Chang et al., 2013).

In total, there are six participants, including myself, the researcher. I asked the participants to write three journal entries on the following topics, respectively, (a) English language learning experiences before starting their studies at university, (b) their English language development during their university years, and lastly, (c) their English language teaching and further development after university, as part of their careers. Using these entries as a vantage point, I prepared the semi-structured interviews based on the emerging themes and topics. Once the first round of journal entry writing and consecutive interviewing was completed, the participants wrote their second journal entries, which were followed by the second interviews. After the third round of data collection was over, I completed the second coding of the journal entries, which was followed by transcribing the interview data. Meanwhile, I wrote self-reflection papers that include information that I asked my participants in their interviews. In total, there were three journal entries and three interviews for my participants along with three self-reflection papers that I wrote myself.

Employing narrative inquiry and an autoethnographic approach, this study aims to convey how six EFL teachers working at a preparatory school in a university in Turkey view their language learning experiences while trying to understand the effects of this on their current teaching practices

3.2 Setting and Participants

This study is situated at a preparatory school at a foundation university, Firstville University, in İstanbul, Turkey. In the Turkish context to become an English teacher in primary, middle, and high schools, one needs a diploma from English Language Teaching (ELT) or English Language and Literature (ELL) departments. The graduates of ELL departments are required to have a pedagogical formation certificate, obtained from the institutions which the Ministry of National Education of Turkey (MoNE) has approved during or after their bachelor's degree. After obtaining their diplomas, and formation certificates, newly graduated English teachers have two options: working in public or private institutions. Working in state schools requires prospective teachers to take the civil servant selection exam (KPSS, *Kamu Personel Seçme Sınavı*), followed by an interview. The collective score of KPSS and interview decides whether a teacher candidate can work in public schools with academic tenure or not – teachers who were successful in the exam but who are not appointed as a teacher may work as nontenured teachers in public schools. However, working in private schools does not require KPSS. They only require a diploma, be it ELT or ELL (with pedagogical formation).

At the tertiary level, things are quite different. In Turkey, for the departments which use English Medium Instruction (EMI), students are required to have a certain level of English to start their bachelor's degree. Students who are not proficient enough are required to take the preparatory school until they successfully pass an English proficiency exam. Teachers in Turkey have the option of working in these preparatory schools. To become an English instructor in a university's preparatory school, on top of a bachelor's degree, the candidates need to obtain exam scores from the Academic Personnel and Graduate Education Exam (ALES, *Akademik Personel ve Lisansüstü Eğitmi Sınavı*) and the Foreign Language Knowledge Level Determination Exam (YDS, *Yabancı Dil Bilgisi Seviye Belirleme Sınavı*). However, having these scores is the minimum requirement for being a part-time instructor. The Turkish government requires full-time English instructors in preparatory schools to have a master's degree

in a related field. Nevertheless, the differences between part-time and full-time instructors are merely the salary and social security insurance contributions. While some universities have 12-month contracts for part-time instructors, some have 9-month contracts. Yet, the workload of the instructors is the same. On top of the requirements above, certificates such as Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (CELTA) and Diploma in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (DELTA) are not necessarily mandatory but quite desirable for certain institutions.

I chose the participants of this study purposively amongst my own colleagues, whom I know very well. Purposive sampling is deliberately selecting participants to explore a phenomenon (Creswell, 2012b). As narrative inquiry requires a deep understanding of the participants' experiences (Murray, 2009; Clandinin & Caine, 2013; Barkhuizen et al., 2014), and this study's purpose is to explore those who have gone through similar experiences as the researcher, I recruited five colleagues, who are also my close friends from work, to tell me about their language learning experiences. All participants of this study work at the preparatory school of the same foundation university, Firstville University, in Istanbul, Turkey. Pseudonyms are adopted to protect the privacy of the participants. Table 4 provides detailed information on the participants' backgrounds:

Table 4

Participants

Name	Sex	Experience	Current Education
İsa	Male	2 years	BA + MA in ELT[a]
Efe	Male	1 year	BA + MA in ELT
Hakan	Male	2 years	BA in ELT + MA in C&I[b]
Deniz	Female	1 year	BA + MA in ELT
Ezel	Male	5 years	BA + MA in ELL[c]
Mert	Male	3 years	BA + MA in ELT

Note. None of the participants completed their master's degrees as of this study. All names but the researchers are pseudonyms. [a] English language teaching. [b] Curriculum and instruction. [c] English language and literature.

As can be seen in Table 4, this study employs six (5 male, 1 female) participants in total, one of which is the researcher himself (namely, İsa) as the nature of an autoethnography requires. Five participants obtained their bachelor's degree in English language teaching (ELT) departments, one participant graduated from English

Language and Literature (ELL) department. Furthermore, four participants are studying in the ELT department for their master's degrees as of this study while one studies ELL, and one of them studies curriculum and instruction (C&I).

I, the researcher of this study, was born and raised in İstanbul, Turkey. For 19 years, I lived in Bağcılar with my family. Bağcılar, for me, was a test of my will to be better. I went to primary and middle schools there. After getting a high score on the high school entrance exam, I managed to get into a respectable high school in İstanbul. However, being unaware of my options, I chose to major in the Turkish and Mathematics strand. Over time, seeing that my grades were dramatically low, I realised that mathematics was not what I wanted. I did not want to be a doctor or an engineer. At that point, there was only one subject for me – English, at which I was good. Be that as it may, my high school did not have a language department. One day, because of my seemingly unexpected academic failure, I was called by the guidance office where I pleaded my case on going to another school with a foreign language department (namely, English). I was shut down by the psychological counsellor who called me a failure who had no idea and would dramatically fail the English exam. However, the guidance teacher could not have been more wrong. I changed my school and went to a language college where I was taught formal English and prepared for the university entrance exam (UEE) in my last year in high school. After getting a relatively high score (477 out of 500), I went to start my bachelor's degree in one of the best private universities in terms of exam scores in İstanbul with a full scholarship. Later, I went to Warsaw, Poland for six months as part of the Erasmus+ programme. I found a teaching job in a preparatory school as soon as I graduated. Currently, I am 23 years old and have been a teacher for almost two years. I am getting my master's degree. In the future, I aim to become an ELT teacher trainer.

Efe (pseudonym as all the other names hereafter) was born and raised in İstanbul; he is 24 years old and has been a teacher for almost a year. He lives in İstanbul. He has gone to various state schools throughout his life and has been studying English extensively since the second year of high school. In his last year, he transferred to another high school which had a higher score according to the high school entrance exam. He spent his time preparing for the UEE. During this time, he travelled to Romania as part of the Comenius program for one week. During high school, and some

time before, he was exposed to English through playing video games, following gaming videos on YouTube, and watching original TV series and movies online in English. This was the time when his interest in English peaked. He believes that without these hobbies, he would not have any English, without English, he would not be the person he is now. Later on, he managed to get into the same university as I as a scholarship student, showing great success. We met in one of the courses we took in 2016 and have been friends ever since. During his undergraduate years, Efe was a part of a writing club with his friends. He is known for his love of literature, writing, and movies. Graduating with a high GPA, he had a gap year where he neither studied nor worked due to the pandemic and unwillingness to become a teacher; he wanted to become a writer and pursue his dreams. However, due to the economic problems and suffering particularly from writer's block, he started his MA in ELT as a scholarship student at the same university where he is currently working. Even though he is happy to be an English teacher, he still aspires to be an author in the future.

Deniz was born and raised in İstanbul. She is 24 years old and has been an EFL teacher for almost a year. She lives with her family in Kadıköy, İstanbul. Her father, who ignited her love of English from an early age, is an English teacher as well. Going to a private, high-profile, bilingual middle school, Deniz was exposed to authentic English from the very beginning of her education. Her dream was to help people, hence she wanted to become a psychologist. However, she managed to get into the same university as Efe and me as a scholarship student in ELT. She met with Efe and I there five years ago and has been friends with us ever since. In her second year in university, she started her double major in psychology to pursue her dreams. In her third year, she went to Germany as an Erasmus student and attempted to learn German – she speaks B1-level German. Until she graduated, she was not sure if she wanted to be an English teacher. Eventually, after talking with some English teachers whom she admired, she decided that teaching was a way of helping people as well. Currently, she works at the same university where she is doing her MA in ELT.

Hakan was born and raised in İstanbul, Turkey. He is a 25-year-old EFL teacher who has two years of active teaching experience in preparatory schools. Throughout his life, he has gone to state schools. In his last year in high school, he met Efe, and they have been friends ever since. After the UEE, he made his choice to be in a

foundation university as a scholarship student. This was the university that Efe, Deniz, and I would attend after a year. At university, he improved his speaking skills and overcame his fear of public speaking. During this self-improvement phase, the key event in Hakan's life was going to Canada as a student teacher via a two-month internship. He was constantly exposed to English there. Right after he graduated, he found a job at a foundation university's preparatory school as a part-time instructor. Later on, he wanted to start his MA degree in Curriculum and Instruction at a state university. Currently, he is writing his MA thesis and working at the same preparatory school as the other participants. In the future, he aims to go abroad to improve himself in the field.

Ezel is a 27-year-old EFL instructor at the same university as the other participants. He was born and raised in İstanbul and grew up around Sultanahmet (the historical peninsula), a place full of tourists. With such early exposure to foreign languages, and having a confident personality, Ezel found himself having small talks with tourists. Going to a pre-school, which had an English teacher, until kindergarten helped him immensely as well. After the UEE, he found himself in a state university in northern Turkey, in a relatively small city. He spent five years there, studying English Language and Literature (ELL). After his BA, he started to work as an English teacher in a language school. Over the year, his success as a teacher led him to be the principal of the school for a couple of months. Meanwhile, he took his teaching formation (i.e., a certificate that is required by the Ministry of National Education from the prospective teachers who graduated from departments other than ELT) in another city to be officially able to work as an English teacher in K-12 schools in Turkey. Later on, he found himself in a private university's preparatory school. He worked there for two years. After getting his CELTA two years ago, he changed his workplace. Currently, he is working with the other participants of this study at Firstville University and getting his MA in English Language and Literature (ELL) at another foundation university in İstanbul.

Mert is a 26-year-old EFL instructor at Firstville University. Until high school, he lived with his family in Zonguldak. Throughout his education, he went to state schools. In high school, he found himself in a vocational teacher high school (i.e., a high school whose graduates receive additional points in their EUU scores). He did

not choose to be in this school. It was not because he wanted to be a teacher, but because it was the best school he was able to attend. After studying teaching and English in high school, getting prepared for the UEE, he found himself in the ELT department of one of the best state universities in terms of score in İstanbul, Turkey. During university, he went to Germany as an Erasmus student. There, he started learning German and conducted a student project on intercultural communication and migration with a German researcher team of four. His time in Germany was quite fruitful, not only for his well-being but also for his English language skills. After coming back and upon graduating from the university, Mert found himself working at a private college for over a year. Later, he worked as an education consultant/instructor at a foundation university. Meanwhile, he was proctoring and assessing exams for two international educational services (British Side Educational Services and ConnecMe Education). Finally, he started to work at the same university as the other participants. Currently, he is doing his MA at the same university where he works. In the future, he aims to be an academician in the field of ELT in Germany.

As all participants work as part-time instructors at Firstville University, their workload is the same. Since, to work as a full-time instructor in a preparatory school, you need to have a master's degree with a thesis in Turkey, all participants are part-time instructors. However, there is no difference between full- and part-time instructors when it comes to workload. Each instructor has two classes, one main (called integrated skills) and one side class (called academic skills). As part of integrated skills courses, the curriculum includes the following skills, speaking (only for levels below B1), use of English (grammar), thematic vocabulary, reading, reading strategy training (for B1 and above); as part of academic skills, instructors teach paragraph writing (B1 and below), essay writing (B2 and above), and speaking (for levels above B1). Academic skills courses occasionally include grammar teaching as well.

The instructors have 23 hours of lessons in total; six hours of writing, and 17 hours of main class – the exact time distribution is dependent on the level and module. Even though the workload of the participants is the same, the preparatory school they work in employs a hybrid approach due to the pandemic. Each module and level have different schedules. As of the writing of this thesis, levels below B1 had three days of

face-to-face education and two days of online courses. They, also, have several extra hours every week spent on planning, reading papers, aiding students, and giving feedback. The participants teach the same class every module; every module is eight weeks, the last week being the examination week. As part of the examination week, the instructors assess speaking and writing, in addition to the multiple-choice test on vocabulary, reading, and grammar.

3.2.1 Positionality statement. Amongst the five participants of this study (excluding myself), I have known three of them for over five years, one for two years, and one for a year. While the participants whom I have known for five years were my classmates from our bachelor's degree, the other two are my colleagues and friends. Even though knowing my participants have certain limitations, narrative inquiry requires a certain degree of rapport between the interviewee and interviewer (Murray, 2009). My friendship with the participants was crucial for this study. In a situation where I did not know my participants, the data I gathered from the incorporated tools would be limited to the trust I managed to earn since "establishing a comfortable rapport with the participants is crucial if we expect them to talk about their lives" (Murray, 2009, p. 50). In my case, however, my participants are my close friends; they stated their trust in me to protect their identity and privacy.

3.3 Procedures

3.3.1 Data collection tools. As part of this study, two main tools were utilised. Firstly, the participants were asked to write three separate journal entries on their, respectively, English language learning experiences before starting university, English language learning during university, and English language learning after university, in that, as part of their career.

The second tool was the semi-structured interviews which explored and inquired about the related journal entries. The interviews were held in the participants' preferred language, i.e., English. Even though these interviews, "reflective dyadic interviews" – as Ellis and Berger (2002, pp. 853-854) call them – were traditional in many ways, they had the dimension of sharing personal experiences mutually between the participants and the researcher. As Ellis and Berger (2002) state what the researcher shares is more about the need to share as opposed to trying to encourage them to share more. Meaning that, as interviewees shared the intimate details of their past and current

lives, the interviewer felt the desire to do so as well. In addition to the journal entries and interviews, field notes, curricula vitae, and personal documents were utilised as supplementary data sources to investigate the participants' lives. Table 5 provides an overview of the data collection tools:

Table 5

Data Collection Tools

Tool	Type	Length	Medium	Misc.
Journal Entries	Open-ended prompts	1 week	Word	Text-based
Interviews	Semi-structured	30-90 minutes	Teams	Audio-recorded
Supplementary Documents	Various	N/A	N/A	Text-based

As can be seen in Table 5, participants were provided open-ended prompts and a week to write a journal entry, followed by semi-structured, online interviews that ranged from 30 to 90 minutes in length. Also, various, text-based documents were utilised.

3.3.2 Data collection procedures. The design of this study required a gradual approach. After getting their consent, the participants were asked to share their curricula vitae with the researcher, from which the researcher gathered the background data that may be of importance to the study. Later, the participants were asked to write the first journal entry on their English language learning experiences before starting university – the participants were given, at least, a week to do so as their busy schedules may have not allowed them to clearly write what they wanted to convey in a limited time. These journal entries were written on a word processing tool (Microsoft Word) in English as participants chose to do so. Table 6 shows the data collection procedures:

Table 6

Data Collection Procedures

Date	Source	Theme	Mode
31 Jan.	JE 1	Language learning experiences pre-university	Text
07-13 Feb.	Int 1	Language learning experiences pre-university	Video
14 Feb.	JE 2	Language learning experiences during university	Text
21-28 Feb.	Int 2	Language learning experiences during university	Video
1 Mar.	JE 3	Language teaching after university	Text
7-13 Mar.	Int 3	Language teaching after university	Video

Note. Respectively, JE and Int stand for journal entry and interview.

As can be seen in Table 6, the journal entries were followed by semi-structured interviews. Journal entries served both as primary data sources and the basis for the semi-structured interviews. The protocols for the semi-structured interviews were prepared according to the journal entries along with the relationships of the researcher and participants. The interviews took place on an online platform (namely, MS Teams) since participants and their busy schedules did not allow regular face-to-face meetings. The participants were asked whether they wanted to use English and Turkish. All participants preferred English as the language of the interviews. After the findings were written, the participants were asked to confirm what was written about them through member checking (Creswell, 2012).

3.3.3 Data analysis procedures. As mentioned, the data were collected over approximately six weeks and thematic analysis was utilised. Thematic analysis is the process of finding and categorising certain patterns and themes amongst any qualitative data (Maguire & Delahunt, 2017). The collected data were gradually and thematically coded. As participants wrote their journal entries, they were thematically coded to create the interview protocols for the following interviews. The first journal entry was thematically coded for the first interview, the second journal entry for the second interview, and the third journal entry for the third interview. As the interviews continued, they were transcribed and coded. From the codes, the researcher produced themes which were put under their related chronological title as pre-university, during university, and post-university.

