

Deniz Ortaçtepe Hart* and Seçil Okkalı

Common ground and positioning in teacher-student interactions: Second language socialization in EFL classrooms

<https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2021-0003>

Abstract: This study aims to present how intercultural and intracultural communication unfolds in EFL classrooms with NNESTs and NESTs who constantly negotiate common ground and positionings with their students. Three NEST and three NNEST teaching partners were observed and audio recorded during the first and fifth weeks of a new course they taught in turns. Data were transcribed and analyzed through conversation analysis using Kecskes and Zhang's socio-cognitive approach to common ground (Kecskes, István & Fenghui Zhang, 2009. Activating, seeking, and creating common ground. A socio-cognitive approach. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 17(2). 331–355) and Davies and Harré's positioning theory (Davies, Bronwyn and Rom Harré. 1990. Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20(1). 43–63). The findings revealed several differences in the ways NESTs and NNESTs established common ground and positioned themselves in their social interactions. NESTs' lack of shared background with their students positioned them as outsiders in a foreign country and enabled them to establish more core common ground (i.e., building new common knowledge between themselves and their students). NNESTs maintained the already existing core common ground with their students (i.e., activating the common knowledge they shared with their students) while positioning themselves as insiders. NESTs' difference-driven, cultural mediator approach to common ground helped them create meaningful contexts for language socialization through which students not only learned the target language but also the culture. On the other hand, NNESTs adopted a commonality-driven, insider approach that was transmission-of-knowledge oriented, focusing on accomplishing a pedagogical goal rather than language socialization.

Keywords: common ground, positioning, second language socialization, socio-cognitive approach, intercultural and intracultural communication

*Corresponding author: Deniz Ortaçtepe Hart, Middlebury Institute of International Studies, Monterey, CA, USA, E-mail: dortactepe@middlebury.edu

Seçil Okkalı, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey, E-mail: secilo@metu.edu.tr

1 Introduction

Language socialization refers to the process in which novices/children acquire the linguistic and cultural norms of their speech community while also becoming its competent and legitimate members (Ochs 1986; Schieffelin and Ochs 1984, 1986). When applied to foreign language learning, language socialization is concerned with the interaction that occurs between a language teacher and language learners within the language classroom where most of the exposure to second language (L2) input and use takes place (Ortaçtepe 2012; Sanal and Ortaçtepe 2019). Common ground, that is, interlocutors' shared knowledge, beliefs, and suppositions held in a particular communication, and the many positionings that take place between teacher-student interactions, have the potential to (re)frame the nature of teacher-student relationships, hence the language socialization practices in L2 classrooms. The present study examines how intercultural and intracultural communications in language classrooms shape the way English language teachers establish common ground and positionings in their interactions with language learners and how these two discursive processes facilitate language socialization in EFL classrooms.

2 Language socialization

According to Ochs (2001), the framework of language socialization explores “how language practices organize the life span process of becoming an active, competent participant in one or more communities” (227). Language socialization, “which encompasses socialization *through* language and socialization *into* language” (Ochs and Schieffelin 2011: 4, emphasis in the original), involves children/novices' involvement and active participation in language-mediated interactions with their caregivers/experts in order to acquire principles of social order and belief systems in their speech community. Language socialization is a bilateral process: its influence is inherently bidirectional since new members of a community are “agentive in the shaping of their development and have the capacity to resist and transform facets of the social order” that exist within the community they are socialized into (Ochs and Schieffelin 2011: 6).

Building on the framework of language socialization, second language (L2) socialization extends beyond individuals' native or dominant language and involves teachers or more competent members of the speech community as experts (Duff 2012; Duff and Talmy 2011; Kanagy 1999; Leung 2001; Ortaçtepe 2012, 2014; Ros i Solé 2007). L2 socialization underlines the dynamic interplay between

language and culture on the linguistic and social development of language learners. It is through language socialization that language learners learn to communicate appropriately in the target language by adopting the target speech community's ways of behavior (Kramsch 2002; Matsumura 2001; Ortaçtepe 2012; Vickers 2007). In other words, through L2 socialization, language learners gradually adopt the socially appropriate and salient discursive processes and conversational moves in their L2 interactions. These discursive processes serve two main functions: to convey denotational meaning and interactional messages, and to co-construct and assert various social identities (Wortham 2003). Common ground has an influence on not only the way(s) denotational meaning is revealed but also how interlocutors position themselves and others in any given speech context (Colston 2008; Ortaçtepe 2014). The next sections, thus, will discuss Kecskes and Zhang's (2009) socio-cognitive approach to common ground and Davies and Harré's (1990) positioning theory, as well as the reciprocal nature of these two discursive processes within L2 socialization.

2.1 Common ground

The early conceptualizations of Stalnaker's (1978) notion of common ground included common knowledge (Lewis 1969), mutual knowledge or belief (Schiffer 1972), and joint knowledge (McCarthy 1990). Clark (1996) defines common ground as interlocutors' shared knowledge, world views, beliefs, and suppositions that are pertinent in their communication. Not only that language use is context dependent, but also meaning construction and prompting systems are culture-specific (Kecskes 2008, 2019). Hence, Kecskes and Zhang (2009) propose a socio-cognitive approach to common ground in which meaning is constructed by the dynamic interplay between the message and the situational context. This socio-cognitive approach involves two components of common ground: core common ground, deriving from the speaker and hearer's shared knowledge of a previous experience; and emergent common ground, arising from the interlocutors' individual knowledge of a previous or current experience.

Within Kecskes and Zhang's (2009) socio-cognitive approach to common ground, core common ground consists of three subcategories: common sense, culture sense, and formal sense. *Common sense* refers to the world knowledge: the understanding and cognitive reasoning of the objective world. *Culture sense* includes the knowledge of culture-specific norms, beliefs, and moral values of a speech community. *Formal sense* entails the knowledge of the language system used in communication. Kecskes and Zhang (2009) emphasize that core common ground is an assumption made by all the participants involved in a conversation rather than

a fact that can be taken for granted since any shared knowledge – which is relatively static – is still subject to change over a period time due to the changes in people's social lives. Such changes in the linguistic core common ground (i.e., *formal sense*) may be exemplified as the semantic changes of lexical items such as “gay, piece of cake, awesome, and patronize” (Kecskes and Zhang 2009: 348). Additionally, core common ground may differ among individuals in a particular community depending on factors such as geography, education, finance, and so on.

Compared to core common ground, which is mainly composed of interlocutors' prior knowledge or experience, emergent common ground is claimed to be more private and dependent on the situational context. Kecskes and Zhang (2009) categorize emergent common ground as shared sense and current sense. *Shared sense* includes interlocutors' shared knowledge of their personal experiences. For instance, the shared sense that exists between spouses may be different from the one between colleagues. People who experience the same event may have different memories of it. Therefore, shared sense is a “dynamic assumptive feature” that requires a joint effort from the interlocutors (Kecskes and Zhang 2009: 349). Similarly, *current sense* needs to be jointly established by the interlocutors as their perception of the current situation may often be different due to their varying perspectives, attentional resources, and so on.