3.3.4 Trustworthiness. Even though autoethnographers employ and appreciate the narrated truth of the participants' experiences (Bochner, 1994), they are still aware that memory is rather imperfect, meaning that people may not be able to througly remember and describe the past events (Ellis et al., 2010). Hence, the meaning and usage of the words, reliability, validity, and generalizability, change when they are applied to autoethnography (Ellis et al., 2010) or any qualitative research. Moreover, member checking was utilised to confirm the accuracy of the findings.

Reliability in autoethnography is concerned with the credibility of the reporter while validity requires coherence and believability in the story, a connection to the participants' current lives (Ellis et al., 2010). On the other hand, Plummer (2001) states that the narrator's perspective does not need to conform with reality per se, yet the narrative should let the audience into the life of the teller.

Generalizability, however, does not refer to the large samples of respondents as in the traditional sense. The audience is the entity that has the power to decide whether a narrative responds to and reflects them or their lives.

3.4 Limitations

The main limitation of any autoethnographic piece is being criticised as too artistic and not systematic, or too systematic and not artistic enough (Ellis, 2010). When traditional, social scientific standards are considered, autoethnography is either not theoretical enough or too aesthetic and emotional (Ellis, 2010). The emotionality, evocation, and seeming individuality of autoethnography may make it seem as if it is not scientific enough. On the other hand, this study is limited to six participants. Narrative inquiry is an intensive process that requires time (Murray, 2009); therefore, it would not only be difficult to have more participants due to the time limitations but also unnecessary since there is no pursuit of universal generalisations in qualitative research (Murray, 2009). Similarly, all participants in this study work in the same institution. Not having a quest for universals and generalisability, this study is limited to the six people who have taken part in it. Moreover, the participants of this study are not experienced teachers (1-5 years of teaching experience).

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the methodology of the study was depicted. As part of the methodology, research design, participants and setting, data collection and analysis

procedures, as well as the data collection tools, and limitations of the study were provided. In the next chapter, the findings of the study will be provided.

Chapter 4: Findings

Introduction

In this chapter, I, first, summarise the data collection and analysis procedures. Then, I present the findings of the study by using second language socialisation (SLS) theory as a theoretical lens in three parts as the participants' (a) language learning experiences before university, (b) language learning experiences during university, and (c) language teaching experiences after graduating from university.

The data in this study were collected primarily through participants' journal entries (JE) and interviews (Int). More specifically, I utilised three journal entries for each participant and three consecutive semi-structured interviews. The participants were asked to write three JEs on their language learning experiences pre-university, during university, and after they graduated, as part of their career, respectively. Basing the questions on these JEs and our friendship, semi-structured, online interviews were conducted on Microsoft Teams after each JE. As secondary data, I analysed participants' curricula vitae (CVs) along with incorporating informal conversations we had over the course of our friendships. The collected interview data were thematically analysed. Consequently, several themes were generated under the scope of each interview. Table 7 shows the generated themes under each interview subject:

Table 7

Generated Themes

Interview 1	Interview 2	Interview 3
Initial SLS into English	SLS in different universities	Explicit & implicit teaching
SLS in state schools	SLS abroad	Being friendly with students
Informal SLS	ADS	Formal teacher socialisation
	EMI	

Note. SLS, ADS, and EMI respectively stand for second language socialisation, academic discourse socialisation, and English medium of instruction.

As can be seen in Table 7, several themes were generated under each interview. Under the first interviews regarding our (the participants') learning experiences pre-university, there are initial second language socialisation (SLS) into English, SLS in state schools, and informal SLS. As part of the second interviews about our language learning experiences during university, four themes were generated: SLS in different universities, SLS abroad, academic discourse socialisation (ADS), and English

medium of instruction (EMI). Under the last interviews on our language learning experiences after university, as part of our careers, three themes were generated: explicit and implicit teaching, being friendly with students, and finally, formal teacher socialisation.

Moreover, our socialisation processes started with SLS before university, continued with ADS, and then, teacher socialisation after our bachelor's degrees. Although these processes were consecutive, they were continuous as well, meaning that after SLS started, it kept continuing. The start of another socialisation process did not cease the others; on the contrary, they enhanced each other.

4.1 Language Learning Experiences Pre-University

Efe, Ezel, Mert, Deniz, Hakan, and I, as the participants of this study, have been living different lives with various people, in similar yet distinct cultures. Some had an English teacher in their family (Deniz and Mert); some loved gaming and watching TV series in English (Efe and I); one read books in English extensively (Hakan); one had the earliest possible exposure to English (Ezel). All these teachers of English, collectively, have merely one thing in common, and that is being an EFL teacher in a preparatory school at Firstville University in İstanbul, Turkey. Even though we may have had similar experiences, these experiences affected us differently. In this part, I present the findings regarding our pre-university language learning experiences in three sections, (a) initial second language socialisation into the English language, (b) second language socialisation in state schools, and (c) informal second language socialisation.

4.1.1 Initial second language socialisation into English. Almost all of us experienced and were exposed to language one way or the other at home. Some of us were socialised into English via the family members who speak English, and some of us via the internet. On having an English teacher in the family, Deniz said, "I did not have a chance to speak. So, he [her father] was the one on the speaking side for me. He was the one who taught me how to learn and speak English" (Int1). In Deniz's case, her father was the expert, and she was the newcomer who was starting to be socialised into the English language. Similarly, Mert had a sister whose linguistic knowledge he admired. Even though he stated that his sister did not have a great impact on his

learning process, they still practised from time to time. However, this practice was limited to a few times a year when they were together as a family. His sister was an old-timer, an expert in the English language for Mert. Consequently, his initial socialisation into language was through her. Deniz's father and Mert's sister were the ones who initially socialised them into the English language.

Even though Efe and I did not have any family members with whom we could practice English, we found our own socialising agents: TV series and gaming. We were socialised into the English language over the years through watching original TV series and playing video games in English so much so that we believe they became the foundation of our language abilities and knowledge. On his love of gaming and its effect on his English, Efe stated,

> To start with my, you know, the effect of it [gaming] on my English, I would say it created it. I would say it didn't help, it created because, like I said, I base my English knowledge on the exposure I have. (Int1)

Efe believed that his English was not merely improved by video games, it was created by them. Video games that he played were not only the initial means of exposure but also the initial agent of second language socialisation (SLS). Video games provided us with not only linguistic input (i.e., different accents, vocabulary, colloquial language, and so on) but also cultural input (i.e., contextual information gathered through the narrative story of a game). Also, Efe stated that he "did not really enjoy the company of [his] peers" (Int1) when he was around 10 years old. He did not find his peers interesting, or rather, he found their interests and practices boring. Reluctant to partake in their specific communities of practice (CoP), he focused more and more on playing video games and the internet, through which he found his love of YouTube. YouTube acted as a socialising agent for him as well. For Efe, YouTube was entertaining, yet to access the entertainment, he needed the key which was English. On this platform, he started watching videos on gaming and found himself in various gaming-related forums where he joined the discussions. These forums functioned as a CoP for him. Although this CoP was related to gaming, its language was English. Consequently, Efe was led to legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) in both English and gaming through this CoP. Furthermore, I (İsa) loved playing first-person shooter games, but my family did not always have a powerful enough computer to play the games that I

wanted. I remember playing Call of Duty on the lowest settings, trying to understand the story and failing since there were not any Turkish subtitles. Being unable to play and understand, I found YouTube and started to watch some videos there – just as Efe did.

Ezel's situation was quite different, though. He neither had a family member speaking English nor did he have a love of gaming. Instead, he went to a pre-school where he was initially exposed to English, and later, he found himself growing up on the streets of Sultanahmet. As opposed to the rest of the participants, he was quite extroverted throughout his life and was not avoiding opportunities to practice. His extroversion and the opportunity for LPP amongst English-speaking tourists in Sultanahmet led him to practise English without aiming to do so. Ezel told a memory of his on learning English via tourists,

> All the time I made something up to talk to tourists. I was asking questions in broken English. "Hello, where do you come from?" and "How many years did you spend here?" or "How many weeks have you been staying here?" Those kinds of questions. I remember when once I asked the tourists that how old is he or she, and he told me, or she told me the age, and she asked me back. I said twenty instead of twelve. I was mixing twenty and twelve all the time back then. Sometimes you just make mistakes in some phrases, you know, and after that I was twenty times more careful. (Int1)

At that time, his goal was not to practise English but to interact with people by asking some questions. Yet, he, unintentionally, practised English with the tourists. He learnt and improved his English.

4.1.2 Second language socialisation in state schools. Even though Deniz and I have had private school experience at some point in our education, the rest of us went to state schools until university. Collectively, there were many common experiences, beliefs, and perceptions of our state school education. These commonalities were,

- Overcrowded classrooms,
- Ineffective teachers,
- Ineffective state school coursebooks,
- Lack of foreign language department,
- University entrance exam and negative washback.

Regarding overcrowded classrooms, Efe said, “my class was like 60 people at some point, it's not really possible to, you know, practise English there or learn like a lot of stuff” (Int1). The crowdedness of the classroom prevented it from functioning as a CoP since the teacher – as the old-timer of the community – of such a classroom would have 40 seconds per student throughout one lesson. Consequently, Efe could not have meaningful interaction with the old-timer(s) of the community. In addition to the lack of regular, let alone meaningful, interaction, the supposed old-timer of the classroom, the teacher, was barely an expert according to Efe. On the competency and effectiveness of his teacher, Efe stated that although he was not sure if he could take care of 60 students, but surely, he would know what “you’re welcome” meant in English, referring to one of his teachers who claimed that the phrase “you’re welcome” merely meant “welcome,” i.e., greeting. Due to the lack of an old-timer, opportunities for LPP, and time, Efe’s classroom failed to become a CoP that fosters meaningful interaction, regular collaboration, and legitimate participation.

Similarly, on the topic of incompetency of the state-school English teachers, Hakan said, “at primary school, when I was studying there, it was awful. I mean, yeah, we all know that state schools are not good for [education] in terms of English” (Int1). Efe furthered his answer by telling a memory of his,

> I remember, like, asking [his teacher in the state high school] a couple of words, but she said they didn't exist. Like, *dude*, I heard that a lot when I was watching, like, TV shows or YouTube videos, and I was like, “teacher, what does this mean, *dude*?” I wrote it on the board. I remember. And she was like, that's not a word, that doesn't exist. (Int1)

For both Hakan and Efe, they barely had an old-timer, let alone a classroom as a CoP in their primary state schools. Even though Efe, at first, claimed that the teacher might have believed that the word *dude* was not a word that Efe would need to know; however, after contemplating on the topic, he decided that it was extremely possible that the teacher did not know what *dude* meant since it was obvious that the teacher learnt English through grammar. She was neither exposed to culture nor slang. Consequently, she might have been, simply, imitating how her teachers taught her, under the influence of apprenticeship of observation (AoO).

Moreover, Deniz stated that she had a teacher in a state school who merely focused on the university entrance exam (UEE) as the indicator of success and would regularly explode on the students and scream, “You cannot be this stupid!” when students answered a grammar question wrong. She says, “He was like the visual representation of evil” (Int1), not because he was focused on the exam but because he was extremely rude and visibly careless for anything but grammatical knowledge More importantly, almost all participants were adamant that the teachers were preventing them from socialising into or through the language due to their outdated methods of teaching and disregard of the speaking and listening practices. I stated that,

> We endlessly practised grammar. We would always skip listening or speaking parts. At first, the names of the grammar topics scared me, then, I realised I just did not know their names but knew how to use them. I did not believe grammar was important and refused to listen to the teachers. (JE1)

Hakan went through something similar,

> I couldn't really understand the listening audios when I was listening at high school because I had no [previous] exposure or no real learning experience about listening or speaking, we were not speaking. We were memorising something. We were just learning the rules. (Int1)

Efe said,

> I remember the lessons were more like, you know, just doing the coursebook one by one. Fill in that blank, fill in this blank, fill in that blank and then do this and then go to the next unit. (…) we didn't really focus on the speaking parts. (Int1)

Even though Hakan, Efe, and I went to different state schools in different neighbourhoods, our experiences were quite similar. All our teachers disregarded the speaking and listening activities and instead focused on endless grammar practices and rote memorisation. We were prevented from LPP into speaking and listening skills at the start of our formal English education, which consequently either prevented or made it hard for us to participate in our future CoPs to socialise into language, academic discourse (see academic discourse socialisation under the second part of the findings), or even teaching (see the third part of the findings).

Hakan stated that he had a “horrible” experience until high school because of this above-mentioned “garbage-means-trash” interpretation of language teaching (Int1), namely, the grammar-translation method coupled with intentional disregard of some skills. At first, one might hold the view that the constant focus on grammar and lack of speaking was due to not being in the foreign language department (FLD). In Hakan’s case, this belief would be correct. After enrolling on the FLD in high school, his English visibly developed, and he believed that the methods became more communicative with the inclusion of group activities, hence collaboration. His English teachers in the FLD were able to generate an environment where students could learn not only from the teacher but also from each other by participating in their CoPs.

On a similar, yet inverted, note, Deniz went to a private and bilingual middle school with international students and foreign, English-speaking teachers. She identified herself as an introverted person who generally disliked group activities. However, in this school, she had many group activities, and she referred to them as fun,

> It [group activities] gave me the opportunity to use my imagination. So, it's really fun to create short stories or game shows or just colouring a poster was just so fun for me. So, I learned along with the entertaining part of the activity. So, even though I didn't like the group projects, I managed to study with other people because they were also having fun. (Int1)

She stated that her teachers showed her that English could be fun to learn together with others, under the guidance of teachers as old-timers. Even though she was provided with a CoP with opportunities of LPP and ample chance to socialise into the language during middle school, this opportunity ceased to exist when she started high school in the Turkish and mathematics strand. The four years in high school, which she referred to as the time she received nearly no English education for four years in her first JE, not only displaced her from all CoPs related to the English language and culture but also robbed her of the chance to master the language earlier than she did.

Moreover, all of us linked the problems mentioned above to the negative washback created by the UEE. This washback was twofold as on teachers and learners. Firstly, we agreed that the teachers believed getting a high score on the UEE was more important than learning to speak English. This agreement was seen in Deniz’s excerpt,

> I had a teacher in high school. He was like the visual representation of an evil. He just thought that the university entrance exam was the only indicator of English success, only that showed success in English. If you fail it, you shouldn't do anything about English in the future. So, if you don't know the basics, for example, like simple past rules, he would say, “you cannot be this stupid!” (Int1)

Her teacher was utilising teaching-to-the-test, and most would agree that this was, and possibly is, quite necessary for the current educational assessment system of Turkey. Deniz’s teacher failed her when they called people stupid because of their mistakes in English grammar. Deniz went on to say that one of her friends in high school grew so hateful of English that she refused to learn it in the future. Moreover, I had a similar experience where we endlessly practised grammar, solved multiple-choice tests, and intentionally skipped speaking, writing, and sometimes, listening activities. Preparing for a UEE that did not directly test speaking, writing, and listening, memorising vocabulary, and solving grammar tests were, indeed, necessary but not at the expense of other skills.

Secondly, on the negative washback on students, our speaking skills suffered the most, and it shaped the future of our English skills until we overcame it. Hakan voiced his frustration on the negative washback effect,

> (…) you don’t have writing, listening, or speaking, just reading vocabulary, answering some questions like completing dialogues, etc. [in the UUU] This made me ignore the other skills, and it makes people ignore the other skills. (Int1)

Deniz supported this idea,

> There was no speaking or writing activity as they were not “important” for the university entrance exam. The education system was designed around the idea that knowing enough English to pass the exam was the only thing that students had to do to become successful – which meant memorizing question types, grammar rules, and necessary vocabulary for reading texts. (…) I only focused on getting good grades and making the least number of mistakes in an exam as I thought it would be the only indicator of success. (JE1)

We did not have a chance to legitimately practise speaking, writing, and listening within the respective CoPs of these skills during language education. More importantly, even though all of us successfully passed the UEE, and we eventually enrolled at language-related departments, teaching-to-the-test approach of our teachers and the effect of negative washback on us caused all of us except Ezel to fail in joining other CoPs that required us to speak, write, or listen to English during university (see the second part of the findings). Ezel gave voice to the thoughts on students who are educated by teaching-to-the-test, "we should not call them [students] language learners because they are not learning language; they are learning how to get the highest score in the test" (Int1).

On the other hand, even though all participants voiced their concerns about the negative effect of the UEE on their language learning, Mert normalised the effect of the UEE. Even though the UEE negatively affected his and his students' speaking skills, "they [productive skills] just develop later than other skills" (Int1). Moreover, Hakan also stated his grammar knowledge was positively affected by this washback (Int1). Conversely, Efe, Deniz, Ezel, and I stated that we lacked the intricacies of some grammar topics as opposed to thousands of hours of grammar lessons.

4.1.3 Informal second language socialisation: "I just know English!". Over the course of our language learning journeys, most of us were exposed to English via gaming, listening to music, communicating with our families, or living in a certain neighbourhood. Our endeavours, hobbies, and interests led us to certain communities of practice (CoPs) where we were socialised into not only English but also to the norms of the community at hand. We found ourselves at a certain place where we were able to say, "I just know English!" On the other hand, one of us, Hakan, was not exposed to English through his informal endeavours until university.

To start with me, over the crucial years of my English development, I fell in love with metal music and the community. I found myself researching the backgrounds and the history of metal bands in online metal music forums, such as Encyclopaedia Metallum. I was rather a shy person. I could not dare to speak Turkish in front of people at that time, let alone English; however, writing was not a problem. After lurking in the forums and other online platforms, I started to exchange messages with people, leave comments, present my ideas, and understand what people were saying

as much as I could. I remember visiting Google Translate more times than I would want to admit. I was a novice in metal music and English at the same time. Consequently, communicating with the old-timers of metal and English, I found myself socialising into English via this unexpected CoP.

Efe, similarly, found himself on gaming forums, then YouTube. He developed a love of gaming. Even though he identified as a shy and introverted person, he found himself playing online games. At first, he was either not actively communicating in English or playing with people who spoke Turkish. Then, through a friend, he met with several American, Irish, and Scottish gamers, who were playing a multiplayer game, namely Apex Legends, as a group. Over time, Efe started orally communicating and interacting with them,

> I was nervous at first and as we played, I got freer, you know, more fluent, more, you know, comfortable with my own English. I was like, at first, "oh, my accent is not that good; my accent is sometimes broken; my accent [pronunciation] of this word is not really good." After a while I was like, I don't care. I'm just going to talk. And then, all those problems, like the fluency and some other problems, got better. (Int1)

At first, Efe, having an introverted character, was quite nervous to speak and chose listening over speaking. However, the old-timers of this multiplayer gaming CoP were rather accepting of Efe and did not care whether he could speak English perfectly or not. For the members of this CoP, including Efe, the domain was gaming. In addition to gaming, the domain was twofold for Efe. It also had language as a part of it. Consequently, Efe, through LPP over time, socialised to use the language through Apex Legends and socialised through language into Apex Legends.

Moreover, Deniz grew up with an English teacher at home, her father. As an old-timer, her father taught her the alphabet, numbers, and basic vocabulary during her childhood. She had fun singing traditional kid songs and watching cartoons in English. Occasionally, she met with her father's English-speaking friends and spoke with them in English. Similarly, Mert had his sister who was an English teacher. Even though he stated that she did not make a great impact on his overall learning process, she was an old-timer of the English language and related culture. Even though they could not interact frequently, they interacted regularly. He stated, "(…) I admired her, the way

she spoke English, and her overall knowledge of English" (JE1). Deniz with her father and her father's English-speaking friends as old-timers and Mert with his sister as an old-timer were socialised into English.

Hakan's situation, however, was different from the rest of us. He did not have many chances for informal socialisation until his university years, and the chances he had were not suitable for his personality,

> I was trying to watch some TV series. My friends were playing games, watching some movies like Spiderman, Lord of the Rings but I didn't have such a habit. So, it was hard for me to understand what they were speaking because it was so fast, and I couldn't catch the words. Sometimes I tried to understand the subtitles. I tried to use some English subtitles. Well, it wasn't okay as well because of my personality. I guess I needed to make everything clear. I wanted to understand every detail in the TV series. (Int1)

This lack of socialisation and an apparent CoP resulted in a lack of certain skills in the future for Hakan. Even though we all had problems regarding our certain English skills, be it due to UEE or negative washback, none of them was as overwhelming as Hakan's speaking problems during university. Hakan was unable to speak to the extent that he would refuse to answer questions even if he knew the answers (see the second part of the findings).

Moreover, all participants were asked to find a metaphor for their language learning experiences before university in the first interview. Efe's metaphor was a key to entertainment through which he was socialised into English via a gaming CoP. Deniz likened it to having fun and swimming; for her, in both swimming and English, her father was the old-timer. Ezel stated that it was tabula rasa (i.e., a blank sheet) which needed to be filled with culture. Ezel grew up around culture and was initially socialised into the language via English-speaking tourists. Mert's metaphor was a compass to explore the world, a tool to participate in other CoPs. Every participant focused on the non-linguistic part of English, such as entertainment, exploring, cultural learning, and so on, but Hakan was the only one who focused merely on language skills. He stated, "language learning for me is like puzzle pieces coming together because language was like a package for me all the time" (Int1). Everyone else focused on another aspect of English, through which they were socialised into the language.

Hakan learnt language mostly by himself, without any agent of socialisation until university.

4.2 Language Learning Experiences during University

In this part, I present the findings on our language learning experiences during university in four sections, (a) SLS in state and foundation universities, (b) SLS abroad, (c) academic discourse socialisation (ADS), and (d) English Medium of Instruction (EMI).

4.2.1 Second language socialisation in state and foundation universities. While Efe, Deniz, Hakan, and I went to a foundation university as scholarship students in İstanbul, Ezel and Mert went to state universities – Mert in İstanbul, Ezel in a very small city in northern Turkey. Except for Ezel, who studied English Language and Literature (ELL), everyone else studied English Language Teaching (ELT).

The two state universities mentioned in this study were completely different in almost all aspects. Mert was studying in an ELT department in İstanbul whereas Ezel was in the ELL department in a very small city in northern Turkey. Going to a university in a big city like İstanbul provided many opportunities to socialise through and into the language for the rest of us. For instance, Mert was able to meet with and get to know many kinds of people from around Turkey, while Ezel felt as if he was in exile. On living in a small city for five years, Ezel's feelings were very strong,

> It [university] is not exactly in the black sea. [University is in] Eurasia [which] is close to the black sea region. Yeah, I felt like I was in exile for a while because there were no city activities, no (…). So, I felt like I was in an exile. I didn't feel like I will have lots of fun. (Int2)

It took him some time to adapt to living in a very small city in northern Turkey, after living in İstanbul for years. He did not feel like he had much to do. He did not have much chance to socialise into his university and city. While Mert's university had various people around the country, this was not the case for Ezel. He mentioned that the student profile of the school was not quite diverse. Most people were from neighbouring cities with similar socioeconomic statuses. Ezel, interestingly, believed that most people cared about neither education nor literature. He said, "You know, some students are just studying for fun. Some students are studying to earn money or

their future" (Int2). Amongst hundreds of other students, he was not able to find a CoP related to his love of literature and languages. On the other hand, Efe and Hakan, for instance, were able to find another person to join their community (a writing club) and make it a CoP where they could learn from each other in İstanbul.

As opposed to Ezel's feeling of exile, and similar to Efe and Hakan, Mert was extremely happy about his university and city. He described his university as "living in a bubble" (Int2) since his university created a completely different environment than the world outside. On a similar note, while Ezel's university was not the greatest, Mert's university was amongst the best when it came to the brand of the university. Such a situation dramatically altered the student profile in their respective universities. The people who had scored a point high enough to go to Mert's university were relatively different from Ezel's university. Mert described his university and its student profile as,

> You, you can see people with different ideas with different beliefs, even though there are lots of differences, they were able to communicate. We were able to live together without having any problems. It just taught us to be tolerant. It wasn't actually even teaching. So, we were in that atmosphere, and it felt like this is the normal, this is the right way to live, the right way to be with people. (Int2)

Mert felt that people were different within the confines of the university. When he went out of the campus, he would realise that he was not going to receive or see the same tolerance towards other people or his differences. He believed that his university, teachers, and professors not only socialised him into teaching and English but also into life, in that, being tolerant towards others' differences, and learning the right way to be with people.

Even though the consensus and university scores would beg to differ, both participants were happy with the education they received. Both Mert and Ezel explicitly voiced the quality of their teachers and professors. However, Ezel also mentioned a professor who was unexpectedly rude, yet righteous,

> I remember once our professor told the class that we need to improve our English. It was not directed to one person, I mean, the professor was telling the whole class and he told that everyone should go to English courses or should

> go abroad because their English is terrible. Yeah, it was the second grade or third grade. I know the professor came from Cambridge. He was Turkish. I don't know why he came [to his university], but he came. And yeah, everyone felt terrible. I observed some people and (…) they were saying that they were shocked, and they were thinking and saying that the professor was rude. (Int2)

Even though this was directed to the whole class, Ezel did not take it for himself. On the contrary, he thought the professor was rude, yet correct.

All the other participants, including me, were part of the same foundation university. We had the same professors, same department, same education, same tasks, and activities. On the quality of our university education in ELT, I stated,

> My first choice was not to be in this university, but it was my second. I felt quite sad when I learnt I could not reach my first goal. Then, in hindsight, I could not have been happier. We were trained like soldiers. I have never felt we were missing anything crucial. When I started teaching, I knew what to do in almost every situation. (JE2)

I was not taught how to teach; I was socialised into teaching. Even though we were regularly presented with theories, and assessed on our knowledge of them, we were practising teaching regularly. We had internships starting from the second grade. We were socialised into teaching not only by our teachers but also by the teachers who supervised us during our internships. These internships and in-school practice sessions (e.g., micro- and microteaching sessions, preparing authentic materials and lesson plans, and so forth) constituted the first time we were undergoing teacher socialisation. On the quality of the education in our university, Efe stated that all his teachers were competent in their fields. Deniz stated,

> (…) the instructors were really, I think, perfect. There was nothing wrong with them and I think I have become a teacher like this because they taught me how to become a teacher like this. So, it was a good experience in terms of the instructors, and they were really knowledgeable. So, they helped me with the process. (Int2)

She went on to describe her teachers one by one, stating how they socialised her into language and teaching as old-timers. She claimed that one of her teachers showed her how to have passion for teaching. A rare moment where apprenticeship of observation

paid its dues to her. Another one showed her how resilient she was, “even though the assignments are really hard and overwhelming, I can survive everything” (Int2). She believed that another professor taught her all the theories she needed to teach. In a drama class, another teacher taught her how to have stage presence. About the same drama class and teacher, I stated in my JE3 that they opened my eyes to my creative side and showed me how to show my presence in the class, how to use my voice, and how important my tone was. In that drama class, we were a group of students and a teacher collectively and often collaboratively doing creative writing activities, presenting monologues that we have written, and acting to discover our strengths and weaknesses which we improved with the help and guidance of the old-timer, our teacher. Combining the practice of using my voice with the theory of classroom management, I realised how connected the curriculum was. On a similar note, we all taught that giving us the oral communication skills class in our first semester was the best choice (see the academic discourse socialisation part).

On the non-academic aspect of our education, our teachers were extremely caring and approachable. Efe said,

> I will say my teachers, professors, they all were like really approachable and, you know, comfortable. And that's why I didn't really feel there was a lot of reasons to be nervous and when I had to ask a question, you know, when I didn't understand something, when I missed something, I didn't really feel nervous. So, I think that's helped a lot. (Int2)

Being able to approach old-timers on the problems we had with the subject at hand improved our chances to successfully become socialised into the field and legitimately participate in the respective CoPs. Similarly, Hakan said,

> Some teachers really motivated me because I thought that I was so anxious and I cannot speak in front of people, et cetera, but different than some state universities did, the teachers were so close to the students, and they were motivating us all the time. (Int2)

Even though the teachers were quite approachable, knowledgeable, motivated, caring, and I daresay, loving, unfortunately, our classes were not full of people who were there to learn just as Ezel stated about his state university. There were quite many people who did not care about being a teacher. Deniz stated,

> Well, I don't know if I should say it, but when I saw the other people in the class, I realized that most of them are not there to become real teachers, let's say, or good teachers. I don't know. So, I realized that actually I can do better than them, and I can maybe become better just by listening to the classes. (Int2)

I always gave the same example on this problem, "There was a student who, even in our third year, mixed the simple concept of am/is/are. She kept saying you is!" (JE2). Hakan stated that this student profile of his university affected him negatively in his first year because he had a chance to go to a state university with a slightly less score, but he refused because of the opportunities a foundation university could present (i.e., going abroad easily). He also stated that he was not the only one who was negatively affected by the student profile,

> [It was negative] for the teachers as well, they [were] affected negatively because some teachers were disturbed as well. So, in the middle of the class, some students are using mobile phones all the time, and some students are leaving in the middle of the teacher's sentence, this is disrespect. The instructor gets disturbed, and it affects the whole class, the rest of the class. So not just me, but everyone was affected by this type of student profile. (Int2)

For his classroom to become a CoP where they socialised into and through the English language, not only collaboration but also mutual respect was required. Even though he regretted it at first, he stated that this situation turned around in his second year since he learnt whom to choose for his group tasks. All of us had the same solution to this problem. We all realised some people were of our calibre and we continued our group tasks with them, and we studied together for the exams. On studying with friends, Deniz stated,

> I had a friends' group as you are familiar with, and we were five people. So, we did every project and worked together. And when it was that way, actually I had a fun time doing even the hardest work. [It] was great to work with them, but other than them, when I've worked with other people, it was like hell, and I didn't enjoy any second. So, working with the people that you are familiar with, I think, improves your efficiency in your work and the outcome I can say because you're having fun. You don't think much about the process and what

everyone is going to do, but other than that, all I was thinking about was "can she do this? Can he do this? Is he capable of doing this," like that. (Int2)

She, as well as Hakan, Efe and I, learnt the hard way to participate in CoPs rather than in a random community of people who seemed as if they were a CoP. For every CoP she joined, there was a specific domain. For instance, a CoP might be related to digital literacy skills where we needed to create a poster. In such a case, there would be an old-timer who would socialise the others into the specific skill. The same old-timer might become a newcomer in another CoP with the same members. Our specific CoPs were socialising us into university life as well since we were friends, not merely classmates.

4.2.2 Second language socialisation abroad. Four of the participants went abroad as part of their education. I went to Poland for six months as an Erasmus student. Deniz and Mert went to Germany for six months as Erasmus students. Hakan went to Canada for two months as a teaching intern. Even though Efe went abroad, it was not during university. Ezel did not go abroad, yet. The ones who went abroad had extremely positive effects on their speaking, personality, learning, and cultural competency.

All of us attempted to learn another language abroad. For us, these attempts were to communicate and socialise with the people around us and to become able to participate in their CoPs on language, culture, daily life, and so forth. We attempted to socialise to use the language and socialise through language. For me, socialisation through language worked. For Deniz and Mert, they had to socialise to use the language.

To start with me, I was living in a dormitory amongst Ukrainians. When I first arrived, alone, without anyone, no one attempted to communicate with me or accept me into their community. Later, I found out that it was because of their level of confidence in English. I learnt a bit of Ukrainian and Russian and attempted to communicate with them. I was bad at it, and they somehow liked it and started to communicate with me in English. After that, I was accepted into their community, they taught me everything I needed to know about Poland. Interestingly, to pave the way towards socialisation into their CoPs and Poland, I needed to use another language that I did not speak. Afterwards, I was given ample opportunity for LPP. They were there

for years and were the old-timers of the CoP I attempted to participate. I was able to ask everything to them. I was socialised into the local cultural practices in Poland via a Ukrainian community. On my socialisation to Poland, Ukrainian, and the people of Ukraine, I stated "I, now, was aware that you need to make mistakes, show people that you are not perfect. Imperfections are the things that make us approachable. I made mistakes, and I made them confidently" (JE2). I was, luckily and relatively, confident in speaking during my time abroad. More than confidence, I would say I was careless. I did not care if I made mistakes because the old-timers did not care. This approach to using the English language allowed me to legitimately participate in CoPs through English.