2.2 Positioning

While establishing and maintaining common ground in a conversation, the interlocutors also position themselves and each other with respect to the speech context (Colston 2008; Ortaçtepe 2014). Positioning was first conceptualized by Goffman (1979) as alignment, referring to the positions that are adopted by interlocutors in social situations. Later on, Davies and Harré (1990: 48) defined positioning as a “discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines.” Positioning may occur interactively (i.e., an interlocutor positions the other) or reflexively (i.e., an interlocutor positions oneself in relation to the other) (Davies and Harré 1990; Jones 2013). Hence, a participant may position oneself or be positioned by the others in a conversation as “powerful or powerless, confident or apologetic, dominant or submissive, definitive or tentative, authorized or unauthorized” (Harré and van Langenhove 1999: 17).

In line with Kecskes and Zhang's (2009) socio-cognitive approach to common ground, positioning theory emphasizes that any conversation is a dynamic, joint discursive action in which speakers and hearers (e.g., the narrator and the audience) negotiate various identities while positioning themselves interactionally and

reflexively (Wortham 2000). Through social interaction, an individual appears as an identity that is ‘constituted and reconstituted’ by the various discursive practices they take part in, rather than a ‘fixed end product’ (Davies and Harré 1990). In other words, positioning refers to the act of appointing ‘fluid’ roles to anyone involved in these discursive acts (Harré and van Langenhove 1999).

2.3 The intersection of common ground and positioning in classroom contexts

Both core and emergent common ground play an important role in classroom settings. Classroom interaction is both the medium and the object of teaching/learning processes and a common body of knowledge is constructed through the interaction between the teacher and the learners (Hall and Walsh 2002). According to Tsui (2004), classroom discourse is a process in which the teacher and the learners negotiate and disambiguate meanings, as well as establish and expand common ground. The more common ground is shared between participants in conversation, the less effort and time is needed to convey and interpret information (i.e., interactional efficiency) (Kecskes 2014), thus allowing language learners more affordances for meaningful interaction in the classroom (Tsui 2004). While establishing common ground, teachers and learners assign themselves and each other fluid roles depending on the instructional activity and/or the situational context (Harré and van Langenhove 1999). For instance, teachers may act as an information source, cultural mediator, academic counselor, and so on. These positionings teachers and students take on in the classroom may also serve as rapport building and thus shape the nature of teacher-student relationship (Enfield 2008).

According to Davies and Harré (1990: 46), the roles and identities one adapts in a constantly evolving interaction depend “upon the positions made available within one’s own and others’ discursive practices and within those practices, the stories through which we make sense of our own and others’ lives.” It is within these stories lie the intersection of common ground and positioning theory. To elaborate, in any given interaction, “the meaning and the “force” of what we say are interpreted within the context of the various “stories” and “histories” that we bring to the interaction or that we “make up” together with other participants as we go along.” (Jones 2013: 2). These stories may rely on interlocutors’ shared past experiences (i.e., core common ground) and/or derive from the immediate situational context (i.e., emergent common ground). There are also “master narratives” or “cultural story lines” which are culturally shared discursive behaviors interlocutors draw from in order to “formulate their actions and interpret the

actions of others” (Jones 2013: 2). Being very similar to *culture sense* within core common ground, these cultural story lines enable participants to organize, execute, and make sense of an interaction while they simultaneously co-construct various positionings. Therefore, while different factors such as gender, age, and other social constructs may influence the nature of common ground in classroom settings, the cultural background of the interlocutors (and whether the communication is intercultural or intracultural) may add an additional layer to these differences and pose further challenges in language classrooms.

According to Kecskes (2015: 175), intracultural communication “occurs in interactions between members of a relatively definable L1 speech community following conventions of language and conventions of usage with individual choices and preferences,” while intercultural communication takes place between “speakers who have different first languages, communicate in a common language, and, usually, represent different cultures.” While this study perceives intercultural and intracultural communication as a continuum rather than a dichotomy to acknowledge the dynamic, emergent nature of “culture” and the different factors that come into play in a given communicative situation (Kecskes 2015), the extent to which interlocutors engage in intercultural or intracultural communication may still require different discursive acts when it comes to establishing and maintaining common ground. For instance, due to little or no prior shared experience among the interlocutors, the common ground shared in intercultural communication is sometimes claimed to be limited compared to the generally shared knowledge in intracultural encounters (Gumperz 1982; Kecskes 2015; Scollon and Scollon 2001; Tannen 2005). Thus, interlocutors in intercultural communication may need to seek, create and co-construct common ground rather than activate their previously existing mutual knowledge (Kecskes 2014, 2015). In EFL classrooms, non-native English language teachers (NNESTs) who share a similar cultural background with their students may easily make use of their mutual knowledge, while native English speaker teachers (NESTs) coming from different cultural backgrounds might need to establish emergent common ground to compensate for the lack of shared cultural knowledge and practices and to provide novel affordances for their students.

3 Methodology

The overarching purpose of this study is to investigate the similarities and differences between NESTs and NNESTs in regard to their language socialization practices EFL classrooms. Notwithstanding, this study avoids dichotomizing NESTs and NNESTs as two distinctively different entities. It also refrains from

attributing the differences to issues such as language ownership and default expertise in a way that perpetuates the power of the native speaker as a construct and yields to discriminatory professional environments (Rudolph et al. 2015). Instead, by having an emic perspective rooted in conversation analysis, this study aims to present how intercultural and intracultural communication unfolds in EFL classrooms with NNESTs and NESTs who constantly negotiate common ground and positionings with their students. Therefore, this study addresses the following research questions:

1. In what ways do English language teachers establish common ground with their students in intercultural and intracultural communication?
2. In what ways do they position themselves in these common ground building/maintaining acts?

3.1 Context

This study was conducted at an intensive English language program of a higher education institution in Ankara, Turkey. At this university, English-medium instruction is provided in all departments; therefore, students are required to take a university-wide proficiency exam and score a B2 level according to Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). If students fail to achieve this proficiency level, they are required to attend an intensive English language program where classes are taught by both local teachers who usually share the same L1 with the students, and international instructors coming from a variety of countries such as the U.S., the U.K., Ireland, South Africa, and so on. NESTs and NNESTs often teach the same class in turns, using the same integrated-skills syllabus. The program employs a modular system consisting of beginner, elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate, upper-intermediate, and pre-faculty modules. Students study each module for two months, at the end of which they are randomly assigned to different classes and instructors in order to begin a new module.

The focal participants of this study were three teaching partners of NESTs and three NNESTs in this intensive English program. The only criteria applied to the selection of the instructors was that they had not previously met the group of students that would be observed and that the new module would be their first encounter with them. The students in these classes were at pre-intermediate and intermediate levels and each class consisted of 12–17 students aged between 18 and 21. Both the instructors and the students were asked to sign a consent form prior to the observations. Detailed information about the participants and their classes is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic information of the participants.

Class #	Name ^a	Teaching experience	Nationality	L1
1	Paul	2 years	American	English
	Buket	13 years	Turkish	Turkish
2	Ursula	4 years	American	English
	Ayfer	6 years	Turkish	Turkish
3	Joanne	3 years	South African	English
	Mine	5 years	Turkish	Turkish

^aAll pseudonyms.