At first, Deniz and Mert needed to socialise to use the language. Even though they attempted to and were expected to speak German, they were not able to do so. Their attempts were in vain since they were mostly spoken to in English, no matter the language they were speaking. They had a perception of being judged and/or being looked at in a strange way because of their limited language skills. On this problem, Mert voiced his frustration, "it felt like [if] you're not German, you're not qualified to speak in German. So, you're going to hear English. Maybe they had good intentions. [However,] it didn't feel positive" (Int2). They felt as if they were prevented to socialise into the German language. However, Germans' refusal to speak German with non-German people led to them speaking English, which in turn, led Mert and Deniz to practise English more. Mert stated that he stopped caring about making mistakes,

> (…) even though I made some mistakes or looked silly, that wouldn't be a problem because I wasn't going to see them again, like after a couple of months. So, I felt really relaxed. I mean I was just trying to talk to everybody. I was trying to go everywhere. And during these, just seeing the places, like doing different activities… During these times, I was using English to communicate to just, you know, get by. (Int2)

He had to use English to get by. There was no other choice. He was, somehow, aware of this and stopped thinking about what could go wrong. Instead, he felt confident. What started as an attempt on speaking German and socialising to use it ended in socialising into various local CoPs through English. Interestingly, he said, "the more I speak, the better I became and, you know, it just went on like that and I felt more

confident" (Int2). They were not only socialising into the spoken English language in an authentic setting but also gaining confidence.

4.2.3 Academic discourse socialisation: Writing, reading, speaking, & listening. Throughout our education and career, be it ELT or ELL, we were bound to write and read, listen and speak. Most of us were made aware of this necessity during our first year; for some of us, this realisation came before our first year: after the proficiency exam to be exempt from the preparatory school. All of us were exempted from the preparatory school, yet not all of us were happy about this exemption.

Although Efe, Ezel, Deniz, and I have never viewed preparatory schools as a means to improve our English skills, Mert and Hakan were unhappy about their exemption. This unhappiness had two aspects. Firstly, Mert and Hakan emphasised the socialising agency function (be it academic or social) of preparatory schools. Mert was adamant about needing preparatory school to socialise into university life through language; he even showed regret, "other than that [academic aspects of preparatory schools], you're just socializing. You're meeting new people and you're just getting ready to university life. So, that was an important loss for me (…) since I didn't attend to prep school" (Int2). Their classroom(s) and the people in them would serve as a CoP for university life and the inner workings of their institutions.

On the other hand, what was more emphasised by Mert and Hakan was the academic aspect of preparatory schools. Mert stated that even though his English did not necessarily require more formal practice, he would be able to finetune what he was lacking through preparatory school,

> I was in my upper-intermediate, advanced level. So, for this group [preparatory class], if you start with advanced level, so you are not learning a lot of things in prep school. You're just there to maybe improve a couple missing points in your language skills. (Int2)

Even though he was aware of the limited improvement chances of the preparatory school, he believed that he would have ample opportunity to improve some crucial points regarding his language skills. He believed his problems in productive skills (i.e., speaking and writing) with his lack of time to focus on them because of the intensive weekly course schedule he had during his bachelor's degree,

> I just graduated without knowing very well the components of academic writing because I passed the prep school accidentally. It's a funny sentence, but in this case, I just graduated without even knowing what the topic sentence exactly was. I mean, I could write it, but I didn't know what it was in terms of definition. (Int3)

Mert explained his ability to write a topic sentence without knowing what it is with one of his previous high school teachers who intentionally focused on academic writing. As he voiced his belief on needing to know the topic explicitly to teach it in our third interview, he experienced the effect of this deficiency in his teaching as well, and he had to learn what he lacked via teaching-writing-related CoPs during his teaching career (see the next chapter on teaching career).

Hakan, similarly, did not have any time to get prepared for what awaited him in his first year of university. Even though he believed the root of the problem to be the negative washback effect of the university entrance exam (UEE), he was aware that the preparatory school would be able to improve his speaking and listening skills, not only socialising him into English but also into life in university.

However, even without preparatory school, we, collectively, still improved our four skills through various CoPs. As agreed by all of us, English language teaching (ELT) and English language and literature (ELL) departments do not aim to teach how to use English but teach how to teach. Hakan briefly summarised our perspective,

> University gave me the chance to 'be really exposed to' English. All the courses were delivered in English, all the materials were in English, and I was supposed to use English in all the tasks and exams. In other words, I was using both my receptive and productive language skills in a natural way. The aim there at the university was not learning English which 'ironically' helped me to learn English. (JE2)

Our department was a teaching-related CoP. While we were collaboratively being socialised into teaching (see the section on teaching career), our means of communication was English. Ironically or not, we were socialising into ELT through language. To this end, two courses were extremely crucial and were mentioned by all participants: oral communication skills, and academic reading and writing (except

Ezel, who stated that he did not have these courses since he was in an ELL department). The oral communication class was fun for Deniz. She stated,

> I remember doing a presentation of my own funeral. (…) So, I wrote my own eulogy. It was weird for me to stand up in front of everyone and read as if it was my death day. It was fun, and it made me realize that actually I can speak in front of people. (Int2).

The professor of this class was an American man who was, naturally, qualified in English and communication. As an old-timer of our community of oral communication, he socialised us into the academic discourse of speaking by giving us many opportunities to practise speaking in various contexts and fostering our participation in the domain. The class was not only fun but also didactic. Even though it was not fun for the rest of us at first, it was quite fun in hindsight. Yet, the didactic quality of the oral communication class was valid for all of us. Efe stated,

> I chose ELT, but I did not want to do any presentations because I always got nervous, but I had to speak in front of, like, crowds. (…) I had some practice with my speaking [gaming buddies], but I did not have practice with my speaking in an academic sense. (…) doing a presentation in something in front of the class and doing something academic, I wasn't really used to it. So, um, when my first presentation time came, I was really nervous. (Int2)

We were socialised into this academic discourse in two consecutive semesters through individual presentations, collaborations, and feedback from our old-timers. As novices, we were quite open to communication and guidance. The professor was also an example for us. After giving us an assignment, he would demonstrate it, give details, and rules of thumb. Some of the students were, also, better at this academic discourse. By LPP, we learnt from them as well. Over time, we realised that "it was okay. It was not the end of the world. It was not that bad" (Int2, Efe). All of us were quite nervous at first, but Hakan was completely ashamed during his first presentation,

> I was not able to make sentences and totally ashamed during the presentation since it was my first time delivering a speech in English. I was shaking and my face was as red as a tomato. I even remember the instructor's face looking at me as if he had been trying to save me but didn't have this chance because I already ruined the whole presentation. (JE2)

This was a crucial turning point in his education and future career. He realised that not only he had no idea how to speak academically but also he was very anxious and shy. The problem was not merely his language skills. At first, he practised himself by recording, memorising to no avail. Later, his more knowledgeable classmates and friends who were old-timers of the academic discourse of speaking came into play. He received many strategies from the other members of the CoP, such as looking at people's foreheads instead of eyes, thinking that he was talking to stupid people, and so on.

However, his anxiety went on for some time and he stayed in the peripherals of the speaking-related CoPs. At that time, yes, Hakan was able to successfully pass his courses that require speaking, but still, he was not speaking unless it was a must, "even if I knew the answer, I was not answering the questions" (Int2). He overcame his anxiety in two distinct situations through old-timers' help. Firstly, one day, in class, he wanted to elaborate on a discussion topic, and he was brave enough to raise his hand. When he did, the teacher was so surprised that they told the class to be silent because Hakan was speaking. At first, this sounded derogatory. However, according to Hakan, this was not the case. The teacher was not only aware he had speaking anxiety but also knew he must have had something important to say. Afterwards, he realised that he was able to speak. Secondly, his two-month internship journey in Canada helped him improve his confidence and taught him not to be afraid of making mistakes. Consequently, with the support and help of various old-timers, while his peripheral participation slowly gained legitimacy, his speaking skill gained complexity.

Another problematic area for the participants was writing. We improved our writing skills in different ways. Some of us were using writing as an outlet. Some of us were writing as a hobby, yet almost all of us improved our skills via the academic writing and reading course. On writing as an emotional outlet, I was the main character. When I started university, I was a shy, introverted person, just as most of the participants. I had some familial problems at home, and I was fighting severe anxiety problems and daily panic attacks. At that time, I felt as if writing in English was the only way I could express my thoughts and feelings. I was keeping a journal of sorts. Later on, that journal was transformed into a short story, then a long story – yet

it was left unfinished. I was writing, but I did not know whether it was good or not, or whether it was full of mistakes. I needed an old-timer to guide me. One day, I was brave enough to show my writing to one of my favourite teachers. It was around 15 pages. She read all of it and gave me some crucial feedback. Until her feedback, I was neither aware of correct punctuation use in English nor my fossilised grammar knowledge due to my informal learning of English. After that, I saw that my writing was not that bad. I was a legitimate novice. I kept writing and she kept giving me feedback on various papers of mine. I was slowly, yet surely, learning, and hence socialising into writing, through her guidance and competency. However, I did not have a community to guide me. I had a teacher on whom I could always count.

For Efe and Hakan, this was not the case. With another close friend of theirs, they set up a writing club of sorts. For Efe, writing was a passion, "I was like, okay, I'm going to write some English, but I don't know if it is going to be good. And as I was writing it (…) I still remember my passion" (Int2). In this writing club, they chose a topic at the start of a week. Following some deadlines, they individually wrote stories about the topic at hand. Later, they got together to read and talk about each story. While talking about their stories, they talked about certain aspects of their language. They occasionally talked about the mechanical part of their language (i.e., punctuation, tenses, vocabulary, and so on). They were socialising into the academic discourse of writing via each other. At first, even though Efe and Hakan agreed that none of them was better than the other in general, each of them improved a certain skill better than the others. For instance, Hakan was very good at grammar and sentence structure; Efe was very good at vocabulary. Even though there was not one specific old-timer in their community, they were old-timers in their specific field. They gave each other chance to learn through collaboration, regular interaction, and feedback. Hakan described the feedback as,

> We never, you know, criticize each other in a harsh way. We read the stories and even when the stories were not so good, we first started with the positive things and then gave our feedback and then finished our recommendations with positive feedback. (Int3)

The existence of feedback suggested that one was better than the other since the ability to give feedback required one person to have more knowledge on a topic. Hakan summarised the benefits of having this CoP,

> So, if you have a group, if you are learning as a group, you have different perspectives and you learn from your peers. It was a quite beneficial experience for me in terms of improving my writing skills. I helped them. They helped me. It was so helpful. I always feel good about it. (Int3)

In their CoP, novices were not the only ones who learnt. The old-timers learnt through the others as well. On the other hand, writing stories as a hobby or writing as an emotional outlet may be good practices, but it does not substitute for academic writing, it just adds to it. ELT or ELL departments may not provide linguistic knowledge, but they do provide academic writing courses. Efe was one of the participants who was aware of the benefits of academic writing,

> Language learning wasn't the main focus in our education as you remember. But I remember the first lesson I took. One of the first courses I took was academic writing, and in that lesson, I learned all about like writing, all about APA, citations, and stuff (…) I learned how to create like a comprehensive paragraph, and a cohesive paragraph. (Int2)

The academic writing course, as its name suggests, was as academically comprehensive as possible. In the CoP of academic writing, our old-timer was our professor who guided us through writing. Even though Efe, Hakan, and I were writing stories, we still did not have any experience in academic writing. We were not aware of the components of an academic paper. This deficiency was visible for us. Efe stated, and I completely agreed, "before that [academic writing course] I checked my first paragraphs a while ago, and it was like, okay, (…) there was no major grammatical errors and mistakes. But structure-wise, I think that academic writing has provided a lot for me" (Int2). We were able to write grammatical sentences. Of course, we had some mechanical errors, but we were not bad. However, we did not have much experience when it came to writing academically. This course and countless other opportunities of writing an academic paper throughout our university education gave us the chance to be socialised into the academic discourse of writing. Throughout the four years we had in our bachelor's degree, we wrote many papers, prepared countless

lesson plans, and were exposed to many academically written papers. Our teachers and professors were the old-timers for us. They introduced us to academic writing step by step. We started by reading academic papers and being introduced to the world of academic writing. Later, we started writing reflection papers which would be graded by the old-timers, and they would give us crucial feedback on how to make our writing more academic. There were collaborative writing tasks throughout our education, as well. In those cases, some of our group friends were more socialised into academic language and they would guide us. Until the academic writing course and the other LPP opportunities that followed, we did not know what a thesis statement entailed. By continuously writing and being exposed to academic papers, we were socialised into the academic discourse of writing with the help of our old-timers, teachers.

Our socialisation into the academic discourses and English language affected our socialisation into teaching, as well. Hakan stated that he loved giving writing classes as a teacher, and he enjoyed these classes more than his main classes while the others claimed the opposite. During the interviews, he had an epiphany. He believed that his love of reading and writing was the reason why he loved teaching writing classes. Since speaking was not his forte, he improved his writing the most, and he was socialised into the English language via writing. Being socialised into teaching via writing shaped how he was socialised into language teaching. Similarly, I was socialised into English through my informal endeavours, such as music and gaming. During the time I spent on this paper, I realised that I used the examples of music and gaming more than any other topic. I found myself referring to songs and games as examples of language use. I, also, fostered listening to music and reading lyrics in their original language during and after classes.

4.2.4 English Medium of Instruction. Studying ELT or ELL, we all had English medium of instruction (EMI) in almost all our courses – except for rare elective courses. None of us was against the use of EMI and being educated through it. Yet, there were some disadvantages presented by the participants. Efe, firstly, stated that EMI immensely improved his field-related vocabulary. Yet, while improving his English vocabulary, it hindered his Turkish,

> If I want to have a conversation about ELT, I can't do it in Turkish because I know all the terms and terminology in English. So, basically, in a Turkish

> conversation, if I want to talk about the course itself and the syllabus, I can't say the Turkish translation of syllabus. I just say syllabus [because I do not know it in Turkish]. (Int2)

Since Efe learnt almost all field-related vocabulary and terminology through EMI and did not translate them to Turkish in his mind, he was not able to talk about ELT-related subjects in Turkish. He constantly added English words to his speech. Being socialised into teaching through language, namely English, he naturally continued to use the same language. Similarly, I, the researcher, also experienced some problems related to EMI. Being exposed to English continuously, and doing various assignments in English, I grew the habit of searching everything in English, resulting in learning new words only in English as opposed to both my L1 and L2. This effect of EMI was not only on my academic life like in Efe's case but also on my daily life, as well. For instance, I would not be able to tell you what a "nutmeg" is in Turkish, just as I would not be able to tell you the Turkish translation of the theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978) even though I know what both are. Moreover, Hakan not only reiterated what Efe and I said about the effects of EMI on academic life but also added, "the [EMI] in terms of speaking, when all the classes are English, teachers had to speak English as well. And I, and I heard some teachers [were] speaking English really bad, and they had difficulty doing that" (Int2). In the CoP of ELT departments, our old-timers were mostly the teachers and professors. We were legitimate novices who were guided into English through our old-timers. However, in such cases that Hakan mentioned, even though our teachers and professors were old-timers and experts in their fields, they might have prevented us from successfully socialising into ELT through language.

In spite of feeling strange because of our habits, overcoming inadequate teachers, and accepting that we might not know the Turkish terminology of some words, we still uncovered mostly positive effects. Mert stated that EMI helped all of his language skills, except maybe reading claiming to have improved it himself. Ezel remarked that even though he felt strange, he adapted to EMI quickly, and as a literature student, he noted that people might not be able to convey or express some of the thoughts they have in their first languages. Deniz said that she would not be able to use the English language as well as now if she had not received her undergraduate education in EMI.

She stated that the ELT department provided her with many opportunities to utilise English in many different contexts and communities of practices. She was socialised through language. Moreover, Efe stated that EMI not only improved his chances to speak but also functioned as an enforcer of language use,

> In like a non-native country like Turkey, where English is not an official language and you don't have any many native speakers that you can talk with I think that's forced, like forced, maybe is not the correct word, but that forced English use in the classroom. (…) If they have to speak English, they're going to, and when they do, they're going to get better. If they do not have to use English, as we have seen in our high school English lesson, then they're not using English, they're going to think like, okay, my English is not that good. I'm just going to answer this question in Turkish. (Int2)

EMI, then, was viewed as the intangible means of communication within the borders of the campus CoP where students not only socialised into their departments and fields but also into the English language and the accompanying cultures. Interestingly, not having an English speaker around meant that the participants would not practise speaking English as Efe stated. The same belief was seen in almost all participants. On practising speaking with his friends from Turkey, Ezel pointed out that it was not quite possible since, he believed, the human brain searched for what it was used to, in this case, Turkish. Hakan stated that he was able to practise speaking only with international students in the ELT department. When asked whether she practised speaking in any other way, Deniz stated that she did not since she "did not have any 'native' friends" (Int2).

4.3 Language Learning Experiences after University

4.3.1 Explicit and/or implicit teaching: An option or an obligation. When the participants were asked whether they liked teaching explicitly or implicitly, their answers varied greatly. Efe and I prioritised implicit teaching over explicit. We understood the importance of acquiring the language. Efe, on this topic, said,

> I do believe it [teaching language] should be implicit. I don't believe explicit teaching is that effective. It's language. Language is one of the most natural things we have and it's one of the hardest things to learn. (…) Sometimes, that

> [explicit teaching] makes me feel, I don't want to say hopeless or desperate, but that makes me feel like I'm, kind of, bad. Like, I really don't believe in every lesson I teach. (Int3)

Efe believed explicit teaching was not the best way to teach language. He, also, believed that students who were taught explicitly need to practise more than those who acquired language implicitly. He claimed that students who learned explicitly would be able to answer some questions for two weeks without practice, but they would come to a screeching halt later unless they "practise to internalise it" (Int3, Efe). Hakan, on the other hand, agreed that implicit teaching was required to acquire the language. He focused on rule discovery, as opposed to giving the rule directly. He intentionally avoided explicit teaching from time to time. However, there were certain times (more often than he would have liked) when he did not have enough materials, support, or time to teach implicitly. Mert, on a similar note, believed implicit teaching was quite important, yet he did not disregard explicit teaching. On the contrary, he believed he would never use completely implicit teaching, "I don't think I will completely use implicit teaching. As I said, also, I like teaching explicitly and learning explicitly" (Int3). These beliefs we had on teaching explicitly or implicitly might be the result of our learning experiences as learners. We might teach explicitly (or implicitly) because it was a choice, needed by our students, or simply an obligation. Mert stated that he chose to teach explicitly because that was how he learnt and liked to learn. For him, explicit teaching was a choice. He was formally socialised into English via formal, explicit teaching through his teachers as old-timers, and classroom as a CoP.

Hakan was reading a lot as a learner of English. As he read, he discovered some rules, yet he kept learning the rules explicitly. He had a fine balance that led him to learn grammar. He was a strong supporter of implicit teaching; however, he said that "sometimes, students have really difficult time to discover something. So, you may have to shift to giving the formula [grammar rule]" (Int3). He taught in a way his students needed. Yet, from time to time, he did not have materials that were appropriate to teach implicitly. His institution left him in a place where he could not teach any other way. Efe, on the other hand, could not teach implicitly because "sometimes, it is impossible to do this [teach implicitly] within this short time" (Int3). For Efe, it was not a choice but an obligation. An obligation that created hopelessness,

“I really do not believe in every lesson I teach” (Int3). He metaphorized implicit versus explicit teaching,

> Let's say when I go somewhere, I don't really, if I know the place, I don't really look around. Let's say I am going from the subway station to my home. I just do it, right? I start walking. I don't look around. I don't consciously think like, “all right, I need to take a left here; I need to take a right here. I have to go straight here.” (…) I don't think like that. I just put on some music, just walk. (Int3)

He did not learn how to go home. He, with his family, unintentionally practised going home. No one told him to turn right or left.

I, on the other hand, wholeheartedly stated that implicit teaching was the way to learn a language without much effort. However, when I taught, I found myself running back to rules. During my BA and MA, I was taught to teach communicatively and implicitly, yet I still found myself giving the formula and teaching English as if it is mathematics. For some of us, it was an intentional choice; for some of us, it was an obligation; for some of us, it was needed. Yet, sometimes, we went back to how we were taught, how we observed being taught. We were, in hindsight, part of a teaching CoP before university, as part of our education. We were being socialised into teaching by observing our teachers as unaware apprentices and legitimate peripheral novices. Our apprenticeship and participation were furthered by our formal teacher education during university.

4.3.2 Do not be friends; be friendly!. As an unexpected part of the findings, virtually all participants agreed on the sentiment of being friendly, but not friends with their students. When I was an ELT student, one of my professors told the class, “Don’t be friends with your students but be friendly!” Her words were carved into my mind because I had my fair share of people whom I dare not call “teachers.” I was a successful student until high school. I went to a top tier high school. I was studying mathematics and sciences, but I was failing hard. Towards the end of high school, I wanted to change schools and go to a college with a language department since English was the only thing at which I was good. When I expressed my thoughts to the councillor, the following happened,

> I told her that I wanted to study English and transfer this year to go to a language school. She shattered my confidence by saying I was not even able to solve Turkish questions, and continued, “Do you know how hard the English exam is?” “Have you ever solved any English questions in your life?” “Those schools are expensive; do not bother your family,” and many, many more hurtful claims. Until that point, I had never solved an English question in my life. Having an anxious, shy, and doubtful character, I started to think she was actually right. I was no one, and I would never amount to anything in my life. A day later, I solved one of the past English exams and scored 60 out of 80 at home. I told her my score and she said, “You’re lying, please do not waste my time with this nonsense. I have things to do.” I am quoting these because I will never forget the things she said to me. (JE1)

I had a reason to believe in the importance of creating a rapport with my students. Even though I tend to overcompensate, thanks to my teacher in university, I did not overcompensate by becoming friends with my students. Since I started teaching, I have tried to prioritise a fun, safe, and friendly zone over “successful” learning. This trend was seen with Deniz as well,

> I try to be a big sister for them instead of just being someone who tries to teach them some stuff. I try to be a big sister first. And why do I say it? Because I care about their mental health more than their language abilities, I think. And I just want them to trust me. Before they start learning something from me and just feel comfortable being in the classroom together with me and their friends, et cetera. So, I try to motivate them, and I try to build a bond between me and them so that they are more open to learn new stuff and explore new stuff together with me. (Int3)

Even though she had her fair share of “evil teachers” (Int1), she had friendly, sincere teachers as well. Combined with her double major in psychology, it was not surprising that she not only believed friendliness was a need but also was aware that friendship was not the way. A similar tendency was valid for Efe too, “I'm not that strict, so it's kind of like being friends somewhat. I am still sometimes strict. I try to keep that line, but yeah, more, I would say it's like a friendly environment” (Int3). Even though he

was aware of the need for a friendly environment, he was also aware that a line must be drawn. Hakan drew this line clearer than we did,

> I learned to have some distance with my students from the negative experience I had at high school. For example, with my teacher, (…) I was going to my teacher's home. So, we were playing PlayStation together and he was acting like we were his friends at this age. When you're a teenager, you think that it's something very good. A man who is in his thirties, having fun with you, making jokes, maybe some sexual jokes, et cetera, and it makes you feel precious. (…) I learned that I should never do that with my students. So, this is something I avoid. I'm trying to keep some distance between me and my students. (…) I always try to avoid being so close to my students. I am trying to be friendly, but not a friend of them. (Int3)

As he said, he was trying to be friendly, but not a friend of the students. Deniz, Efe, Hakan, and I have graduated from the same university and studied with the same teachers. Therefore, at first, I thought that this carefulness and tendency to be friendly, but not friends, was a result of our education. However, Mert, while asked about the differences between him and his teachers, he said,

> I'm trying to find a perfect balance between being friends with them and being teachers. I'm just trying to keep them together, but I don't let them to cross one of the lines. (…) I wasn't that close with my teachers in terms of, you know, relationship or communication. (…) I don't like to keep my communication outside of the class. I'm really friendly inside the classroom. (Int3)

Mert did not see friendliness from his teachers during his pre-college years. He was aware of the importance of friendliness, and even though he went to a different university, he was also aware of the crucial line between being friends and being friendly with his students. Similarly, Ezel did not see much friendliness from his teachers. His lessons were neither fun nor friendly. He felt that he needed to change this in his classes,

> I've seen some insufficient teachers. (…) The way they're acting, their behaviour in the class… We're different. I don't know how to say. They were in touch with the students in a different manner. I mean more bossy. (…) I

> mean, English language classes should be friendly, I think. Of course, there should be some respect, but it shouldn't be, like, bossy. (Int3)

Stemming from teacher education or thousands of hours of unconscious observation of our teachers, we arrived at the same tendency to be friendly, but never friends. We were, through our experiences, socialised into this fine balance of friendliness.

4.3.3 Teacher socialisation: Learning from/through/with each other. To understand our learning processes, one must understand the dynamics of this group of friends. To start with, I have been friends with all the participants. I met Efe, Deniz, and Hakan during my undergraduate studies. While Hakan and Efe met during high school, Deniz, Efe, and Hakan, collectively, got closer after they started working at the same institution. Ezel and I started to work at this institution before the other participants. They started one year after we did. Ezel and I became close friends over the course of our induction program. Mert, however, joined the group with his induction with the others last year. Through me, Ezel met with the others and became friends. One way or another, we all came to know each other over the course of our education and careers. Consequently, our socialisation into teaching was influenced by our friendships. Later – or before for some of us –, our friendships paved the way for teacher and organisational socialisation.

For Deniz, Efe, and I, our current institution was the first workplace we were a part of as EFL teachers. For Hakan and Ezel, it was their second; and for Mert, the third. Mert also worked at a private middle school as an English teacher. As the only person who worked at a private middle school, Mert would be seen as the unluckiest one amongst the participants. In Turkey, there is a trend of disliking private middle schools. Amongst teachers, there was a belief that private middle schools exploit newly graduated teachers, if not all teachers. This belief was constantly strengthened and engraved in our minds by those who had similar experiences. When I started as a completely inexperienced English instructor in my current institution, I was viewed as lucky since I skipped the so-called exploitation step. My informal conversations with my colleagues engraved this luckiness in my mind. When I asked Mert about his experience in the private middle school, I used the expression "not fruitful." However, Mert quickly shut me down,

> I would not say "not fruitful." (…) I would say not pleasant, but fruitful. Fruitful because it is really demanding. (…) I improved my teaching skills a lot. (…) I had to challenge myself to keep them motivated, keep their interest on the lesson. I was spending, like, I was making some effort. I was not feeling exhausted. It became normal. (Int3)

It was quite surprising to hear his perspective on the so-called exploitation. Even though he was not happy with the financial aspect of the job, he was socialised into teaching there. He asked the administrators whether he could observe some classes and teachers before he started teaching to better grasp the workings of the institution, and he did use this opportunity for legitimate peripheral participation. When he started to work at his second institution, a foundation university, he said, "managers were asking them [teachers] to teach standing up, not sitting down. And at the college, it was already something normal. So, and I think it was useful, as well" (Int3). He was surprised that the teachers were complaining about something so simple as standing up while teaching. For him, teaching was already done standing up as taught to him by his old-timers in the CoP of his college workplace.

He voiced that his first institution, a private college, was the place for him to socialise into teaching; it was a place for him to try and apply the theories that he was educated with through regular interaction and participation in the community of practice. Moreover, his colleagues in his second workplace, another foundation university, have immensely helped him. "I had a chance to improve myself [in my second workplace]. It was not a huge impact, but from some of the teachers who were more experienced, I was getting some ideas (…)" (Int3). He also "asked some more experienced teachers what they were doing exactly as they were teaching writing" (Int3). He got some ideas from them on how to use some of the activities in the coursebook. Instead of learning through induction, Mert learnt through his colleagues who were old-timers of his institution.

On the other hand, for Efe, Deniz, Hakan, and I, our socialisation into teaching and institution began with the induction program. The induction program functioned as our CoP where we were being socialised into both our institution and teaching. To start with, although we joined this institution at different times, our induction programs were quite similar. The teacher trainer and administrative coordinators, coupled with

the technology coordinator, conveyed the requirements and expectations of the institution. They, also, gave information on how the institution itself works. We were informed by the old-timers on the student profile, and we took part in group tasks, activities, and discussions. These presentations and informative activities functioned as socialising agents. To become a legitimate participant of the CoP at hand, we needed to, first, be introduced to its components and how it worked. This introduction was the catalyst for our upcoming peripheral participation.

In my case, amongst 25 teachers who were newcomers to the institution, I was a newcomer to both the institution and teaching. While every other teacher in the group was going through LPP, I was on the outer lines of this community, trying to pave my way into it with the help of the old-timers. The old-timers were, first and foremost, the teacher trainer of the institution who prepared and guided the CoP and other presenters and facilitators from the technology and administration departments. Following, and as a part of, the induction programme, we were partnered with other instructors who were more experienced in the institution. These teachers were old-timers for us. Specifically, for me, my first partner in the institution fostered my participation, and thus socialisation. I had many questions regarding the institution such as lessons, material use, weekly level meetings, and even the dress code. She was not only a role model but also an old-timer who was one of the experts of the institution.

On the other side of the coin, the induction was completely online due to the pandemic for Ezel and me. We did not have a chance to see each other face-to-face for months to come. However, Efe, Deniz, and Hakan already knew each other and often met. Mert was a part of the same induction program. Even though their induction was mostly online, they had a chance to see each other face-to-face during their in-school meetings. Efe, on the induction program, said,

> So, the induction was mainly online. So, I figured like face-to-face induction would be more effective, but this online one still showed me like some [information]. I don't know, [like], how do you prepare a lesson? How do you, you know, read the planner? How do you use this learning tool? How do you use the Microsoft Teams program? And it showed me the essentials, I would say.

The induction program helped Efe. Deniz, Hakan, and I would certainly agree that it helped me. As stated, in my case, I did not have any previous experience or any friends when I started working in my institution. All I had was, at first, induction. While I was learning through the induction, I befriended a couple of colleagues, including Ezel. From that point onwards, I started to learn from them and their experience as well. Although they were not old-timers in the institution, they were old-timers in teaching English.

Similarly, Efe, Deniz, and Hakan learnt from not only the induction and each other but also me. Efe stated, "but all the details, I had to learn from you because you were working here before me" (Int3). On the same note, Deniz said, "(…) you helped us [Efe, Deniz, and Hakan] a lot at the beginning of the term. So, we were asking everything to you because we didn't want to do anything wrong. So, I think [working with friends] is really a good thing, I can say" (Int3). Nevertheless, they were not only learning from me; they were also learning from others and each other. On grammar, Hakan gave an example,

> We were talking [about] if close mix type and everyone was asking each other, some teachers were aware of that [the grammar rule], some teachers forgot that. Basically, some teachers said that they were confusing that [if clause mix type]. I was teaching that too to some students as tutoring, but also when I was getting prepared for the university exam, I was studying on that. (…) We were talking about this, and I feel that I'm repeating, you're revising the same things and I'm practising what I know. Colleagues help me remember what I know. (Int3)

I was there when this conversation took place. It was our 15-minute break, and we had gathered with a couple of teachers, including Efe. Somehow, we started to talk about the grammar rule for "mixed conditionals." I had no idea that it was a rule, even. I knew how to use it, but did not know it was a grammar topic, somehow. Notwithstanding, as Hakan said, some of us knew it; some of us were not sure. At the end of the conversation, it was a win-win situation for everyone. Such conversations as the one mentioned were quite a regular occurrence between us, the teachers. These conversations immensely helped everyone. In the case above, Hakan functioned as the old-timer, as stated, his grammar knowledge was above ours. I had no knowledge about mixed conditionals; the other teachers were aware but not very knowledgeable.

Hakan either introduced us to or brushed up our knowledge of English grammar. Quite interestingly, Hakan also claimed at the time of the interview that they were going to cover another topic and Efe was going to ask him about the topic at hand to brush up his knowledge. The topic was non-defining relative clauses. After a week, Efe asked us a question about non-defining relative clauses to brush up on his knowledge.

As a group of friends, it was not surprising that we help each other. We were aware of each other's help. If there was a question in our minds, and if we did not want to ask it in front of everyone due to our introverted personalities or to attempt to compensate for our lack of experience, we knew there would be one of us who knew, and that idea "created, like, a sense of security in me" (Int3, Efe). On having this community, Efe summarised,

> So having that little community that can help you create a sense of security… and that sense of security leads to competency, I think because you are, you know, feeling confident in yourself. (Int3)

Our community of practice created this sense of security which led to further competency in the English language. Similarly, since I socialised into the institution before Efe, Deniz, Hakan, and Mert, I functioned as the old-timer regarding organisational socialisation. They sought legitimate membership in this CoP through me instead of seeking it in already-existing CoPs in the workplace. Efe explained this situation quite well,

> When you first start, everybody knows you're inexperienced. So, you don't want to ask a lot of questions. You don't want to show that. (...] So, having those friends who knew, like, how to do stuff, or how the system works in the school, helped a lot when I had questions (Int3).

Be it our personalities or the unnecessary attempt of hiding our inexperience, they were more comfortable socialising through someone they knew. Although they attempted to compensate for their lack of experience, they did not need to since they, I as well, agreed that our institution's teacher profile aided in our teacher socialisation. Deniz said, "I think there are different kinds of groups in terms of the experience levels. And I think it's a good thing because the different groups can learn from each other" (Int3). Ezel and I second her argument. Everyone was completely open to questions and improvement. "It's not like people are, when you ask a question, like how did you not

understand this? Or they say something disparaging. No, it's not something like that. They always, you know, are open to questions" (Int3, Efe). Even though their participation in the CoP which was also a circle of friendship was clearer, they also participated in other CoPs.