3.2 Data collection

Data collection instruments included classroom observations, field notes, and researchers' journal. Observations were conducted in the first week of a new module, when the students met their instructors for the first time. The same classes were observed for the second time during the fifth week of the same course to explore the social interactions after a month of instructors' teaching and getting to know their students. In order to observe as much teacher-student interaction as possible, speaking and pre-teaching stages of lessons (i.e., warm-up activities) were observed. The second author joined the classes as a nonparticipant observer and made unstructured observations (Dörnyei 2007). While observing the lessons, the second author took field notes in the form of a running commentary to note down the details about the interaction between the teacher and the students, as well as her general impressions about the classroom atmosphere. After each observation, the researcher jotted down her reflections on the lesson in a researcher journal, considering the incidents where common ground was built and the positioning of the instructor during these discursive acts. The audio recorded lessons revealed a total of 640 min of data.

3.3 Data analysis

The data were analyzed in several steps. First, the audio-recordings went through a process of tape analysis with the help of the field notes and the researcher journal. This was the stage where the researchers went through the recordings with an unmotivated look, and created a list of criteria to identify those conversations involving common ground. This stage led to the construction of Table 2, which lists the observable behaviors that might indicate the establishment of common ground.

Table 2: Criteria for identifying instances of common ground.

Core common ground	
Common sense	– There is a misunderstanding about an aspect of daily life. – A reference is made to an aspect of daily life.
Culture sense	– A cultural difference between the teacher and the students is highlighted. – A cultural similarity between the teacher and the students is highlighted. – There is a misunderstanding between the teacher and the students due to a lack of shared knowledge. – A reference is made to the knowledge of cultural norms, beliefs, and values of the local community.
Formal sense	– The teacher and the students communicate in English. – The teacher and the students communicate in Turkish. – There is a misunderstanding/communication breakdown due to the teacher's lack of knowledge in Turkish. – There is a misunderstanding/communication breakdown due to the students' lack of knowledge in English.
Emergent common ground	
Shared sense	– The teacher and/or the students learn something new about each other. – The teacher and/or the students refer to something they already know about each other. – The teacher and/or the students refer to their shared previous personal experiences.
Current sense	– The teacher and/or the students' perception of the current situation is expressed by themselves.

A total of 48 conversations involving common ground were selected using the criteria presented in Table 2. The selected parts of the recordings which were found to include common ground were transcribed using Jefferson's transcript notations (Atkinson and Heritage 2006). Nonverbal behaviors such as gestures and laughs that might contribute to the interaction were also included in the transcriptions. The transcription of the recorded observations resulted in a total of 1055-line database out of 48 excerpts. Table 3 displays the details of the recorded data and the instances where common ground is found based the criteria presented in Table 2.

Second, transcriptions were analyzed using a conversation-analytic framework (see Appendix A) adapted from Kecskes and Zhang's (2009) socio-cognitive approach to common ground and Davies and Harré's (1990) positioning theory. Conversation analysis was followed since it enables the investigation of how "participants analyze and interpret each other's actions and develop a shared

Table 3: Detailed record of the data.

Participant	Recording time (min)		Number of instances ^a		Duration of instances (min)	
	Week 1	Week 5	Week 1	Week 5	Week 1	Week 5
Ursula	50	70	6	3	10	9.5
Paul	50	50	4	2	6.5	2
Joanne	50	50	3	2	5	4
NESTs total	150	170	13	7	21.5	15.5
Ayfer	50	70	7	2	11.5	4
Buket	50	50	4	4	5	5
Mine	50	50	6	5	10.5	10
NNESTs total	150	170	17	11	27	19
Total	300	340	30	18	48.5	34.5

^aInstances of common ground found in the data.

understanding of the progress of the interaction” (Seedhouse 2004:13). While analyzing those excerpts that involved common ground, several patterns were noticed in relation to core and emergent common ground. For instance, in relation to *culture sense*, core common ground was either ‘established’ to overcome a lack of shared knowledge, or ‘maintained’ to activate the already existing background knowledge. Similarly, in relation to *shared sense*, emergent common ground was either ‘established’ by referring to the teacher and the students’ previous experiences, or ‘maintained’ by activating what they already share in common. This process enabled the researchers to develop two main codes for the analytical framework: 1) establishment of common ground (i.e., the (co)construction of common ground, 2) maintenance of common ground (i.e., the activation of already existing common ground). As for *formal sense*, the conversations between the teachers and the students were found to be either monolingual (only English) or bilingual (both Turkish and English).

After analyzing the establishment and maintenance of common ground using the analytical framework, a list of descriptors to identify the teachers’ positioning was created through emergent coding. Table 4 presents those observable behaviors that were found in NESTs’ and NNESTs’ positionings.

To ensure the reliability of the analysis, an expert in the field was asked to analyze 10% of the transcripts using the same analytical framework. The comparison between the expert’s and researchers’ analyses provided similar results. In the few cases when there were discrepancies, there were further discussion and exploration.

Table 4: Observable behaviors in teachers' positioning.

Interactive positioning	– What the teacher and/or the students say(s) positions the other interlocutor.
Reflexive positioning	– What the teacher says positions themselves.
Outsider	– The teacher detaches themselves from the local community. – The teacher talks about their experiences as a foreigner in the local community.
Someone trying to become an insider	– The teacher shows their awareness and/or knowledge of the local culture. – The teacher seems interested in learning about the local culture. – The teacher talks about their experiences as someone who knows about the local culture.
Insider	– The teacher emphasizes the similarities between themselves and the students. – The teacher expresses their inside knowledge about cultural norms, beliefs or values.
Cultural mediator	– The teacher creates a platform for learning about different cultures.
Source of information	– The teacher provides information about language or shares world knowledge.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Establishing and maintaining core common ground in EFL classrooms

Table 5 presents the frequencies in regards to core common ground which consists of *common sense*, *culture sense*, and *formal sense*.

As seen in Table 5, the number of instances where *common sense* is shared with the students is quite low for both groups: two instances by the NESTs, three instances by the NNESTs. As for *culture sense*, out of 20 excerpts in total by NESTs, 11 instances of establishing and seven instances of maintaining common ground were found. NNESTs, on the other hand, establish common ground within *culture sense* only once and maintain common ground in 21 instances out of 28 excerpts in total. These results indicate that as far as *culture sense* is concerned, NESTs seem to build new common ground with their students in order to overcome their lack of shared knowledge. On the other hand, NNESTs seem to activate their existing shared knowledge more than they share new information with their students.

With respect to *formal sense*, out of 20 conversations with NESTs, 18 take place in English, and in two conversations, Turkish is used only by the students. Out of 28

Table 5: Establishing and maintaining core common ground.

	NESTs			NNESTs		
	Week 1	Week 5	Total	Week 1	Week 5	Total
<i>Common sense</i>						
Established	1	1	2	1	0	1
Maintained	0	0	0	3	0	3
<i>Culture sense</i>						
Established	8	3	11	1	0	1
Maintained	6	1	7	15	6	21
<i>Formal sense</i>						
English	12	6	18	5	4	9
English & Turkish	1	1	2	12	7	19
Total # of instances	13	7	20	17	11	28

excerpts with NNESTs, nine conversations are *only* in English while 19 of them are both in English and Turkish. Although the majority of the conversations between NNESTs and students include both L1 and L2, it is often the students who resort to Turkish to ask questions or to provide further explanations. When the students use Turkish, NNESTs either respond to them in English or provide a recast in English. These quantitative results will be illustrated with excerpts from the data, followed by the findings drawn from these descriptives and the discussions of the excerpts.