Furthermore, the participants were asked about the certificates and degrees that they were required or asked by their institutions. On the master's degree, almost all participants had a somewhat mutual belief. When asked about his MA degree, Mert stated,

> Can I be honest, please? It doesn't help me at all (…) because after some point we're learning by teaching, we're not learning from some methodologies, some articles, or et cetera. We can get some ideas from them, sure. (…) I do not think I will improve my teaching because of the ELT, this MA degree. (Int3)

One would ask if it was not helpful, why were we doing MA? To this question, Ezel would say, "Of course I do it to become a full-time teacher!" (Int3). Such beliefs were valid for certification programs such as CELTA and DELTA. While Ezel stated that the CELTA certificate programme did not teach him much, others mentioned that it was not necessary unless they were going abroad. Deniz, on the other hand, was still somewhat hopeful that MA would help. Even though she was yet to take classes that would improve her teaching as of our interviews, she was open to learning. Yet, she stated that she did not learn anything new and was not very hopeful that she would learn. Efe, however, had different beliefs about MA. For him, MA was a means of creating confidence, overcoming the survival stage of teaching, and reflecting,

> I'm not saying like, I'm going to be the perfect teacher after I graduate, but I'm saying this about my self-confidence. I'm not going to think like, "oh, am I going to be enough for like teaching this?" (…) The question [in my mind] is not going to be, "am I enough?" It's going to be, "how can I be better?" (…) I think it's just going to teach me how to think more consciously about my teaching, how to notice stuff (…). (Int3)

Efe believed that to become a legitimate member of the CoPs of teaching that he was a part of, he needed the education provided by the master's degree. Other participants were adamant that a master's degree in the fields of ELT, ELL, or curriculum and instruction would not necessarily improve their teaching or language,

it must be noted that they were yet to finish their master's degree as of the writing of this thesis. Somewhat similar to Efe, I believed that the master's degree would improve, not necessarily my teaching, but my knowledge as a future academician, teacher trainer, and researcher in the field of English language education. Throughout my courses and the writing of this thesis, I was socialised into the world of academics through my professors, the old-timers of the field.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I, first, summarised the data collection and analysis procedures followed by the presentation of findings of the study under the scope of second language socialisation (SLS) theory. The findings were presented in three parts, our (a) language learning experiences before university, (b) language learning experiences during university, and (c) language teaching experiences after graduating from university. Our language learning experiences before university consisted of our initial SLS into the English language, in state schools, and informal SLS while our experiences during university were shaped by SLS in different types of universities and abroad, academic discourse socialisation and English medium of instruction. Lastly, our teaching experiences consisted of our choice of explicit versus implicit teaching, our level of friendliness with our students, and our formal socialisation into teaching.

In the next chapter, I will provide a brief overview on the study and discuss the findings by answering the research questions. As part of this chapter, pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research will be presented as well.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions

Introduction

The purpose of this study was twofold. Firstly, this study uncovered how six EFL teachers working in a preparatory school in Turkey viewed their language learning experiences. Secondly, it explored the effects of these experiences on their professional lives. To this end, this study addressed the following two research questions:

1. How do six EFL teachers from Turkey working at a preparatory school at a foundation university in Istanbul view their language learning socialisation experiences?
2. How are their views regarding their own language learning socialisation manifested in their current teaching practices?

To answer these research questions, I recruited five participants, and also investigated my own language learning narratives in an autoethnographic format. During the data collection, all the participants (including me) worked as EFL teachers at the same preparatory school at Firstville University, a foundation university in İstanbul, Turkey. The data were collected via (a) journal entries (JE), (b) semi-structured interviews, (c) supplementary documents (i.e., curricula vitae, exam scores, and so on), and (d) informal conversations between us as co-workers and friends.

In this chapter, I discuss the research findings according to the existing literature on second language and teacher socialisation in light of the research questions. As part of the chapter, I present pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research as well.

5.1 Discussion of findings for research questions

The findings will be discussed in two parts as (a) how the participants view their language learning experiences before, during, and after university, and (b) how these views are manifested in their current teaching practices.

5.1.1 Language learning experiences before, during, and after university. In this section, I discuss the findings of the first research question in light of the literature on second language socialisation and academic discourse socialisation. The first research question was "how do six EFL teachers from Turkey working at a preparatory

school at a foundation university in Istanbul view their language learning socialisation experiences?" The overall findings revealed that we (the participants) viewed our language learning experiences until university as mediocre at best. However, our perspective changed during university, which provided us with more opportunities to socialise into the English language. Moreover, as we started to work as teachers, we started to function as old-timers for our own students, and sometimes, each other.

Within our formal education, the quality of language education we received in state schools prior to university played a central role to a certain extent. People who learn an additional language are bound to experience SLS, and consequently, participate in CoPs. These CoPs should be a group of people who regularly interact through communicative and cooperative activities while aiming to help each other and share information. According to Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner (2015), being in a classroom does not make a community a CoP; the members of the community (mainly, teachers and students) need to interact with and learn from each other on a regular basis. In our case, the language classrooms, of which we were a part, were not exemplary CoPs since we regularly stated that we neither had regular communication nor enough time to do so. Apart from the insufficient time and communication, it was also found that our language teachers who were supposed to be the old-timers of our communities were not experts in the domain of our community, which was the English language. Their lack of expertise invalidated their function as old-timers of our CoPs. Without apparent old-timers in our CoPs, we were not presented with opportunities for legitimate peripheral participation (LPP, Lave & Wenger, 1991) which was required for learning to occur. Consequently, as one of the central reasons for our negative view on our language learning experiences, it could be stated that the lack of LPP opportunities and competency of our teachers led to the absence of SLS before university for us. Meaning that we did not have a chance to formally learn the English language in school, as part of a second language classroom CoP. Such situations corroborate with the literature (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015), in that in language classroom CoPs, the existence of an old-timer was a must, and the level of competency was quite crucial to being able to present learning opportunities, in other words, opportunities of LPP. In line with what the scholarship of second language

socialisation suggests, our language learning was hindered without teacher expertise, and thereby without old-timers, a CoP, and LPP.

Moreover, according to Polat (2019) and Külekçi (2016), students mostly focus on grammar, vocabulary, and reading skills and disregard the others (i.e., speaking, pronunciation, listening, and writing). In addition, the incompetency of our old-timers in terms of content and pedagogical knowledge, coupled with the overwhelming use of the teaching-to-the-test approach resulted in negative washback on our side. Meaning that we disregarded speaking and listening skills and instead focused on the others as part of our formal language education. This finding corroborated with Solak and Bayar's study (2015) on 22 state school students from various departments; language learners from Turkey complained about their inability to express themselves in English, as some of us did. According to Solak and Bayar' (2015) participants, even though there were several other reasons such as the structure of languages, materials, personal differences and so forth, one of the reasons for this deficiency in expressing themselves in English was the teachers' lack of expertise in their fields. Their participants stated that they just sat and listened to the teacher passively throughout the lessons, without legitimate participation in the CoP of the English language. Similarly, we suffered from this absence of LPP as well in the form of being passive listeners who were not given a chance to practise the language. Not being given chances to practise the language, merely being exposed to it, led to SLS problems in the future for us as discussed in the next paragraph. Furthermore, while Lave and Wenger (1991) emphasised the importance of LPP for learning to occur, Duff (2012) stated that novices or newcomers of a second language learnt through the mediation and expertise of people who were more proficient in the language and its culture. Even though the term "old-timer" is overwhelmingly used when referring to these people, Duff (2012) also referred to them as "experts" (p. 566). To answer the first research question regarding our experiences before university, corresponding with what Lave and Wenger (1991) and Duff (2012) stated, it can be discussed that the lack of expertise of our old-timers, coupled with the lack of opportunities for legitimate participation, we viewed our language learning experiences as average, if not below average.

When it comes to our language learning socialisation experiences during university, negative washback (Hughes, 1989) resulting from the university entrance

exam (UEE) and lack of previous SLS into the English language affected how we were socialised into the language, as well as teaching (see next section on the manifestation of our language learning experiences on our teaching). On the lack of previous SLS into the English language, Şanal and Ortaçtepe (2019) found that such deficiency might result in future SLS problems such as not being able to create appropriate speech requests, refusals, and acts. The findings of this study corresponded with what they found: lack of authentic and regular interaction, communication, and practice in the classroom affected our socialisation processes negatively. Moreover, the above-mentioned negative washback effect resulted from the UEE (Külekçi, 2016). As we disregarded speaking and writing skills, we had to compensate for what we lacked during university. Consequently, most of us had to overcome the hardships created by this deficiency in both speaking and writing. In line with the literature at hand, the university entrance exam and previous language education have crucial effects on the following language learning opportunities.

However, despite the lack of opportunities to socialise into the English language before university, we were provided with many chances in university to practise academic writing in the form of reflection papers, writing lesson plans, and so forth, as well as speaking in the form of pair/group discussions, drama sessions, various presentations, and so on via our old-timers, namely teachers and instructors. Amongst these chances of legitimate participation in the CoP of English language during university, the most crucial ones were a part of academic discourse socialisation (ADS). Even though almost all of us had our fair share of problems during university regarding speaking (stemming from the lack of formal SLS prior to university), we were all socialised into the academic discourse through speaking at the end of our education via individual and collaborative presentations, regular discussions, and various speaking-related group activities. In Kobayashi's (2016) longitudinal study on learning oral presentations as part of a university course, it was found that preparing a presentation, watching other members present, reflecting on, reading about, and inquiring into the topic with continued engagement in the classroom CoP resulted in the participant socialising into the academic discourse of speaking in English. The findings of this study corroborated with Kobayashi's findings, in that we were socialised into the academic discourse of speaking in English via, mostly,

presentations as well. We were given various topics to present on and watch other members of our CoP present, as well as raise our awareness on what we lack in terms of speaking and reflect on these specific deficiencies. A similar trend was seen in Dumlao's (2020) study on ADS of the speaking skill of undergraduate student teachers in Thailand. It was found that the participants continually negotiated with their peers and instructors (old-timers) not only to prepare for but also to reflect on the speaking CoP (Dumlao, 2020). Both Kobayashi (2016) and Dumlao (2020) stated that continued engagement and negotiation in the classroom resulted in ADS for their participants. Consequently, the continued engagement and negotiation might result in instantaneous and unprepared dialogues about the topic at hand. Similarly, we produced and experienced unrehearsed speech acts with our instructors and other members of our CoP who did not speak the same L1 as us. However, although this finding of Kobayashi and Dumlao is somewhat corroborated, some of us stated that instantaneous speech acts were limited due to most of the members of the CoPs speaking Turkish as their L1. Even though we were presented with opportunities for instantaneous speech acts, we chose our L1 over the English language which showed the need to enforce the use of the L2 throughout ADS activities within a language learning CoP.

Duff (2012), Ochs and Schieffelin (2008) and others (Zuengler & Cole, 2005; Hornberger & Duff, 2008, and so on) stated that SLS is a lifelong process. Being aware of their sentiment on the never-ending process of language learning, our awareness stemmed from the constant learning of the English language even after we completed our bachelor's degrees. Even though we were not learning under the guidance of our previous old-timers, university instructors, we were, then, instructors as well. Not limited to the participants of this study, but the Firstville University as a whole, there were many old-timers who were experts on various topics. Limited to the participants at hand, our expertise varied: one of us was less peripherally part of the grammatic knowledge of English while one of us was better at speaking. Consequently, while we were teaching our students as old-timers, we were part of many informal, self-organising CoPs where the old-timers varied.

To conclude the answer to the first research question, we viewed our language learning socialisation experiences as mostly negative until we started university.

Before university, we lacked old-timers in our CoPs. To be more precise, our teachers lacked expertise. Their lack of expertise resulted in a lack of opportunities for us to legitimately participate in the English language. Such inability to practise language resulted in deficient SLS. Concurrently, our old-timers were negatively affected by the washback effect created by the UEE, which affected us as learners. During university, however, although we had various problems with speaking and writing due to the previous negative washback and lack of formal SLS, we overcame what we lacked through ADS. At the end of university, when we started to work as EFL instructors, we were still being socialised into the English language, as well as academic discourses. Yet, the most significant socialisation we were going through was teacher socialisation, more specifically, organisational socialisation as teachers.

5.1.2 Manifestation of language learning experiences in teaching practices.

In this section, I discuss the findings of the second research question in light of the literature on second language socialisation and teacher socialisation. The second research question was "How are the participants' views regarding their own language learning socialisation experiences manifested in their current teaching practices?" I found that several experiences we had over the course of our formal education and informal endeavours not only affected how we taught but also were manifested in our teaching practices as the effects of the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1974), teacher socialisation (Staton, 2008), and academic discourse socialisation (Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, Duff, 2017).

The way we were socialised into the English language shaped our teaching. Our formal SLS was done through explicit grammar teaching. When the time came for us to make that seeming choice between explicit and implicit teaching, some of us went on with explicit teaching, even though our beliefs suggested otherwise. This finding corroborated with Johnson's (1994) study of four student teachers of ESL on the apprenticeship of observation. She found that the participants failed to reflect their teaching beliefs on their teaching practices. On the other hand, even though this thesis supported Lortie's (1974) theory of apprenticeship of observation (AoO) from the perspective of explicit versus implicit teaching, we managed to either mitigate or disrupt the effects of AoO. We had been friends with our teachers in the past and saw that being friends was, for some reason, the norm. We were apprenticed into teaching

by observing our teachers be friends with some of us. However, we strictly chose to be friendly with our students, as opposed to being friends with them since our teacher education taught us that some lines should not be crossed. This choice was apparent and on purpose. We were aware that being friends with our students might cause problems in our teaching activities, and we learnt during our teacher education that a line had to be drawn between teachers and students. Yet, we were also aware of the need of being friendly to create a safe classroom where collaboration, communication, and participation, and hence learning, could occur effectively. We started to socialise into teaching during our bachelor's degrees through various CoPs under the mediation of our old-timers. Due to this strong start to teacher socialisation, we were able to disrupt the possible effect of AoO. This finding corroborated Smagorinsky and Barnes' (2014) study that contradicted Lortie's description of AoO. Smagorinsky and Barnes' participants refused to follow what they observed for thousands of hours and instead reflected their beliefs and ideals on their teaching. While some of us were negatively affected by AoO, some of us managed to mitigate it; similarly, some of us were both negatively affected and managed to mitigate it. This contradiction between the selective effects of AoO on us and our teaching-related choices, practices, and beliefs might be explained by what Mewborn and Tyminski (2006) stated about AoO. For them, AoO was not a one-size-fits-all justification for all our actions. Even though AoO was not a one-size-fits-all justification, it negatively affected us (i.e., choosing between explicit and implicit teaching). On the other hand, although AoO was one of the hardest obstacles to overcome while learning to teach (Darling-Hammond, 2006), we were able to mitigate and/or disrupt the effects through our formal teacher socialisation (i.e., learning through our old-timers in university that friendliness was preferred over friendships with students.). Similar mitigation of the AoO was seen in our lack of speaking and writing skills stemming from the academic discourse socialisation (ADS) we went through during university. Almost all of us suffered from the above-mentioned washback effect resulting from the university entrance exam. The findings on ADS corroborated with the literature (see Kobayashi, 2016; Dumlao, 2020).

On the other hand, Kırkgöz (2017) calculated that from the second grade to the last year of high school, a student in Turkey was exposed to 1,000 lesson hours of

language education. We, the participants of this study, stated that we were exposed to almost continuous grammar-centred teaching. Despite the supposedly approximated 1,000 lesson hours of grammar-centred teaching, some of us still had problems with grammatical knowledge. This relative incompetency in grammatical content knowledge that we had might be explained by the lack of expertise on the side of our old-timers throughout our education before university – as well as ELT departments not teaching grammar as part of the curriculum during university. We had to learn the grammar of English formally, through education, in the classroom. Although we had several opportunities to informally socialise into the English language in various skills (i.e., socialising into speaking via gaming, socialising into the use of field-related vocabulary through music, and so on), we did not have many chances to informally learn the grammar: we neither had a legitimate old-timer who was an expert, nor a CoP, and consequently, nor opportunities for LPP.

On the other hand, we were inexperienced teachers (between one to five years of experience); three of us were in their first year of teaching. Consequently, we lacked organisational knowledge in addition to the above-mentioned content knowledge. To overcome these organisational and content-related deficiencies, we needed a way to learn. Eventually, we found ourselves in CoPs regarding organisational socialisation. Since I was more knowledgeable in our organisation than most of the participants, I was appointed and recognised as their old-timer. Even though there were many other old-timers who were more experienced than I was and from whom they could ask for help, I became the old-timer of this organisational socialisation CoP since we were all close friends. Our friendship, as stated by us, created a safe zone where we did not need to hide our inexperience or questions that we perceived as possibly illogical. As a result, I, the researcher, was an old-timer in the institution and served as so for my colleagues, and friends.

On a related note, they, the participants, were not socialised into the institution through only me, some of them were also a part of the same institution previously, as student teachers. Being somewhat aware of how the institution worked, coupled with the induction programme, they legitimately participated in the institution-related activities. Similarly, Flores (2019) found that one of the participants who was, previously, a part of the institution as a student was socialised into the institution more

easily. Some of us were in a similar position: we were working in the same institution we studied to become teachers. Consequently, this awareness aided in our organisational socialisation processes, coupled with the induction programme and our CoPs. Our CoPs, be it organisational or content-related, were mostly formed naturally as informal endeavours to learn. Nevertheless, as Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner (2015) stated, even though informal CoPs might be quite effective, they were bound to evolve into formal CoPs to gain recognition as true CoPs, though this gained recognition was not a requirement for a CoP. Similarly, Viskovic (2006) found that informal CoPs between colleagues working at a university were quite significant for the socialisation and professional development of the teachers. Correspondingly, a similar trend was found amongst the participants of this study regarding both content and organisational knowledge. Also, the findings of this study corroborated with the view of Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner, in that, our organisational CoP started as an informal one that constantly evolved through time.

To conclude the discussion on the second research question, the apprenticeship of observation was one of the factors affecting our teacher socialisation when it comes to our knowledge of grammar and our speaking and writing skills. Nevertheless, we were able to overcome the AoO on certain aspects as a result of our ELT education and the consequent teacher socialisation. During our teacher socialisation, we were also a part of an organisational CoP where I functioned as the old-timer for my colleagues and friends who were the participants of this study.

5.2 Pedagogical implications

EFL is a field that constantly changes and adapts to the requirements of the ever-changing world. As the field of EFL evolves, the stakeholders of language education are required to do so as well. Correspondingly, the purpose of this study was to understand and explore the areas of further improvement and adaptation of the current generation of EFL teachers, teaching at a preparatory school of a foundation university in İstanbul, Turkey. To this end, this study attempted to uncover how six different EFL teachers viewed their language learning experiences before, during, and after university, and how their views were manifested in their teaching careers under the guidance of second language socialisation theory.

The findings of this study revealed that the awareness of our language learning experiences, and hence how we socialised into a second language, academic discourse, teaching, and our institutions led to the retrospective reflection of our teaching practices to understand why we taught the way we did. Reflecting on our teaching beliefs and practices during and after our teacher education was an effective way of realising the reasoning behind our beliefs and practices – also, a way of mitigating the negative effects of the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975). The participants of this study were good examples of the positive effects of retrospective reflection. Therefore, the stakeholders of language teacher education in Turkey, namely Council of Higher Education of Turkey and various ELT departments, should encourage retrospective reflection of learning experiences, teaching practices, and the connection between these experiences and practices within their curriculum. To this end, ELT departments and teacher preparation programs can keep in touch with the newly graduated teachers after they graduate, during their first year. Such continuous aid might not only help student teachers mitigate the effects of AoO but also keep in contact with their teacher CoP, the department of ELT, while becoming legitimate members of their institution.

Moreover, the language teaching profession is a social (Johnson, 2009) and cultural (Kramsch, 1995) practice. As the participants of this study went, or rather have been going, through teacher socialisation, the findings of this study revealed that being aware of the CoP in which teachers partake may improve their teaching-related beliefs and practices. Teachers' shift from novices to legitimate members is affected by the way they are inducted and socialised into the institution while joining the respective CoPs in teaching-related domains (i.e., institutional, writing and speaking related, and so on). Therefore, it is certain that informal teaching-related CoPs have a crucial role in teacher socialisation. Teaching-related CoPs can be explicitly fostered by the institutions while creating awareness on the benefits of an effective CoP. In turn, CoPs are bound to create awareness of teaching beliefs and practices which may affect students' language learning experiences, as well.

Moreover, as seen in this study, the participants learnt not only from each other but also from those who were more experienced and open to possible inquiries. Therefore, assigning an old-timer as a partner to function as a mentor to a novice

teacher may immensely enhance the institutional and teacher socialisation processes of the newcomers. In conjunction with mentorship, the assigned partners can be encouraged to assist in the teacher socialisation processes of the newcomers.

5.3 Conclusions

This study attempted to reveal how six EFL teachers working at a foundation university in İstanbul, Turkey view their language learning socialisation experiences, and how these experiences were manifested in their teaching practices and beliefs. The findings revealed that before university, our language education was viewed as subpar due to the lack of expertise of our teachers in our CoPs. Such lack of expertise caused the absence of legitimate peripheral participation on our side, and hence the lack of second language socialisation. Similarly, our old-timers, as well as us as students, were under the influence of the negative washback of the university entrance exam. The absence of expertise and presence of negative washback resulted in us failing to socialise into certain academic discourses during our education until university. Our communities of practice in university provided us with many opportunities to practice and become legitimate members of the academic discourse communities of practice into which we failed to socialise previously.

In conclusion, these findings and the following discussion revealed that we viewed our language learning socialisation experiences until university as unexceptional, to say the least. Our second language socialisation experiences before university affected how we were socialised into the English language during university. The indirect language education and many opportunities for second language socialisation during university paved the way for our teacher socialisation after we graduated and started to work.

5.4 Recommendations for future research

Based on the findings and the limitations of this study, several recommendations can be provided for future research. Firstly, this study can be replicated with participants from various universities as the current study is comprised of teachers from only one institution. With participants from various institutions, the effects of organisational differences on teachers' socialisation can be studied.

Secondly, this study recruited participants from similar backgrounds. To uncover the effects of various backgrounds, namely international background pre-university, on the language learning socialisation experiences, participants who have various international background can be recruited in a future study.

Moreover, this study recruited one female participant, and five male participants since the possible sex differences between the socialisation processes of the participants were not part of the purpose of this study. Nevertheless, this study can be replicated with a more balanced demographic to reveal possible cross-gender differences.

Finally, more experienced teachers can be included in a future study as the participants of the current one are inexperienced teachers of English (between one and five years of experience). By doing so, the effect of experience and further teacher socialisation can be studied to further reveal the process of teacher socialisation.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I discussed the research findings and answered the research questions by considering the related literature. I, also, presented the pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research.

REFERENCES

Adams, T. (2016). Conceptualising autoethnography. In S. H. Jones, T. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (p. 22). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315427812

Akpınar, D. K., & Çakıldere, B. (2013). Washback effects of high-stakes language tests of Turkey (KPDS and UDS) on productive and receptive skills of academic personnel. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 9*(2), 81-94.

Alptekin, C., & Tatar, S. (2011). Research on foreign language teaching and learning in Turkey (2005-2009). *Language Teaching, 44*(3), 328-353. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144481100005X

Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalisation of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11(3-4),* 290-305.

Altun, H. (2017). *A language ecology perspective on second language socialization of undergraduate Turkish international students in terms of their linguistic, social and cultural identity development* (Publication No. 10284514) [Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Arik, B. T. (2020). English in Turkey. *World Englishes, 39*, 514-527. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12488

Arik, B. T., & Arik, E. (2014). The role and status of English in Turkish higher education. *English Today, 30,* 5-10. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266078414000339

Armour, K., Quennerstedt, M., Chambers, F., & Makopoulou, K. (2017). What is 'effective' CPD for contemporary physical education teachers? A Deweyan framework. *Sport, Education and Society, 22*(7), 799-811.

Barkhuizen, G., Benson, P., & Chik, A. (2014). *Narrative inquiry in language teaching and learning research.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1083000

Bayley, R., & Langman, J. (2011). Language socialization in multilingual and second language contexts. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second*

language teaching and learning (Vol. 2, pp. 291-302). Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203836507.ch18

Beach, R. (2012). Can online learning communities foster professional development. *Language Arts, 89*(4), 256-262.

Blitz, C. L. (2013). *Can online learning communities achieve the goal of traditional professional learning communities? What the literature says.* U.S. Department of Education. Washington: Institute of Educational Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic.

Bochner, A. P. (1994). Perspectives on inquiry II: Theories and stories. In M. L. Knapp, & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 21-41). Sage.

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S., & Wallace, M. (2005). *Creating and sustaining professional learning communities.* London: General Teaching Council for England, Department for Education and Skills.

Borg, M. (2004). The apprenticeship of observation. *ELT Journal, 58*(3), 274-276. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.3.274

Botha, C. (2020). The impact of the apprenticeship of observation on pre-service teachers' perceptions of teaching. *Journal of Education,* (81), 50-64.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781912284764

Boyd, A., Gorham, J. J., Justice, J., & Anderson, J. L. (2013). Examining the apprenticeship of observation with preservice teachers: The practice of blogging to facilitate autobiographical reflection and critique. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 40*(3), 27-47.

British Council. (2015). *The state of English in higher education in Turkey.* Yorum Basın.

Buchmann, M. (1987). Teaching knowledge: The lights that we live by. *Oxford Review of Education, 13*(2), 251-264. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305498870130203

Çakar, G. G. (2009). *The relationship between past language learning experiences and foreign language anxiety of Turkish university EFL students*. (Master's thesis, Bilkent University). http://repository.bilkent.edu.tr/handle/11693/15420

Cancino, M., Duran, M., & Solorza, C. (2020). What learning can do to teaching: Assessing the impact of apprenticeship of observation on pre-service teachers' beliefs. *English Teaching & Learning, 44*(3), 297-312. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00044-z

Çankaya, P. (2017). Challenges in EMI from the teachers' and students' eyes. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching, 5*(4), 830-839. https://doi.org/10.18298/ijlet.2096

Chang, H. (2016). Individual and collaborative autoethnography as method. In S. H. Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 107-122). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429431760-6

Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F., & Hernandez, K. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315432137

Carter, E. A. (2018). *The perceived value of professional communities of practice: A case study* (Publication No. 10976458) [Doctoral dissertation, Capella University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Cheng, L. (2005). *Changing language teaching through language testing: A washback study*. CUP.

Cheng, L., Watanabe, Y., & Curtis, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Washback in language testing: Research contexts and methods.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Choi, I. (2008). The impact of EFL testing on EFL education in Korea. *Language Testing, 25*(1), 39-62. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532207083744

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.21236/ad0616323

Clandinin, D. J., & Caine, V. (2013). Narrative inquiry. In A. A. Trainor, & E. Graue (Eds.), *Reviewing qualitative research in the social sciences* (pp. 166-179). Routledge.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.* Jossey-Bass.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational researcher, 19*(5), 2-14.

Conner, J., & Vary, G. (2017). Confronting apprenticeships of observation: How student-faculty pedagogical partnership complicates conceptualisation, understanding, and practice of effective pedagogy. *International Journal for Students as Partners, 1*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v1i1.3179

Council of Higher Education. (2022). *Türlerine göre birim sayıları raporu [Number of units according to their types]*. Ankara: Council of Higher Education.

Creswell, J. W. (2012a). Narrative research designs. In J. W. Creswell, *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4 ed., pp. 501-517). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2012b). Collecting qualitative data. In J. W. Creswell, *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4 ed., pp. 206-207). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2012c). Analysing and interpreting qualitative data. In J. W. Creswell, *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (p. 261). Pearson.

Cruess, R. L., Cruess, S. R., & Steinert, Y. (2018). Medicine as community of practice. *Academic Medicine, 93*(2), 185-191. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001826

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2017). Multilingual socialization through (language) textbooks. In P. A. Duff, & S. May (Eds.), *Language socialization* (pp. 195-210). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02255-0_15

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105285962

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(8). https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171109200622

Dearden, J., & Akıncıoğlu, M. (2016). *EMI in Turkish universities: Collaborative planning and student voices.* Oxford University Press.

Diab, R. L. (2009). Lebanese EFL teachers' beliefs. *TESL Reporter, 42*(2), 13-34.

Doğan, S., & Yurtseven, N. (2018). Professional learning as a predictor for instructional quality: A secondary analysis of TALIS. *An International Journal*

of Research, Policy and Practice, 29(1), 64-90. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2017.1383274

Doğançay-Aktuna, S. (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguistic profile. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 19*(1), 24-39. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639808666340

Doğançay-Aktuna, S., & Kızıltepe, Z. (2005). English in Turkey. *World Englishes, 24*(2), 253-265.

Duff, P A;. (2007). Second language socialisation as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching, 40*(4), 309-319. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508

Duff, P. A. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly, 29,* 505-537. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588073

Duff, P. A. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching, 40*(4), 309-319. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508

Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialization. In N. H. Hornberger, & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 427-452). Multilingual Matters.

Duff, P. A. (2012). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), T*he handbook of language socialisation* (pp. 564-586). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444342901.ch24

Duff, P. A., & Anderson, T. (2015). Academic language and literacy socialization for second language students. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 337-352). Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118531242.ch20

Duff, P. A., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 95-116). Routledge.

Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/111.4.563

Dumlao, R. P. (2020). Language socialization through an oral academic presentation in an EFL environment: A qualitative study. *The Qualitative Report, 25*(2), 416-440. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.4213

Eberle, J., Stegmann, K., & Fischer, F. (2014). Legitimate peripheral participation in communities of practice: Participation support structures for newcomers in faculty student councils. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 216-244. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2014.883978

Ekoç, A. (2018). English Medium Instruction (EMI) from the perspectives of students at a technical university in Turkey. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2018.1527025

Ekoç, A. (2020). No teacher is an island: Technology-assisted personal learning network (PLN) among English language teachers in Turkey. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1712428

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography* (Vol. 11). AltaMira Press.

Ellis, C., & Berger, L. (2002). Their story/my story/our story. In J. F. Gubrium, & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research* (pp. 849-875). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ellis, C., Adams, T., & Bochner, A. (2010). Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 12*(1), pp. 1-18. https://doi.org/https:/doi.org/10.17169/fqs-12.1.1589

Ellis, R. (2021). A short history of SLA: Where have we come from and where are we going? *Language Teaching, 54*(1), 190-205. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444820000038

Flores, C. (2019). Beginning teacher induction in Chile: Change over time. *International Journal of Educational Research, 97*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.06.001

Friedman, D. A. (2021). Language socialization and academic discourse in English as a Foreign Language contexts: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444821000422

Garrett, P. B., & Baquedana-Lopez. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation, and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*(1), 339-361. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085352

Glazier, J. A., & Bausell, S. B. (2018). New teacher socialisation and the testing apparatus. *Harvard Educational Review, 88*(3), 308-334. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-88.3.308

Goodyear, V. A., Parker, M., & Casey, A. (2019). Social media and teacher professional learning communities. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 24*(5), 421-433.

Gray, P. L. (2020). Mitigating the apprenticeship of observation. *Teaching Education, 31*(4), 404-423. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2019.1631785

Grusec, J. E., & Hastings, P. D. (2015). Preface. In J. E. Grusec, & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (2 ed., pp. xi-xiii). The Guilford Press. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444342901.ch1

Guarda, M., & Helm, F. (2017). 'I have discovered new teaching pathways': The link between language shift and teaching practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20*(7), 897-913. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1125848

Gulliver, T. (2010). Immigrant success stories in ESL textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*(4), 725-745. https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2010.235994

Gumperz, J. J. (1968). The speech community. In D. L. Sils, & R. K. Merton (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (pp. 381-386). Macmillan.

Gumperz, J. J., & Hymes, D. (1964). The ethnography of communication. *American Anthropologist, 66*(6), 137-153.

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2013). English Language Testing and Evaluation (ELTE) Teaching Policies and Needs in Turkey. *19th Conference of the International Association for World Englishes: World Englishes in the Multilingual World*, (pp. 16-18). Arizona.

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2016). The impact of the university entrance exam on EFL education in Turkey: Pre-service English language teachers' perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences, 232*(1), 136-144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.038

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2017). History of language teacher training and English language testing and evaluation (ELTE) education in Turkey. In *Mediterranean English Language Education Policy* (pp. 227-258). Pearson.