Excerpt 1 below presents a classroom discussion about the similarities and differences in terms of politeness within Turkish and American culture. Ursula, an NEST, asks students whether kissing in the corridor at school is rude or not within the Turkish culture.

- 90 T: Number ten, kissing your boyfriend or girlfriend in the corridor.
 S1: = Yeah, very very okay.
 S2: = Ok ya ↑
 T: It's very okay?
 S1: Teacher, my hometown, in my hometown, it's very (0.2) rude, but, mm in [the name of the university], it's normal.
- 95 T: Aha? What do you think?
 S3: Ama, not French kiss yani, {But, not French kiss I mean}
 S2: Maybe, maybe İzmir, it's okay.
 S1: (laughs)
 T: (laughs) Depends on your hometown? What do you guys say?
- 100 S3: Two
 T: Two?
 S1: Teacher!

- T One?
- S1: Not a problem for me.
- 105 T: Not a problem for you?
- S1: Teacher! You?
- 110 T: I would say, in like an American high school or university, one. Okay. It's very, very common. More common than here. So, I'm used to it. I don't think it's rude. I think maybe Turkish teachers think it's rude? ↑ (asking for the approval of the researcher) but I don't. I don't know, I've walked with Turkish teachers and say "Students!" (with a disapproving tone) I'm like "What?" "Kissing in the hall!" I'm like aha, oh? Yeah? ↑ Bad!

In this conversation, Ursula inquires whether kissing in the school corridor is perceived as a rude behavior within the Turkish culture. Her comments imply a lack of core common ground in relation to *culture sense* about politeness rules. Through lines 108–113, she shares a narrative about her experiences in Turkey in order to establish common ground with her students as well as to raise their awareness of the differences between the local culture and her own.

In Excerpt 2, Ayfer, an NNEST, revises vocabulary related to the theme of that lesson. She gives an example about the Turkish unemployment agency "İşkur" to exemplify the collocation "work with unemployed people."

- 465 I work with students or I work with young people. Ok? I work with teenagers. We work together. Alright? So, look at the box here, part 1. Look at the box, and can you please put these under the suitable part? Which preposition? Let's do one of them together. Unemployed people?
- S2: With.
- T: Unemployed?
- 470 S1: İşsiz. {Unemployed}
- S2: İşsiz kişi demek. {It means unemployed person}
- T: Ok. Somebody who doesn't have a job.
- S2: =No job.
- Alright, what can we say? Work with unemployed people. Who works with unemployed people? Who?
- 475 S1: Türkçe'sini biliyor muyum? {Do I know the Turkish for it?}
- S2: Kim çalışır ki? {Who works with them anyway?}
- S3: İşsizler kimle mi çalışır? {Who works with unemployed people?}
- T: No. Work with unemployed people. Somebody works with unemployed people.
- Who is that?

480 S2: Who is somebody?

T: (0.3) İşkur.

S2: Haa.

Türkiye İş ve İşçi Bulma Kurumu. They work with unemployed people. They need to find jobs for these people. Yeah?

485

In this conversation, Ayfer makes a reference to the local context shared in *culture sense* to teach vocabulary, enabling her to maintain core common ground. After checking the meaning of the word in lines 470–474, she tries to elicit a response from the students in line 480. At first, the students cannot come up with an answer and one of the students asks “Who is somebody?” in line 482. Following this question, Ayfer gives away the answer “İşkur” in line 483. The student’s expression “Haa” showing their understanding in line 484 indicates the recall of the shared knowledge within that community. Here, it is clear that both the teacher and the students share “İşkur” as their core common ground, which the teacher uses to consolidate students’ vocabulary learning.

Based on the quantitative results and the conversation analysis presented in Excerpt 1 and 2, two main findings can be drawn in regards to the ways NESTs and NNESTs establish core common ground with their students.

Finding 1. NESTs and NNESTs differ in the ways they share core common ground in their interactions with their students in relation to *culture sense*. In the conversations between NESTs and students, there is often a lack of shared knowledge in terms of local traditions, rules of politeness, aspects of popular culture, and so on. Therefore, NESTs often seek and build new common ground with their students to overcome this lack of shared knowledge to avoid and overcome misunderstandings and/or communication breakdowns. In their conversations with students, NESTs seem to be maximizing the affordances for classroom interaction by focusing on meaning and fluency. NNESTs, on the other hand, maintain core common ground by referring to their common knowledge about the local culture rather than forming new connections. They often refer to their shared background in terms of local places, common practices, and social behavior in order to activate students’ schemata. NNESTs’ common ground building/maintaining acts seem to have derived from a pedagogical goal such as exemplifying a teaching point, checking students’ comprehension, or consolidating their learning.

Finding 2. NESTs and NNESTs also differ in their conversations in relation to *formal sense*. NESTs share common ground with their students in English in almost all their conversations with the students. As shown in Excerpt 1 above, the interaction

between Ursula and her students continue in English despite the gap in their shared knowledge. The use of English to establish common ground provides an opportunity for the students to focus on the negotiation of meaning rather than achieving linguistic accuracy. The students seem motivated to share genuine information about the topic at hand, and while doing so, they use the language for real-life purposes. Similarly, Excerpt 2 presents a lack of shared knowledge in Ayfer and her students' core common ground, yet Ayfer's approach to overcome this lack of knowledge differs from Ursula's. The students' Turkish utterances in Excerpt 2 help Ayfer gauge the level of common ground already shared and enable her to take advantage of their shared L1 to achieve her pedagogical goals (i.e., teaching vocabulary).

4.2 Establishing and maintaining emergent common ground in EFL classrooms

Table 6 presents the frequencies in regards to emergent common ground (i.e., shared sense and culture sense) that occurred in the data.

Table 6: Frequencies for NESTs' and NNESTs' establishment and maintenance of emergent common ground.

	NESTs			NNESTs		
	Week 1	Week 5	Total	Week 1	Week 5	Total
<i>Shared sense</i>						
CG established	2	4	6	8	4	12
CG maintained	6	2	8	6	2	8
<i>Current sense</i>						
CG established	1	0	1	0	0	0
CG maintained	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total # of instances	13	7	20	17	11	28

As seen in Table 6, emergent common ground is established and maintained by NESTs and NNESTs within *shared sense* to a large extent, while there is only one instance of *current sense* activated by an NEST. Out of 20 conversations, *shared sense* is established in six instances of common ground and maintained in eight instances by NESTs. On the contrary, NNESTs establish more common ground in *shared sense* with 12 instances, and maintain common ground in eight instances

out of 28 conversations in total. Excerpts 3 and 4 discuss the ways NESTs and NNESTs establish emergent common ground with their students.

In Excerpt 3, Joanne, an NEST, gives a presentation about the customs and wedding traditions of her own country, South Africa. Then, she asks students to make comparisons between South Africa, Turkey, and another country of their choice. The following conversation takes place when she asks students to present their comparisons to the whole class.

- 415 T: Last pair?
 S: India.
 T: Different? Similar?
 S: Similar, same time different, because again about wedding. In Indian, girl's family pay the bride prize to the boy's family. But in Turkey, opposite.
- 420 T: Yes, ok.
 S: South Africa, pay?
 T: It's the same as Turkey. The man pays for the woman.
 S: Yes, but not money.
 T: Yes. Cows.
- 425 S: Cows, yes.
 T: And it's an old tradition. It's now money as well. Or a car, or a house or something.

In this conversation, common ground emerges from Joanne and her students' previous experiences related to wedding traditions. Although this excerpt is about cultural similarities and differences, the common ground in this conversation does not come from interlocutors' previous experiences in that community per se but is rather emerged within the classroom discussion, as part of their *shared sense*.

Excerpt 4 below presents a speaking lesson during the fifth week of the course, when Mine, an NNEST, asks students to answer a series of questions as a whole class activity. The following conversation takes place after a student responds to the question "What would you do if you won the lottery?"

- 965 S1: When she will go Africa?
 S2: When she will go? I don't know. I just want so much. And I believe, one day (0.2) I want to (0.2) going kurum? {organization}
 T: What kurum? {What organization?}
 S2: Hocam, organizasyon. {Teacher, organization.}
- 970 T: Voluntary organization.
 S2: For example, I write a book and I want to buy and this money,
 T: =With this money you'll go abroad, you will go to Africa.

- S2: Yes.
 T: So what will be the content of the book? What are you going to write about?
 975 S2: My talent is,
 T: Being a student, how to be a [name of the university] student.
 S2: (laughs) yes.
 T: The difficulties of being a [name of the university] student.

In this conversation, through the lines of 975–978, emergent common ground related to *shared sense* is maintained with Mine and her student's references to their shared experiences in this particular higher education institution.

Finding 3. In regards to emergent common ground, both NESTs and NNESTs establish new common ground and maintain already existing common ground in *shared sense* (i.e., shared personal experiences). In their conversations with students, both NESTs and NNESTs share personal information about themselves and learn more about their students in order to build common ground while also referring to their previous encounters with the students to activate common ground. However, the similarities and differences between NESTs and NNESTs should be treated with caution since emergent common ground is perceived to be more participant-oriented and context-dependent (Kecskes and Zhang 2009). Additionally, the instances for *current sense* seem to be very limited in the data as *current sense* is not quite observable as a discursive act in its nature. *Current sense* derives from the interlocutors' perception and evaluation of the current situation, and participants within the same conversation may perceive the same speech event differently (Kecskes and Zhang 2009). Therefore, the teachers' and the students' perceptions of *current sense* may not be observed through classroom observations but require the use of stimulated-recall interviews.

4.3 Positioning through common ground building/maintaining acts in EFL classrooms

Table 7 presents the frequencies of the positionings adopted by NESTs and NNESTs within common ground building/maintaining acts.

As seen in Table 7, there are very few instances where *interactive* positioning occurs between the teachers and the students (only three instances by the students where NESTs are positioned as outsiders, while no instances for NNESTs). In the vast majority of the instances where common ground is shared, NESTs and NNESTs

Table 7: Frequencies for NESTs' and NNESTs' positioning.

	NESTs			NNESTs		
	Week 1	Week 5	Total	Week 1	Week 5	Total
<i>Interactive</i>						
Insider	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outsider	3	0	3	0	0	0
<i>Reflexive</i>						
Insider	0	0	0	13	7	20
Outsider	7	2	9	2	1	3
Cultural mediator	6	0	6	2	0	2
Outsider to insider	4	2	6	0	0	0
Source of information	0	2	2	9	5	14
Other	0	0	0	2	2	4
Total # of instances	13	7	20	17	11	28

position themselves *reflexively* in their conversations with the students. The most frequent position adopted by NESTs is an “outsider,” with nine instances out of 20 conversations in total. The second most common positions are “cultural mediator” and “as someone trying to become an insider” with six instances each. As for NNESTs, the analysis presents two most common positions: an “insider,” and a “source of information,” (in 20 and 14 excerpts out of 28 conversations, respectively). In the following section, excerpts from the data will be provided to illustrate the results, and findings regarding NESTs' and NNESTs' positioning through instances of common ground will be discussed.

In Excerpt 5, the conversation takes place between Paul, an NEST, and his students about free time activities.

- 300 T: We were talking about how people in Turkey spend their time. Go to cinemas,
 S1: =Watching TV
 T: =Go to cinema, watch TV, what else?
 S2: Watch TV
 T: A lot of watching TV. What else?
 305 S3: Smoke
 T: Arda said smoking. Yeah, it's kinda like a free time activity. What other free time activities are there in Turkey?
 S2: Connecting to social media.
 T: Looking at social media? Yeah, what else is there?

- 310 S1: Neydi, go to fasıl. Do you know fasıl? Nasıl denir ki? Do you know raki?
Raki?
- T: Drinking? Yeah, that happens everywhere. What are some free time activities in Turkey? What are some other ones?
- S1: Saying,
- T: Same? Same in every country?
- 315 S1: People, Turkish people says, aaa, siyaset yapmak, politic, and,
T: Talking about politics?
S1: Yes.
T: That's every, most countries.
S2: But Turkish people more, more than,
- 320 T: =Turkish people are talking about politics more than people in other countries?
Maybe, I don't know.

Between lines 302 through 311, Paul asks questions to activate students' schemata in relation to free time activities in Turkey. By repeating his students' responses in lines 302, 304, and recasting them in 309, Paul establishes common ground in *culture sense* about the leisurely activities in Turkey. In line 310, one of the students asks whether Paul knows about "fasıl," which is a traditional night out in Turkey. Paul makes an attempt to show familiarity with this past-time activity in Turkey in line 311 by saying "Drinking?" in response to students' question "Do you know raki?" However, he does not elaborate much on "fasıl" which seems to be unfamiliar to him. Similarly, in lines 316 and 320, Paul prefers not to elaborate on the topic of 'talking about politics' and says "I don't know." Paul's detachment of himself from the local political issues and cultural practices indicates how he *reflexively* positions himself as an outsider in a foreign country.

In Excerpt 6, Ursula positions herself as a cultural mediator in a speaking activity where she provides students with a list of behaviors that might be polite or rude in different cultures. She tells them "1" means "OK," "2" means "rude" and "3" means "very rude," and asks them to match each behavior with a number.

- 1 T: OK. Should we go over it? Tell me one, two, or three. Hmmm. Blowing your nose? (0.3) In class? Yes?
- S1: [Two]
- S2: [Two]
- 5 S3: [Rude]
- S4: [Three]
- T: Three?↑ Very rude?
- S5: Two.
- T: Two?

- 10 S2: Because if you're sick, (inaudible)
 T: There might be, umm, a cultural difference here. In Saudi Arabia [asking a Saudi student]?
 S1: Two
 T: In America?
 S3: Two?
 15 T: One.
 S3: Oh, ok.
 T: It's ok. Yeah. I didn't, I didn't know last year, Last year students say, teacher, teacher, can I go to the bathroom? Ok? ↑ In my mind, just blow here. It's fine. Just do it here. Because in America, in class, if you're sick, (0.3) blowing your nose is not rude. It's like (coughs) the same.
 20

In this excerpt, Ursula establishes core common ground within *culture sense* since there is a lack of mutual understanding about politeness in Turkish and American culture. Between the lines 3 and 6, students state that it is rude to blow their nose in the class, and then in line 6, one of the students says it is very rude. In the following line, the teacher expresses her surprise by repeating the students utterance “Three” with a rising intonation and emphasizes “very” when she asks “Very rude?” – signaling that her opinion may be different from the students. In line 13, the teacher asks the students to guess whether it is rude in her home country. One of the students makes a guess by saying “Two?” with a rising intonation, and Ursula gives away the answer in line 15. In line 16, the use of a change of state token “Oh, ok” (Heritage 1984) by a student shows that common ground is established in the conversation. In this conversation, Ursula *reflexively* positions herself as a cultural mediator by raising students’ awareness of the politeness rules in these two countries.