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

Heath, S. B., & Kramsch, C. (2004). Individuals, institutions and the uses of literacy: Shirley Brice Heath and Claire Kramsch in conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*, 75-91. https://doi.org/10.1558/jal.v1i1.75

Ho, M. C. (2011). Academic discourse socialization through small-group discussions. *System*, *39*(4), 437-540. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.10.015

Hodgkinson-Williams, C., Slay, H., & Siebörger, I. (2008). Developing communities of practice within and outside higher education institutions. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 39*(3), 433-442. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2008.00841.x

Holliday Hughes, S. (2019). Coursebooks: Is there more than meets the eye? *ELT Journal*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccz040

Holmes, J., & Marra, M. (2002). Having a laugh at work: How humour contributes to workplace culture. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(12), 1683-1710.

Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work.* Longman.

Hord, S. M. (1997). *Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement.* U.S. Department of Education. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Horii, S. Y. (2015). Creating a multilingual/multicultural space in Japanese EFL: A critical analysis of discursive practices within a new language education policy. In C. Weninger (Ed.), *Language, ideology and education: The politics of textbooks in language* (pp. 159-176). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315814223-18

Hornberger, N. H., & Duff, P. A. (2008). *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 8). Springer.

Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for language teachers.* Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Bride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-285). Penguin.

Jinjer. (2019). Teacher, teacher! [Online]. Austria; Napalm Records. Retrieved 22 August 2021, from https://youtu.be/oRkRwL0vjOg.

Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*(4), 439-452. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051x(94)90024-8

Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. Routledge.

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. 11-36). Cambridge University Press.

Karakaş, A. (2019). A critical look at the phenomenon of 'a mixed-up use of Turkish and English' in EMI universities in Turkey. *Journal of Higher Education and Science, 9*(2), 205-215. https://doi.org/10.5961/jhes.2019.322

Karakaş, A., & Jenkins, J. (2022). Academic English language policies and practices of English Medium instruction universities in Turkey from policy actors' eyes. In Y. Kırkgöz, & A. Karakaş (Eds.), *English as the medium of instruction in Turkish higher education* (pp. 3-25). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88597-7_1

Keleş, U., & Bedrettin, Y. (2022). Multi-level EMI policy implementation in Turkey's higher education: Navigating ideological tensions. In Y. Kırkgöz, & A. Karakaş (Eds.), *English as the medium of instruction in Turkish higher education* (pp. 109-134). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88597-7_6

Keleş, U., & Yazan, B. (2020). Representation of cultures and communities in a global ELT textbook: A diachronic content analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820976922

Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). Motivation and student perception of studying in an English medium university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 1*(1), 101-123.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2009a). Globalisation and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational Policy*, *23*(5), 663-684. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0895904808316319

Kırkgöz, Y. (2009b). Students' perceptions of English language versus Turkish language used as the medium of instruction in higher education in Turkey. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(1), 81-93. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510802602640

Kırkgöz, Y. (2017). English education policy in Turkey. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in the Middle East* (Vol. 13, pp. 235-256). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46778-8_14

Kitao, S. K., & Kitao, K. (1996). Testing communicative competence. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *2*(5), 1-6.

Knapp, N. F. (2012). Reflective journals: Making constructive use of the apprenticeship of observation in preservice teacher education. *Teacher Education*, *23*(3), 323-340. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2012.686487

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*(1), 95-121. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.2494

Kobayashi, M., Zappa-Hollman, S., & Duff, P. A. (2017). Academic discourse socialization. In P. A. Duff, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (3 ed., pp. 239-254). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02255-0_18

Kramsch, C. (1988). The cultural discourse of foreign language textbooks. In A. J. Singerman (Ed.), *The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages*, (pp. 63-88). New York.

Kramsch, C. (1995). The cultural component of language teaching. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *8*(2), 83-92. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908319509525192

Krashen, S. (1981). Formal and informal linguistic environments in language acquisition and language learning. In S. Krashen, *Second language acquisition*

and second language learning (pp. 40-50). Pergamon Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/3585637

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* Longman. https://doi.org/10.2307/414800

Külekçi, E. (2016). A concise analysis of the foreign language examination (YDS) in Turkey and its possible washback effects. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 3*(4), 303-315.

Lacey, C. (2012). *The socialization of teachers.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203126004

Langman, J., Bayley, R., & Caceda, C. (2015). Second language socialisation in adolescence: Exploring multiple trajectories. *International Journal of TESOL and Learning, 4*(1), 33-50.

Lantolf, J., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development.* Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2009). Teaching and testing grammar. In M. H. Long, & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 518-542). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444315783.ch27

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511815355

Lee-Kelly, L., Turner, N., & Ward, J. (2014). Intentionally creating a community of practice to connect dispersed technical professionals. *Research Technology Management, 57*(2), 44-52.

Leung, S. (2001). Language socialisation: Themes and advances in research. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL, 1*(1), 1-18.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* University of Chicago Press.

Macaro, E., & Akıncıoğlu, M. (2018). Turkish university students' perceptions about English Medium Instruction: Exploring year group, gender, and university type as variables. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 39*(3), 256-270. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1367398

Maccoby, E. E. (2015). Historical overview of socialization research and theory. In J. E. Grusec, & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (2 ed., pp. 3-33). The Guilford Press.

Madaus, G. F. (1988). The influence of testing on the curriculum. In L. N. Tanner (Ed.), *Critical issues in curriculum: Eighty-seventh yearbook of the National Society for the Study of the Education* (pp. 83-121). University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146818808900505

MEB. (2013). *İlköğretim Kurumları (İlkokullar ve ortaokullar) İngilizce Dersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı.* Ankara: T.C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Mewborn, D. S., & Tyminski, A. M. (2006). Lortie's apprenticeship of observation revisited. *For the Learning of Mathematics, 26*(3), 23-32.

Maguire, M, & Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide for learning and teaching scholars. *All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 8*(3), 3351-3364.

Miller, A., & Sorenson, A. (2017). Promoting veteran career success through employer partnership. *CAEL*, 1-24.

Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (2000). *Profound improvement: Building capacity for a learning community.* Swets and Zeitlinger. https://doi.org/10.1108/jea.2001.39.4.394.2

Moodie, I. (2016). The anti-apprenticeship of observation: How negative prior language learning experience influences English language teachers' beliefs and practices. *System, 60*, 29-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.05.011

Moore, L. C. (2017). Multilingual socialization and education in non-Western settings. In P. A. Duff, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (3 ed., pp. 155-168). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02255-0_12

Morita, N., & Kobayashi, M. (2008). Academic discourse socialization in a second language. In P. A. Duff, & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Language* (2 ed., Vol. 8, pp. 243-255). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_210

Motha, S., & Lin, A. (2014). "Non-coercive re-arrangements": Theorizing Desire in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 331-359. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.126

Mullany, L. (2008). 'Stop hassling me!': Impoliteness, power, and gender identity in the professional workplace. In D. Bousfield, & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (pp. 231-255). Mouton de Gruyter.

Murray, G. (2009). Narrative Inquiry. In J. Heigham, & R. A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative Inquiry in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 45-65). Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230239517_3

Myers, C. B., & Myers, L. K. (1995). *The professional educator: A new introduction to teaching and schools.* Wadsworth Publishing.

Nagao, A. (2018). Can the EFL classroom be considered a Community of Practice? *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning, 4*(1), 93-108. https://doi.org/10.22492/ijll.4.1.06

Newmann, F. M. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(3), 409-429. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587831

Ochs, E. (1985). Variation and error: A sociolinguistic study of language acquisition in Samoa. In D. Slobin (Ed.), *The cross-linguistic study of language acquisition* (Vol. 1, pp. 783-838). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315802541-9

Ochs, E. (1988). *Cultural and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.26-6333

Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz, & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407-437). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-92299-4_29

Ochs, E. (2001). Language socialisation. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Key terms in language and culture* (pp. 227-230). Blackwell Publishing.

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

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In P. A. Duff, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Vol. 8, pp. 3-15). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02255-0_1

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2011). The theory of language socialisation. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialisation* (pp. 1-22). Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444342901.ch1

Ochs, E., Solomon, O., & Sterponi, L. (2005). Limitations and transformations of habitus in child-directed communication. *Discourse Studies, 7*(4-5), 547-583. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054406

Olmos-Vega, F. M., Dolmans, D. H., Guzman-Quintero, C., Echeverri-Rodriguez, C., Teunissen, P. W., & Stalmeijer, R. E. (2019). Disentangling residents' engagement with communities of clinical practice in the workplace. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 24*(3), 459-475. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-019-09874-9

ÖSYM. (2021). *2021 YKS Yerleştirme Sonuçlarına İlişkin Sayısal Bilgiler.* ÖSYM.

Özer, Ö. (2020). Lecturers' experiences with English medium instruction in a state university in Turkey: Practices and challenges. *Issues in Educational Research, 30*(2), 612-634.

Özer, Ö., & Bayram, N. (2019). Students' experiences of English medium courses at tertiary level: A case in Turkey. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 11*(1), 61-70. https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2019.01.005

Pogodzinski, B. (2012). Socialization of novice teachers. *Journal of School Leadership, 22*, 982-1023. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461202200507

Polat, M. (2019). Washback effect of Turkish foreign language proficiency exam YDS: A scale development study. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15*(4), 1252-1268. https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.668404

Poole, D. (1994). Language socialisation in the second language classroom. *Language Learning, 42*(4), 593-616. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1992.tb01045.x

Reading, C. (2010). Using ICT to increase professional connectedness for teachers in remote Australia. *Australian Educational Computing, 25*(2), 3-6.

Reed-Danahay, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the self and the social.* Berg. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003136118

Regan, J., & Gold, J. (2010). Think tanks with deliverables: How communities of practice helped LPL financial manage rapid growth and organizational complexity. *Global Business & Organizational Excellence, 29*(3), 17-26. https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.20315

Richard, L., Chiocchio, F., Essiembre, H., Tremblay, M., Lamy, G., Champagne, F., & Beaudet, N. (2014). Communities of practice as a professional and organizational development strategy in local public health organizations in Quebec, Canada: An evaluation model. *Healthcare Policy, 9*(3), 26-39. https://doi.org/10.12927/hcpol.2014.23731

Richards, J. C., & Pennington, M. C. (1998). The first year of teaching. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Beyond Training.* Cambridge University Press.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.28-0612

Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. D. Rio, & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 139-164). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139174299.008

Rover, D. T., Moderator, P., Smith, K., Kramer, B., Streveler, R., & Froyd, J. (2003). Communities of practice in engineering education. *33rd Annual Frontiers in Education.* IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/fie.2003.1264718

Şanal, M., & Ortaçtepe, D. (2019). Conceptual socialization in EFL contexts: A case study on Turkish EFL learners' request speech acts realization. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15*(1), 376-399. https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.547766

Sapir, E. (1933). Language. In E. R. Seligman, & A. Johnson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of the social sciences* (Vol. 9, pp. 155-169). Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520311893-002

Schieffelin, B. B. (1985). The acquisition of Kaluli. In D. Slobin (Ed.), *The cross-linguistic study of language acquisition* (Vol. 1, pp. 525-593). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315802541-6

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986b). *Language socialisation across cultures.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511620898

Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986a). Language socialisation. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15*(1), 163-191. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.15.100186.001115

Schnurr, S. (2009). Constructing leader identities through teasing at work. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(6), 1125-1138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.10.002

Selvi, A. F. (2014). The medium-of-instruction debate in Turkey: Oscillating between national ideas and bilingual ideals. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 15*, 133-152. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2014.898357

Selvi, A. F. (2021). English language teaching in Turkey in the 1960s: Plus ça change...? *Çankaya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 15*(2), 205-222. https://doi.org/10.47777/cankujhss.1047473

Sert, N. (2008). The language of instruction dilemma in the Turkish context. *System, 36*(2), 156-171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.11.006

Shi, X. (2006). Intercultural transformation and second language socialization. *Journal of Intercultural Communication, 11*(1), 4-18.

Sinanoğlu, O. (1998). İngilizce öğretmenin yolu. In A. Kilimci (Ed.), *Anadilinde Çocuk Olmak, Yabancı Dilde Eğitim [Being a child in a mother tongue, education in a foreign language]* (pp. 118-122). Papirüs Publishing.

Slobin, D. I. (Ed.). (1967). *A field manual for cross-cultural study of the acquisition of communicative competence.* University of California.

Smagorinsky, P., & Barnes, M. E. (2014). Revisiting and revising the apprenticeship of observation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 41*(4), 29-52.

Solak, E., & Bayar, A. (2015). Current challenges in English language learning in Turkish EFL context. *Participatory Educational Research, 2*(1), 106-115. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.15.09.2.1

Spratt, M. (2005). Washback and the classroom: The implications for teaching and learning of studies on washback from exams. *Language Teaching Research, 9*(1), 5-29. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr152oa

Starr, L. J. (2010). The use of autoethnography in education research: Locating who we are in what we do. *Canadian Journal for New Scholar in Education, 1*(3), 1-9.

Staton, A. Q. (2008). Teacher socialization. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. 4990-4994). Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405186407.wbiect016

Staub, D., & Kırkgöz, Y. (2014). Motivation and student perceptions of success at English medium universities in Turkey. *Abstracts of English Scholars Beyond Borders.* University of Dokuz Eylül.

Stoll, L., & Louis, K. S. (2007). Professional learning communities: Elaborating new approaches. In L. Stoll, & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas* (pp. 1-14). Open University Press.

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., Mcmahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change, 7*(4), 221-258. https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2017.0220

Sugihara, M. (2006). For pedagogical examination of "Learning Community" in university [In Japanese]. *Kyoto University Researches in Higher Education, 12*, 163-170.

Tabak, H., & Şahin, F. (2020). Investigating the relationship between school effectiveness, professional learning communities, school culture and teacher characteristics. *Education Reform Journal, 5*(2), 45-59. https://doi.org/10.22596/erj2020.05.02.45.59

Thompson, S. C., Gregg, L., & Niska, J. M. (2004). Professional learning communities, leadership, and student learning. *Research in Middle Level Education Online, 28*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2004.11658173

Toole, J. C., & Louis, K. S. (2002). The role of professional learning communities in international education. In K. Leithwood, & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second*

international handbook of educational leadership and administration. Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0375-9_10

Tucker, L., & Quintero-Ares, A. (2021). Professional learning communities as a faculty support during the COVID-19 transition to online learning. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 24*(1), 1-18.

Turhan, B., & Kırkgöz, Y. (2018). Motivation of engineering students and lecturers toward English medium instruction in Turkey. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14*(1), 261-277.

Turkish Education Association. (2015). *Hayat=180 dk.* Retrieved from Türk Eğitim Derneği: https://www.ted.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/180dk.pdf

Uztosun, M. S. (2017). Profiles of Turkish pre-service teachers of English in terms of language learning background. *Journal of further and higher education, 41*(4), 492-503. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2015.1135883

Uztosun, M. S., Skinner, N., & Cadorath, J. (2014). An action research study designed to implement student negotiation to improve speaking classroom practice in Turkey. *Educational Action Research, 22*(4), 488-504. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2014.904238

Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(1), 80-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004

Viskovic, A. (2006). Becoming a tertiary teacher: Learning in communities of practice. *Higher Education Research & Development, 25*(4), 323-339. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360600947285

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1992). Thick explanation in the ethnographic study of child socialization: A longitudinal study of the problem of schooling for Kwara'ae children. In W. A. Corsaro, & P. J. Miller (Eds.), *Interpretive approaches to children's socialization* (pp. 51-66). Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219925805

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialisation paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(8), 331-350. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00233.x

Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Gegeo, D. (1986). Calling out and repeating routines in Kwara-ae children's language socialization. In B. B. Schieffelin, & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 17-50). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511620898.002

Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Nielsen, S. (2003). Language socialisation in SLA. In C. J. Doughty, & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition.* Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch7

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning as a social system. *Systems Thinker*, 1-10.

Wenger-Trayner, E., & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015, April 5). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction.* Retrieved from https://wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice/

Yang, N. (2000). Teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching: A Cross-cultural comparison. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education, 5*(1), 39-52.

Yıldırım, O. (2010). Washback effects of a high-stakes university entrance exam: Effects of the English section of the university entrance exam on future English language teachers in Turkey. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, *12*(2), 92-116.

Yıldırım, R., & Şeker, M. (2013). Community of practice: An investigation into its impact on ELT students' personal and professional development. *Ç. Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 22*(2), 365-382.

Yıldız, M., Soruç, A., & Griffiths, C. (2017). Challenges and needs of students in the EMI classroom. *Konin Language Studies, 5*(4), 387-402. https://doi.org/10.30438/ksj.2017.5.4.1

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience? *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 7-11. https://doi.org/10.1177/002248718103200302

Zuengler, J., & Cole, K. M. (2005). Language socialization and second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language*

teaching and learning (pp. 301-316). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410612700-27