In Excerpt 7 below, Ursula this time positions herself as ‘someone trying to become an insider.’ In the same speaking lesson about politeness rules in different cultures, students ask Ursula whether crossing one’s legs while sitting is considered rude or not.

- 50 S1: Ursula, in America, rude? (crossing legs)
 T: [Yes? Wait, crossing (0.2) wait (bringing a chair and sitting to cross her legs) This?
 S1: Yes.
 T: No? ↑ Is it rude here?
 S2: Yep.
 55 S3: Yeah.
 T: Is it?

- S1: Turkish people,
 T: You're doing it!
 S1: Yeah, family, I mean (0.2) traditional behavior rude
 60 T: Traditionally it's rude? You're doing it, you're doing it, you're doing it
 (pointing to students)
 S2: But we don't agree.
 T: Oh, really? Why?
 S2: In family yani, together,
 65 S3: My father and I are sitting, no problem. But some families, traditional,
 when his father came to living room and he up
 T: =Stands up?
 S3: Yeah.
 T: Wo:w. In your family?
 70 S2: No.
 T: Anyone's family?↑
 S3: Yeah.
 T: Really? Your father comes in and you say hello father (standing up)
 S3: [Yeah
 T: Really? ↑ I'm surprised!
 75 S3: It's a traditional rule.
 T: Aha. It shows respect. Maybe when I come into the classroom, all the
 students stand up, (inaudible)
 S3: Tomorrow? (laughing)
 80 T: Tomorrow? I like this. (laughing) Everyone can stand, "hi Ursula",
 honestly, I feel like this is, (sitting and crossing her legs) in America,
 this is slightly more polite (sitting legs wide open) than this, definitely
 than this (sitting laid back). For women, this (crossing legs) is more
 polite.
 S3: I do this, in my old class, in high school, my teacher tells me, it's not a
 coffee.
 T: (laughs) Really?
 S3: Yeah, really.
 85 T: Ok, well then, this is not a café. Same rules, same rules here. Ok, I
 should be careful. If I go to a Turkish house, I don't know them, I won't
 do it. Thank you, for teaching me that.
 90

From Ursula's reactions in lines 52, 55, 57, 59, and 62, it is apparent that there is a lack of core common ground within *culture sense* as she seems surprised to hear about this cultural norm. In lines 58, 64, and 65, students explain that traditionally

it is rude to sit with your legs crossed in the presence of an older or more respected person. In line 76, Ursula's comment "Aha. It shows respect" indicates that she has understood this cultural norm and that common ground is emerged. In this excerpt, the establishment of core common ground enables the teacher and the students to *interactively* position the NEST as someone who is trying to become an insider, which can be evidenced in lines 87 and 88. In fact, in lines 76 and 79, she embraces the newly established common ground by jokingly telling students that they should all stand up when she comes into class. Moreover, in lines 86 to 88, she thanks her students for informing her about this cultural norm and expresses her willingness to follow it, indicating her reflexive positioning as someone who is trying to fit in the local culture. This excerpt in that sense illustrates the bi-directional influence of language socialization practices, and the complexity of novice-expert relationship.

Excerpt 8 presents the most common positioning adopted by NNESTs, which is "an insider." The following conversation takes place about the word 'karaoke.' In the pre-listening stage of the lesson, Buket elicits the meanings of some vocabulary items.

- 812 T: Can you explain karaoke? What is karaoke?
 S1: You can see on the screen, ee, layrics,
 T: Lyrics
- 815 S1: Lyrics, and this song's melody is hearing, and
 T: And?
 S1: Uuh the same time.
 T: You try to sing at the same time. Yes. Ok. So is it popular in Turkey?
 S1: No.
- 820 T: Not that much I think. Is there any karaoke bar in Turkey? Or in Ankara?
 S2: [the name of a local bar]
 T: Is there a karaoke thing?
 S2: Organize ediyor. {They organize it there.}
 T: Hmm ok. Any other? Or have you ever been to a karaoke night for example?
- 825 S1: Hocam şeydeydi. In Fethiye, English and Irish people bar. {It was in Fethiye}
 T: Yes, it is very popular for English and Irish people.
 S1: They are, says old rock musics.
- 830 T: Rock music I know. Have you ever been to Didim? Didim? So in Didim, it's very popular because lots of English people live in Didim. And

there are lots of karaoke bars for example. At night they go and they sing. They shout. Ok?

In this conversation, Buket maintains core common ground within *culture sense* by commenting on the popularity of karaoke in Turkey and more particularly of karaoke bars in resort towns such as Fethiye and Didim. In these instances, she *reflexively* positions herself as an insider by drawing from their mutual knowledge regarding the social activities and norms in Turkey.

Excerpt 9 exemplifies the second most common positioning by NNESTs, which is “a source of information.” In this excerpt, Ayfer establishes common ground with her students to teach vocabulary by discussing the Turkish law “#657” to teach the collocation “work for the government.”

- 435 T: Who gives me my money?
 S1: Your, [the name of the university].
- 440 T: Ok, [the name of the university]. Ok? When we are talking about your boss, you need to use this preposition. I work in [the name of the university], it's ok, and I work in a school, in a university. But my boss, my big boss, [the name of the university]. They give me my money. Alright? When you want to talk about, the boss, owner, or manager, we use 'for'. Work for bla bla.
 S1: Birisi için çalışmak. {To work with someone}
 T: Sorry?
 S1: Orası için çalışmak. {To work for that place}
- 445 T: Yes, like your boss. Who gives you your money. You can work for a small company, or big company, or, 657? What is it? 657'ye tabi. {Be subject to 657}
 S2: 657'ye tabi ne ya? {What does being subject to 657 mean?}
 T: Tabi? Hiç mi duymadınız hayatınızda ya? {Have you never heard about it?} S2: (inaudible) mi yok anlamında yani? {Does it mean no (inaudible)?}
- 450 T: A aa. 657'ye tabi olmak. {To be subject to 657.}
 S3: Bağlı mı? {Dependent on?}
 S4: Kamu işte. {It means public services.}
 T: OK, kanun 657. No? {Ok, Law 657. No?}
 S2: No.
- 455 T: Memur, memur [civil servant]. You take the exam, KPSS, ok, you pass it, and you start,
 S1: 657?

- T: Yes. The law is called 657. That's the number of the law. And this is not a company. You work for the government. Ok? The government?
- S2: Hükümet için. Hükümet değil mi? {For the government, right?}
- 460 T: Yes. So, you don't get money from a company, the government pays you money. Ok? Teachers, teachers in state schools, not at [the name of the university], teachers in normal schools, ok? Or doctors, doctors at community hospital. They work for the government. Ok?

In this conversation, Ayfer sets up the conversational context between the lines 431–437 by maintaining emergent common ground within *shared sense* about her work conditions. Then in line 442, she tries to elicit the collocation “work for the government” by drawing from the Turkish law # 657, which she takes for granted as core common ground. However, she struggles to elaborate on this law since the students seem to lack the necessary information, as seen in lines 443, 445, and 447, except for Student 4 in line 448. In lines 451 to 459, she establishes common ground by explaining what #657 is all about and *reflexively* positions herself as “a source of information.”

Finding 4. In their acts of building/maintaining common ground with the students, the most frequent positions adopted by NESTs are “outsider,” “cultural mediator,” and “someone trying to become an insider.” By positioning themselves as “outsiders,” NESTs underline the differences between the students’ and their own culture, while in other instances, they often try to teach as well as learn about cultural norms as “cultural mediators” and as “someone trying to become an insider.” On the other hand, NNESTs most frequently position themselves as “insiders” and as “a source of information” by activating the existing shared knowledge between themselves and their students for instructional purposes.

5 Discussion: L2 socialization through common ground and positioning

This study has revealed several idiosyncratic features of L2 socialization in EFL classrooms. These socialization practices, which are operationalized as common ground and positioning in this study, will be discussed in relation to how intercultural and intracultural communication unfolds in EFL classrooms.

As mentioned earlier, interlocutors in intercultural communication may need to seek and establish new common ground rather than activating their previously existing shared knowledge (Kecskes 2014), since the core common ground shared

between participants might be limited compared to the one in intracultural encounters (Gumperz 1982; Scollon and Scollon 2001; Tannen 2005). As discussed in Finding 1, NESTs engaged in common ground building acts mostly in *culture sense* in order to compensate for their lack of cultural knowledge, norms, beliefs, and values. To overcome any potential misunderstandings, NESTs established common ground with their students by raising their awareness of cultural differences, teaching them about their own culture, and/or learning about the local culture themselves. In doing so, they often positioned themselves as outsiders in a foreign country by emphasizing the differences between themselves and their students in terms of their cultural backgrounds (see Finding 4). NESTs also took on the roles of a cultural mediator and as someone trying to become an insider during the interactions in which they shared information regarding different cultural norms. NESTs' positionings differed from NNESTs in the sense that they detached themselves from the local community by drawing from the cultural differences rather than existing similarities.

NESTs' language socialization practices where they did share core common ground were also different from NNESTs in relation to *formal sense*, which is reported in Finding 2. NESTs and their students carried out their conversations in English to a great extent even when there was no shared knowledge, or when students had difficulties in expressing themselves in English. Yet, their meaning and fluency oriented conversations enabled "mutual transformation of knowledge and communicative behavior" (Kecskes 2015: 184), and maximized opportunities for real life communication in the language classroom (Seedhouse 2004). This difference-driven, cultural mediator approach to common ground enabled NESTs to create authentic contexts for language socialization through which students not only learned the target language but also the culture (e.g., Ochs 1986; Timpe-Laughlin and Dombi 2020; Watson-Gegeo 2004).

According to Kecskes and Zhang (2009), common ground is a significant aspect of communication since having a large amount of shared knowledge between interlocutors makes it easier for them to communicate effectively. Therefore, common ground might play a more efficient role in intracultural communication where interlocutors share a large amount of mutual knowledge. As shown in Finding 2, NNESTs who taught in their home country to a group of students with the same L1 seemed to share a larger amount of mutual knowledge with their students compared to their NEST partners. They also maintained core common ground in relation to *culture sense* by referring to different aspects of the Turkish culture, a finding confirming that in intracultural communication "salience and common ground are governed by the (relatively) same culture" (Kecskes 2015: 189 and also Pang 2020). In addition to their shared cultural background, NNESTs made use of their shared native language with the students in their conversations.

While NNESTs usually avoided speaking in Turkish but maintained their conversations in English, they did use their students' L1 utterances to their advantage (McNeill 2005; Medgyes 1994), by gauging the extent to which they shared common ground with their students. In their teacher-student interactions, NNESTs positioned themselves as insiders, as indicated in Finding 5, by maintaining core common ground in *culture sense* and by making use of their shared native language. Through their positioning as an insider in the local community, they emphasized the commonalities in their cultural background (e.g., Moussu and Lurda 2008). NNESTs also positioned themselves as a source of information: In their social interactions with students, they usually maintained core common ground by giving examples from the local culture to teach grammar or vocabulary. Therefore, their common ground building/maintaining acts often aimed at facilitating classroom instruction rather than focusing on meaning and fluency. To conclude, NNESTs' socialization moves seem to be dependent on the linguistic and cultural commonalities that they share with their students. This commonality-driven, insider approach enabled NNESTs' to have 'transmission-of knowledge-oriented' intracultural interactions with their students (Kecskes 2015), in which the emphasis was on accomplishing a pedagogical goal rather than socialization. In terms of positioning, the roles that NNESTs took on as insiders in the local community may affect their rapport building positively and help them create a positive classroom atmosphere in the classroom.

6 Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the nature of L2 socialization practices, namely common ground building acts and positioning, in an EFL setting through the observation of six NEST and NNEST participants. According to the findings, the intercultural experiences NESTs generated in the classroom provided affordances for language socialization through which the students not only practiced the target language but also negotiated cultural meanings. On the other hand, NNESTs, in their intracultural communication with the students, activated the common knowledge they shared with their students to facilitate classroom instruction. Since L2 socialization is based on the availability of communicative contexts, the variety of communicative activities, and the positioning of novices in participant roles during interactions (Ochs and Schieffelin 2011), intercultural communication may seem to be more conducive for language socialization with its emphasis on the negotiation of meaning, activation of common ground, and the bi-directional influence between the teacher and the learners. On the other hand, intracultural communication seems to provide different affordances for classroom instruction,

with NNESTs' positioning themselves as an insider and a source of information in order to address a pedagogical goal rather than socializing language learners into the target language and culture.

Interestingly, the data analysis revealed only a few instances of *common sense* coming from both NESTs and NNESTs' data and one instance of establishing *current sense*, by an NEST. Kecskes and Zhang (2009: 348) explain current sense as the "emergent perception of the current situation." Therefore, for current sense to be established or maintained in a language classroom, both interlocutors (teachers and students in this case) need to be involved in the same situation but perceive it in different ways and then reach a current sense. The lack of *current sense* then may imply the confined nature of classroom contexts and lack of unprecedented events that might lead to different understandings or perceptions. As far as the *common sense* is concerned, the results might imply that language classrooms, regardless of the type of communication, do not engage language learners in world knowledge nor the discussion of current events and issues that they can discuss and build upon. This finding seems a bit troubling since the field of language education has long moved onto content-based instruction, as a result of which, the integration of world knowledge and social justice issues has gained prominence (Cammarata 2016; Ennser-Kananen 2016; Hastings and Jacob 2016; Hawkins 2011).

These findings should be considered in relation to several limitations involved in the study design. First, this study was based mainly on classroom observations with some insights gained from field notes and researcher journal. Future research should consider video-recording the classroom observations and sharing these videos with the teachers and the students. Conducting this kind of stimulated-recall interviews or member checking with the participants after the observations could shed light on their perceptions of these common ground building acts and reveal data in relation to *current sense*. Secondly, this study was conducted at an intensive English language program in an EFL setting. Future research can focus on ESL contexts where there is additional variety in terms of cultural backgrounds and native languages. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) settings can also be explored in terms of the teachers' and students' language socialization practices since the lack of shared L1 and cultural backgrounds in ELF contexts pose additional challenges for building/maintaining common ground among ELF speakers (Kecskes 2015; Kecskes and Zhang 2009).

References

- Atkinson, J. Maxwell & John Heritage. 2006. Jefferson's transcript notation. In Adam Jaworski & Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *The discourse reader*, 158–165. Great Britain: Routledge.
- Cammarata, Laurent (ed.). 2016. *Content-based foreign language teaching: Curriculum and pedagogy for developing advanced thinking and literacy skills*. New York: Routledge.
- Clark, H. Herbert. 1996. *Common ground: Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Colston, Herbert L. 2008. A new look at common ground: Memory, egocentrism, and joint meaning. In Istvan Kecskes & Jacob Mey (eds.), *Intention, common ground and the egocentric speaker-hearer*, 151–187. Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Davies, Bronwyn & Rom Harré. 1990. Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20(1). 43–63.
- Dörnyei, Zoltan. 2007. *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duff, Patricia A. 2012. Second language socialization. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The handbook of language socialization*, 1st edn. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Duff, Patricia A. & Steven Talmy. 2011. Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition. In Dwight Atkinson (ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*, 95–116. New York: Routledge.
- Enfield, Nicholas J. 2008. Common ground as a resource for social affiliation. In Istvan Kecskes & Jacob Mey (eds.), *Intention, common ground and the egocentric speaker-hearer*. Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Enns-Kananen, Johanna. 2016. A pedagogy of pain: New directions for world language education. *The Modern Language Journal* 100. 556–564.
- Goffman, Erving. 1979. Footing. *Semiotica* 25(1/2). 1–29.
- Gumperz, John. J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, Joan Kelly & Meghan Walsh. 2002. Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22. 186–203.
- Harré, Rom & Luk van Langenhove. 1999. Introducing positioning theory. In Rom Harré & Luk van Langenhove (eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*, 14–31. Great Britain: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Hastings, Christopher & Laura Jacob (eds.). 2016. *Social justice in English language teaching*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL Press.
- Hawkins, Margaret (ed.). 2011. *Social justice language teacher education*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Heritage, John. 1984. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, Rodney H. 2013. Positioning in the analysis of discourse and interaction. In Carol Chapelle (ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*, 1–6. West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kanagy, Ruth. 1999. Interactional routines as a mechanism for L2 acquisition and socialization in an immersion context. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31. 1467–1492.
- Kecskes, István. 2008. Dueling contexts: A dynamic model of meaning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40. 385–406.
- Kecskes, István. 2014. *Intercultural pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kecskes, István. 2015. Intracultural communication and intercultural communication: Are they different? *International Review of Pragmatics* 7. 171–194.

- Kecskes, Istvan. 2019. Impoverished pragmatics? The semantics-pragmatics interface from an intercultural perspective. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 16(5): 489–515.
- Kecskes, István & Fenghui Zhang. 2009. Activating, seeking, and creating common ground. A socio-cognitive approach. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 17(2). 331–355.
- Kramsch, Claire. 2002. Introduction. In Claire Kramsch (ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization*, 1–30. New York: Continuum.
- Leung, Santoi. 2001. Language socialization: Themes and advances in research. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics* 1(1). 1–18.
- Lewis, David. 1969. *Convention: A philosophical study*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Matsumura, Shoichi. 2001. Learning the rules for offering advice: A quantitative approach to second language socialization. *Language Learning* 51(4). 635–679.
- McCarthy, John. 1990. Formalization of two puzzles involving knowledge. In Vladimir Lifschitz (ed.), *Formalizing common sense: Papers by John McCarthy*, 158–166. Norwood NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- McNeill, Arthur. 2005. Non-native speaker teachers and awareness of lexical difficulty in pedagogical texts. In Enric Llurda (ed.), *Non-native language teachers: perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession*, 107–128. New York: Springer.
- Medgyes, Peter. 1994. *The non-native teacher*. London: Macmillan.
- Moussa, Lucie & Enric Llurda. 2008. Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching* 41(3). 315–348.
- Ochs, Elinor & Bambi Schieffelin. 2011. The theory of language socialization. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The handbook of language socialization*, 1–21. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1986. Introduction. In Bambi B. Schieffelin & Elinor Ochs (eds.), *Language socialization across cultures*, 1–13. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, Elinor. 2001. Socialization. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *Key terms in language and culture*, 227–230. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ortaçtepe, Deniz. 2012. *The development of conceptual socialization in international students: A language socialization perspective on conceptual fluency and social identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ortaçtepe, Deniz. 2014. Common ground for positioning: A discourse analysis on second language socialization. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education* 29(2). 160–174.
- Pang, Yang. 2020. The cognitive saliency of word associations of verbs of speech in English as a Lingua Franca interactions. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 17(4): 417–443.
- Ros i Solé, Cristina. 2007. Language learners' sociocultural positions in the L2: A narrative approach. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 7(3). 203–216.
- Rudolph, Nathanael, Ali Fuad Selvi & Bedrettin Yazan. 2015. Conceptualizing and confronting inequity: Approaches within and new directions for the “NNEST Movement”. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 12(1). 27–50.
- Sanal, Merve & Deniz Ortaçtepe. 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.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B. & Elinor Ochs. 1984. Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In Richard A. Shweder & Robert A LeVine (eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion*, 276–320. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B. & Elinor Ochs. (eds.). 1986. *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffer, Stephen. 1972. *Meaning*. U.K.: Oxford University Press.

- Scollon, Ron & Suzanne Scollon. 2001. *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, Paul. 2004. *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 1978. Assertion. In Peter Cole (ed.), *Syntax and semantics 9: Pragmatics*, 315–332. New York Academic Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2005. Interactional sociolinguistics as a resource for intercultural pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2(2). 205–208.
- Timpe-Laughlin, Veronica & Judit Dombi. 2020. Exploring L2 learners' request behavior in a multi-turn conversation with a fully automated agent. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 17(2): 221–257.
- Tsui, Amy. 2004. The space of learning. In Ference Marton & Amy B. M. Tsui (eds.), *Classroom discourse and the space of learning*, 3–40. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Vickers, Caroline. 2007. Second language socialization through team interaction among electrical and computer engineering students. *The Modern Language Journal* 91. 621–640.
- Watson-Gegeo, Karen Ann. 2004. Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal* 88(3). 331–350.
- Wortham, Stanton. 2000. Interactional positioning and narrative self-construction. *Narrative Inquiry* 10. 157–184.
- Wortham, Stanton. 2003. Accomplishing identity in participant-denoting discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 13. 1–2.

Bionotes

Deniz Ortaçtepe Hart

Middlebury Institute of International Studies, Monterey, CA, USA
 dortactepe@middlebury.edu

Deniz Ortaçtepe Hart is an Associate Professor in the MA TESOL/TFL program at Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey. Her research interests are language socialization, intercultural pragmatics, sociolinguistics and social justice language teaching. She has published in *Language Teaching*, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *Journal of Language Identity and Education*, *System*, and *Language and Intercultural Communication*. She is currently working on her book *Social justice and the language classroom: A resource book for action and transformation*, under contract with Edinburgh University Press.

Seçil Okkali

Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey
 secilo@metu.edu.tr

Seçil Okkali holds a Master's degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language from Bilkent University. She has also completed CELTA, ICALT, and DELTA programs offered by the University of Cambridge. She has been teaching English since 2011 and her research interests lie in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis.