



Common Ground for Positioning: A discourse Analysis on Second Language Socialization

Konulandırma Amaçlı Ortak Zemin Oluşturulması: Amerika'da Yaşayan Türk Öğrencilerin Dil Sosyalleşmesi

Deniz ORTAÇTEPE¹

ABSTRACT: Applying Kecskes and Zhang's (2009) dynamic model of common ground in positioning theory (Davies & Harre, 1990), the present study aims to explore the second language (L2) socialization of Turkish students through the discursive processes as well as the skills they adopted in social interactions with the American speakers during a formal reception at an American university. The findings indicated that the Turkish students endorsed similar discursive processes not only to establish common ground as the American speakers', but also to position themselves in the speech context. This study highlights that engaging in real-life conversations with the target language speakers (Gumperz, 1996) encourages L2 learners/users (Cook, 1999) to embrace the discursive practices that are shared within a particular speech community. It also provides suggestions for future research embracing more longitudinal/ethnographic approaches to examine L2 socialization as well as teaching implications for instructional materials and contexts that reflect authentic social encounters.

Keywords: Second language socialization, common ground, positioning, discourse analysis

ÖZ: Bu çalışma, Kecskes ve Zhang'ın (2009) ortak zemin dinamik modelini, konulandırma teorisiyle (Davies ve Harre, 1990) bağdaştırarak, Amerika'da okuyan Türk öğrencilerin ikinci dil sosyalleşmeleri üzerine ışık tutmayı hedeflemektedir. Bu amaçtan yola çıkarak, çalışma Amerika'da bir üniversitede düzenlenen 23 Nisan Ulusal Egemenlik ve Çocuk Bayramı resepsiyona katılan Türk öğrencilerin diğer Amerikalı konuşmacılarla aralarındaki söylemleri analiz etmektedir. Çalışmanın bulguları, Türk öğrencilerle Amerikan öğrencilerin ortak zemin oluşturmak ve birbirlerini konulandırmak için benzer strateji ve becerileri kullandıklarını ortaya koymuştur. Bu çalışma, ikinci/yabancı dil öğrenen/kullanan (Cook, 1999) kişilerin hedef dildeki söylemsel uygulamaları benimsemeleri konusunda desteklenmesi gerektiğini vurgulamaktadır. Çalışma ayrıca, ikinci/yabancı dil sosyalleşmesi üzerinde yapılacak uzun süreli etnografik çalışmaların ve hedef dilde yer alan gerçek sosyal etkileşimi yansıtacak öğretim tekniklerinin gerekliliğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: ikinci dil sosyalleşmesi, ortak zemin, konulandırma, söylem analizi

INTRODUCTION

The framework of language socialization premises that linguistic and cultural knowledge co-construct each other (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), that is, language learning and enculturation are two sides of the same coin (Watson-Gegeo, 2004). It is though language socialization that novices acquire the linguistic norms and the social values *through the use of language* (i.e., linguistic development) and also *to use the language* (i.e., social development) (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Language socialization has also been applied to second language (L2) research through studies examining the acquisition of pragmatic units (Kanagy, 1999; Matsumura, 2000; Ohta, 1999; Ortaçtepe, 2013a), the use of available linguistic resources in bilingual/multilingual communities (Bayley & Schecter, 2003), and the negotiation of identities (Ortaçtepe, 2013b). Of particular interest in relation to language socialization is the term *community of practice*, a framework proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991) to understand how learning occurs through participation in social contexts. With its emphasis on novice-expert relationship, this framework sheds light on the "the development of norms of interaction within dynamic groups, involving either enculturation or acculturation and sometimes lengthy periods of apprenticeship" (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 17).

¹ Assistant Professor, MA TEFL Program, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey, deniz.ortactepe@bilkent.edu.tr

Drawing from these two frameworks that underline the influence of social context on the dynamic interplay between interlocutors (i.e., novice/expert, nonnative/native speaker), the present study aims to examine the social interaction between Turkish and American speakers of English. The significance of this study is twofold. First, with the help of a discourse analytic approach, this study aims to explore the language socialization processes of international students in the United States by analyzing the discursive strategies they adopt in on-going conversations with American speakers. More specifically, this study examines the ways Turkish and American speakers of English established common ground and in what ways these attempts to establish common ground enabled them to position themselves vis-à-vis each other as well as with respect to the speech context. Second, while addressing the above-mentioned purpose, this study does *not* aim to draw conclusions about the interlanguage of the Turkish speakers or to make comparisons with respect to an ideal native speaker (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Cook, 1999). Rather, language learners are examined as individuals at the center of intersecting relationships in the target language culture to discover the discursive strategies as well as skills they adapt in their interactions with target language speakers.

1.LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Ochs and Schiefflin (2012), “Language socialization research apprehends the role of nurture in children’s emergent communication through systematic analysis of locally preferred and socially situated forms of participation, acts, and activities and their broader relation to social positionings, institutions, belief and knowledge systems, and aesthetic judgments” (p. 10). In that sense, L2 learning is also a process of socialization through which L2 learners/users come to know how to participate in forms of talk within a speech community (Goffman, 1981). L2 learners/users need to be socialized to take part in various discourse processes (i.e., meaning making) as well as to use conversational moves that display unique characteristics in distinctive speech communities (Vickers, 2007). These discursive strategies and skills employed in a social interaction within a speech community serve two functions; 1) to convey denotational, referential meaning as well as interactional messages, and 2) to reveal social identities of interlocutors (Wortham, 2003). Therefore, this study analyzes a corpus of conversations between Turkish and American speakers in terms of the use of these two functions which require specific operationalizations to look into the processes of conveying denotational meaning (e.g., extra-linguistic, situational meaning) and revealing social identities (e.g., expressing their roles and responsibilities). This study argues that establishing common ground is a requirement for conveying denotational meaning; and when interlocutors establish common ground, they also reveal their positions vis-à-vis each other as well as with respect to the speech context (Colston, 2008). For this reason, the literature review will comprise two conceptual/analytical frameworks: Kecskes and Zhang’s (2009) dynamic model of common ground and Davies and Harre’s (1998) positioning theory.

1.1. Common ground

Common ground, the information shared and drawn upon by people during a social interaction, has been referred by a plethora of terms such as mutual knowledge, common knowledge, presupposition, shared beliefs, etc., depending on the scholar’s current state of interest (Lee, 2001). Current pragmatic theories, which have its roots in socio-cultural, interactional as well as cognitive-philosophical line of research (Kecskes & Mey, 2008), consider cooperation and common ground as requirements for successful communication (Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). Within the socio-cultural framework which relies on recipient design and intention recognition are Clark’s contribution theory (1996) and Clark and Brennan’s joint action model (1991), both of which perceive communication as transfer between minds (Kecskes & Zhang, 2009; Kecskes & Mey, 2008). In this intention-directed practice approach, communication is a joint activity that expands the common ground of the participants through the inclusion of new

information (Renkema, 2004). Nevertheless, the problem with the socio-cultural framework is that it perceives common ground as “an *a priori* mental state of interlocutors that facilitates cooperation and successful communication” (Kecskes & Zhang, 2009, p. 334).

On the other hand, the cognitive view of common ground emphasizes egocentrism instead of cooperation, thus proposes an emergent common ground in mental processing of communication (Kecskes & Zhang, 2009). The violation of mutual knowledge is a characteristic of egocentrism in social interactions since interlocutors prefer to draw from their own knowledge instead of mutual knowledge. Giora’s (2003) graded salience hypothesis, an example for this cognitive model, illustrates that salience is more important in the use of language. Hence, the cognitive model challenges the cooperation principle as well as the view of communication-as-transfer by perceiving communication as a non-summative, emergent interactional achievement (Arundale, 2008) through a trial-and-error process that emerges from social interaction (Kecskes & Zhang, 2009).

Kecskes and Mey (2008) argue that neither the cognitive nor the socio-cultural approach is wholly convincing by itself since common ground includes “both *a priori* and *post factum* elements” (p. 4). For this reason, Kecskes and Zhang (2009) blend these two approaches into a dialectical perspective of common ground which embraces both cooperation and egocentrism. In this socio-cultural approach of common ground, the *a priori* mental state and *post facto* emergence for common ground blend into a new scheme of background knowledge through which interlocutors negotiate meaning. This dynamic model of common ground consists of two components: 1) the core common ground, shared knowledge or prior experience; and, 2) emergent common ground, individual knowledge of prior and/or current experience that is relevant to the present context. While the core common ground is what individuals bring to the conversation as part of their shared knowledge or experiences, the emergent common ground develops in the immediate discourse as a result of interlocutors’ sharing information with each other (Smith, 2003). In this respect, the dynamic model of common ground refers to “the convergence of the mental representation of shared knowledge that we activate, shared knowledge that we seek, and rapport as well as knowledge that we create in the communicative process” (Kecskes & Zhang, 2009, p.334).

When a new proposition is introduced to the ongoing discourse, it is first assessed then accepted and integrated into the common ground, a process resulting in updated discourse (Smith, 2003). Even with the core common ground, it is important for the interlocutors to agree on the common ground so that they can negotiate meaning. Hence, common ground in a conversation allows interlocutors “to cut costs of speech production by leaving much to be inferred by the listener” (Enfield, 2008, p. 225). In this respect, this study perceives the process of establishing common ground and its acceptance by the other parties as indicators of language socialization since both processes are required for inviting and deriving pragmatic meaning involved in social interactions.

1.2. Positioning

While common ground provides interlocutors with a base to convey denotational meaning through which they achieve successful communication, any conversation that involves exchange of information also leads to a social consequence especially in terms of social and interpersonal affiliation (Enfield, 2008). This second function of any social interaction reflects itself in many ways including alignments or positioning.

Goffman (1979) describes alignment as the position an interlocutor takes up in a social situation. Moving one step further, Tannen (1999) defines alignment as, “how ways of speaking demonstrate and create the context and the relationships among speakers” (p. 224). According to Tannen (1999), alignment, as a form of framing, is directly related Davies and Harre’s (1990)

positioning theory which perceives positioning as a discursive practice through which each participant positions the other, positions him/herself while also being positioned. Therefore, while interlocutors engage in a conversation through which they convey interactional meaning, they also negotiate identities (Wortham, 2000) and position themselves vis-à-vis each other, the communicative activities they are involved in and the wider world (Robert, 1998).

It is also argued that interlocutors tend to re-construct themselves when they tell a story (Georgakopoulou, 2007; Wortham, 2000; Wortham & Gadsden, 2006). In this respect, there are four layers of positioning that a narrator can take on by telling an autobiographical story (Wortham & Gadsden, 2006). First, narrators position themselves as persons having gone through the narrated events that took place in the past. Second, while telling the story, narrators also position and/or voice the people as well as themselves as the characters in the story. Third, the narrator might take a position vis-à-vis the characters in the story. Last, narrators also interactionally position themselves with respect to the co-present interlocutors, who are the listeners of the story. Wortham and Gadsden (2006) employed these four layers of narrative positioning to examine autobiographical narratives coming from individual interviews which display different characteristics than embedded narratives in an ongoing conversation. The extent to which a story is a part of the ongoing conversation determines its place on a continuum of detached to embedded (Ochs, 2004b). While detached narratives can be unrelated to the topic/theme of the ongoing conversation or interrupt the ongoing social activity, embedded narratives appear to be a part of the ongoing conversation by relating events to the current social situation (Ochs, 2004b). While narratives provide sites of socialization (Ochs, 2004b), it is through narratives again that people position themselves in relation to others. As research on language socialization explores “the social and communicative positionings of children and other novices in different activity settings and the affordances of such positionings for situational and cultural competence” (Ochs & Schiefflin, 2012, p. 6), this study focuses on the way Turkish and American speakers of English position themselves in their conversations to shed light on the Turkish students’ socialization processes.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Aim of the study

Adopting a language socialization approach, this study examines the ways Turkish and American speakers of English established common ground and in what ways these attempts to establish common ground enabled them to position themselves vis-à-vis each other as well as the speech context. The overarching research question is: *In what ways do Turkish and American speakers of English establish common ground as a resource to position themselves vis-à-vis other interlocutors as well as the speech context?*

2.2. Data collection

The data came from a social event that required spontaneous English as a second language communication. The reception was organized to celebrate Turkey’s National Day (April 23rd, 08) by the Turkish Student Association at a large university in the United States. Since one of the purposes of this event was to introduce the Turkish culture to the American students on campus, the whole event was recorded by the organizers. All the attendees were informed about the recordings. The researcher, who was one of the attendees of this event, first received the recordings with the permission of the organizers then e-mailed the interlocutors in the videos for informed consent. All the names presented in this study are pseudonyms used to protect the identities of the interlocutors. While sharing the same linguistic and cultural background enabled the researcher to easily access the data and the interlocutors, the researcher adopted an emic (participant-relevant) perspective throughout the data analysis to give voice to only the findings that emerged from the data (e.g., Dings, 2012).

2.3. Data analysis

The transcription of the recorded conversations² resulted in a total of 1707 word database out of 13 conversations occurred between Turkish and American speakers of English. The two transcripts that will be discussed in this paper were selected from the corpus as a result of an initial inductive analysis. The first transcript was selected because of its features of common ground and cooperation. The second transcript was chosen for the way it embeds narratives not only to achieve several goals in the conversation but also to position the interlocutors vis-à-vis each other.

This study's unit of analysis is people-in-action (Scollon & Scollon, 2001); that is, it is not the Turkish students only but their interaction with American speakers. The rationale behind this unit of analysis is twofold. First, language socialization is a circular process which not only requires but also supports *L2 learners' users'* (Cook, 1999) social interaction with target language speakers. It is this social activity between a more and less experienced person that facilitates participation in socially and culturally organized interactions (Ochs, 2004a). Second, adopting a discourse analytic approach entails exploring the discourse itself rather than focusing on individual behaviors since "[d]iscourse analysis is a reciprocal and cyclical process in which we shuttle back and forth between the structure (form, design) of language and the situated meanings it is attempting to build about the world, identities, and relationships in a specific context" (Gee, 2005, p. 118). More specifically, this study analyzed the way interlocutors used the language to build situations or tasks such as taking on an identity or a role (i.e., positioning) and establishing connections (i.e., common ground). Therefore, the analysis of these two conversations was twofold. First, each conversation was examined with respect to Kecskes and Zhang's (2009) dynamic model of common ground. Second, Davies and Harre's (1990) positioning theory was adopted to explore how the emerged common ground enabled the interlocutors to position themselves vis-à-vis each other and the context. Since the second conversation included two embedded narratives, Gee's (2005) framework of narrative analysis was used to identify how the use of embedded narratives helped the interlocutors position themselves interactionally in an ongoing conversation.

3. FINDINGS

Conversation # 1

In the first conversation, Jen, who happens to be the director of the international student services (ISS) at the university, joins Dilek's table and starts a conversation with a question. Surprisingly, Jen turns out to be the person that Dilek has been trying to reach for a while.

Excerpt 1

- Line 49 Jen: Are you a permanent resident?
 Dilek: No no I am doing my PhD here.
 Jen: Ok what's your last name Dilek↑
 Dilek: mmm..XXXXXXXXX. It's lo:ng
 Jen: Spell- the beginning of it.
 Dilek: X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X
- Line 55 Jen: I'm – I'm the director of International student services so I must know your name
 Dilek: OK
 Jen: but
 Dilek: Are you ..?
- Line 60 Jen: I am Jen

² Jefferson's transcript notations (Atkinson & Heritage, 2006) were used for the transcriptions.

(unintelligible)
 Dilek: [OK, I tried to send you]
 Jen: [but it's just a little bit too long I couldn't

As seen in Excerpt 1, Jen shows interest in Dilek's cultural identity and questions her last name. In Line 53, Jen asks Dilek to spell her last name, which can be considered as an act of establishing emergent common ground because in Line 55 she reveals her identity as the director of international student services. This common ground also positions Jen as someone who is responsible for knowing the name of all international students including Dilek's since she says "I am the director of...so I must know your name." Must, a more marked form than need or should, refers to an obligatory in whatever is being mentioned (Leech, 2003). Jen, in Line 62, reconstructs her position as the director by elaborating on the excuse provided to her in Line 52. Thus, this excerpt presents two emergent common grounds: First, the fact that Jen is the director of the international student organization; second, their agreement on the fact that Dilek's last name is too long to remember. Both of these emergent common grounds enabled Jen and Dilek as persons who have business with each other: the director of the international student services and an international student, respectively.

Excerpt 2

Line 63 Dilek: OK..I am so happy to see you because I tried to send you an e-mail but I couldn't find your e-mail address on the web site =
 Line 65 Jen: =Oh Ok
 Dilek: and I sent just I mean like like two days ago, to ISS, but I don't think they- I mean forwarded to you because I never heard them back.
 Jen: Oh Ok I was hearing from about this all the time, is that what you were talking about?
 Line 70 Dilek: Yeah.
 Jen: OK
 Dilek: So I am teaching this writing class that's why I actually wrote to you,
 Jen: [Oh OK]
 Dilek: [to foreign-international students
 Line 75 Jen: I think I did receive that. Umm
 (4.0)
 Jen: I am trying to remember what kind of response you needed
 (1.0)
 Dilek: I'm-I am teaching during the sum[mer].
 Line 80 Jen: [in the summer yeah that's what you needed to forward it to the students and tell them know
 Dilek: yeah [yeah
 Jen: [Right, right we'll do that=
 Dilek: =and I am gonna be teaching in the fall, too. This is my third semester teaching this class= but I have only six students this semester because it was [not advertised.
 Jen: [ah it wasn't very well advertised for spring]
 Dilek: [yeah]
 Jen: I mean..emm..we can type in something in the orientation pack for the students and let them know=
 Line 91 Dilek: =Yeah, yeah yeah that'd be great

In Lines 63-67, Dilek explains the reason for how she knows Jen and why she is happy to come across with her that night. This is an act of establishing emergent common ground through which Dilek positions herself as someone who is trying to reach a person to get help from and Jen is positioned as the person who can help her. In Line 68, Jen confirms the common ground

established by Dilek; however, she does not further the conversation to provide the help Dilek needed. Therefore, in Line 72, Dilek provides more information about her e-mail to Jen. The cooperation provided by Jen through backchanneling (e.g., Oh OK) in Lines 65, 68, 71, 73 is interpreted by Dilek as a request for more information. However, in Line 75, Jen states “I think I did receive that.” This is the point where Dilek stops providing more information. The four-second break here is significant because it is Jen’s turn to provide the response Dilek was seeking. Yet, the break hints that Jen is having problems recalling the content of the e-mail. In Line 77, Jen admits that she is thinking what kind of response Dilek needed. This can be interpreted as a call for help in Jen’s part (a conversational implicature) but Dilek does not interpret this utterance as a pragmatic act instead she gives more time to Jen by relying on the literal meaning of the utterance. These two breaks can be interpreted as where the act of establishing common ground fails. While Dilek believes that she provided enough information since Jen admitted the receipt of the e-mail, Jen fails to provide the information she was looking for. After another second, Dilek jumps in and helps Jen out by providing more information to refresh her memory. After this last piece of information, Jen and Dilek managed to re-establish the common ground to further the conversation successfully. Dilek is teaching a graduate course for international students and she needs the director of the international student services to advertise the course to all international students. Although international students are the core common ground that Dilek and Jen both share, Dilek had to establish this common ground in her conversation with Jen since she could not remember Dilek’s e-mail to her. Therefore, this was an act of emergent common ground on Dilek’s part. In Lines 80 and 85, by repeating what Dilek says in an overlapping way, Jen shows that she remembers what Dilek wrote in her e-mail. This is the point where the emergent common ground was co-constructed by both interlocutors. By repeating the last words or sentences of Dilek, Jen shows that she remembers Dilek’s e-mail while at the same time provides the response Dilek needed from her.

In terms of the way the common ground enabled the participants to position themselves vis-à-vis each other, Dilek positions herself not as an international student as was in Excerpt 1, but as an instructor of a writing course for international students. She also positions Jen as a colleague who can help her to reach more international students to enroll in the course. Compared to the director-student positioning in Excerpt 1, then, the instructor-director positioning brings about different power dimensions to the conversation. The rest of the transcript also suggests how this shift in the positioning and the power dimensions shaped the conversation between Dilek and Jen.

Excerpt 3

- Line 96 Jen: and there is so much e-mail I know I have been afraid there is more things that I am missing. Once it goes off my screen even if I put a red flag by it, it is just so hard to keep up with that all [the time].
- Dilek: [yeah yeah you’re right
- Line 100 Dilek: Yeah it is an important change right? = I mean it’s like..
- Jen: yeah
- Dilek: I have-I have a friend, she has an OPT, a:nd it’s gonna expire in September but she hasn’t found a job (1.0) so I think she has to go back now right? Because she missed the deadline for job applications, and she told me about smt like that.
- Line 105 Jen: Is it one of our students?
- Dilek: Yeah she is
- Jen: She should come in.
- Dilek: She shou[ld?
- Jen: [If she has any questions.yeah
- Line 110 Dilek: Ok I’ll tell her

In this excerpt, Jen explains why she could not remember Dilek's e-mail: She has been busy due to the changes in OPT [Optional practical training], a policy regarding international students who are about to graduate. Dilek, in Line 100, says, "it's an important change, right?" This utterance is an attempt to establish common ground as Dilek not only implies that she knows about the policy change, but also confirms that she understands Jen's being busy. This is also a strategic move on Dilek's side since in Line 102, Dilek explains how she knows about this change: she has a friend whose OPT is about to expire. By bringing in the emergent common ground, she manages to ask a question to Jen about her friend's problem. In terms of the positioning theory, then, Dilek positions herself not only as a person who knows about the OPT, but also as someone who is trying to get information for a friend.

Overall, this conversation between Dilek and Jen underline the importance of the broader context of the speech event: the school environment. School related topics were discussed by the interlocutors not only to establish common ground but also to position themselves vis-à-vis each other. The conversation that took place between Dilek and Jen, required an emergent common ground for the conversation to flow smoothly. Dilek needed Jen's collaboration to recruit students for her classes but before achieving her conversational goal, she had to establish an emergent common ground which would enable Jen to respond to her request. This emergent common ground positioned Dilek as an instructor of a course, and Jen as the person who was in the position to help her. Compared to the sequence in Excerpt 1 where Dilek and Jen were positioned as the international student and the director of international student organization, respectively, the sequence in Excerpt 2 resulted in a shift in the power dimensions where Dilek and Jen were positioned as colleagues sharing the same interest. This conversation overall indicates how the conceptualization of novice-expert relationship as depicted in second language socialization embraces the notions of bidirectionality, which results in shifts in terms of expertise and the dynamic construction of the social interaction moment-by-moment (Leung, 2001). Dilek, in the opening lines of this conversation, was positioned as an international student, then as an instructor teaching international students and finally as a friend of an international student to seek help from the director of international student organization. All these positionings that Dilek adopted in this social interaction were also ratified by the co-present interlocutor which underlines the importance of bi-directionality in language socialization that allowed Dilek to change and expand the conversation in the way she aimed for.

Conversation # 2

In the second conversation which took place in the same event, two friends are having a discussion about Turkey.

Excerpt 4

Line 9	Dave:	She's from Antalya, ma:n. (to the other person)
	Gül:	Yeah.
	Dave:	Antalya
	Gül:	[It's in the south]
Stanza 1 (story about the Turkish girl)		
Line 13a	Dave:	[I didn't know that's where you're from.
13b		I knew a girl.
13c		I never met her
14		but we used to chat online.
14a		That's where she's from.
14b		She always tell me that I should go there
15a		cus it's so beautiful and stuff.
15b		Do all of it.
Line 16	Gül:	[yea:h]

- Dave: [She always tell me.
 Gül: [yeah]
 Dave: [I wanna go over there some day. I wanna do like a tour like all of-
 as much of Turkey as possible. You know what I mean. Just like go
 around all the coast. Do all of it.

Dave's story starts in Line 9 where he tells the 3rd person in the conversation where Gül is from. More specifically, Line 9 is Dave's punch line to open a conversation topic. This is a technique Dave employs to introduce his story in Line 13 since he states "I didn't know that's where you are from."

In terms of Gee's (2005) macrostructures, the setting of this story starts in Line 9, where Dave initiates the narrative sequence. Antalya as a city is the common ground that both Dave and Gül share. By settling the core common ground, Dave sets up the stage for his narrative. In Line 13, he presents his story about Antalya. Lines 9 and 13a constitute the orientation section of the narrative since they orient the addressee into the story to be told. Although Dave's story does not include a complicating action or a problem, Lines 13b-15b constitute the crisis (Gee, 2005) of the narrative since those lines are where the main event of the story lies. In his narrative, Dave uses reported speech as the main idea of his story. Instead of just saying "I want to go to Turkey," he brings another person into the conversation and uses what that person said as a way of justifying his desire to go to Turkey. While Line 17 is the evaluation of why this story is important (because of the fact that the Turkish girl was telling him to travel to Turkey), Line 19 is the coda of this narrative.

According to Jefferson (1978), "an utterance projects for the sequentially following turn(s)" (p. 228). Therefore, a story is implicative of subsequent talk by either triggering a topically coherent subsequent talk or enabling participants to use several techniques to relate the story to subsequent talk (Jefferson, 1978). This is where he structures the sequential implicativeness of the story. By bringing in the fact that he wants to go to Turkey, he not only uses the story as a justification of his desire to go to Turkey but also brings the conversation from a past event to the present conversational context. This subsequent talk is also recognized by Gül, in Line 21, since she makes a comment about Dave's desire to go to Turkey.

When examined from the perspective of establishing common ground and positioning, then, Dave's punch line is actually an attempt to bring the core common ground that they share to the discourse level. His increment of this common ground enables him to tell his story about the Turkish girl he used to chat online. In a circular manner, his story leads to a sequentially implicative action, which is the evaluation of the story: Dave wants to go to Turkey. Therefore, there are a couple of positions Dave engages in through his story. He positions himself not only as someone who knows about Gül's hometown but also as a person who wants to travel to Turkey.

Excerpt 5

- Line 30 Dave: Have you done a lot of travelling throughout the country over there?
 Gül: Well yeah, part[ially].
 Dave: [Yeah]

Stanza 1 (*story about her childhood*)

- Line 33 Gül: Some parts
 I couldn't go there because
 I mean
 when I was a child
 they were not-
 they say
 it was not safe for us to go there

- Line 35 Dave: yeah, I understand
 Gül: but on the western side and on the northern side, north, north-east is
 really nice. [All green, I mean]
 Dave: [That's where]-yeah- that's where everything is. Yeah

In this sequence, the story is again embedded in the ongoing conversation. Dave, in Line 30, asks Gül whether she has travelled a lot in Turkey or not. She methodically introduces her story not only as a response to Dave's question but also as a reason for why she travelled partially in Turkey. In Gee's (2005) terms, the setting starts with Dave's question. In Gül's story, the evaluation (I couldn't go there because) comes before her explanation (when I was a child, they say it was not safe). This is the complicating action/crisis in Gül's story. Similar to Dave, Gül employs reported speech in her story. Instead of directly mentioning the reasons for not going to those parts, Gül draws from what other people said about those places to justify her explanation. In Line 36, Gül relates her story to the present time by indicating that the other parts of Turkey are worth seeing. Since the topic of why some parts of Turkey were not safe to travel would make both participants uncomfortable in that context, as a sequentially implicative action, Gül brings the topic to other places worth seeing in Turkey. Therefore, in these two embedded narratives, the sequentially implicative action relied on the person who provided the story in the first place.

In terms of establishing common ground, Gül successfully integrates her story to the common ground established in the previous excerpt. Since Dave wants to travel to Turkey, this emergent common ground is re-constructed in Gül's sequentially implicative action following the narrative. In Line 36, then, Gül brings the conversation to the emergent common ground; traveling in Turkey. There are also a couple of positionings involved in Gül's narrative. First, by drawing from other's statements with the help of reported speech, she positions herself as a little girl who would listen to her caregivers. On the other hand, in her sequentially implicative action where she talks about the other parts of Turkey, she positions herself as a Turkish person who would like to attract foreigners to Turkey. Hence, Dave is positioned as the person to be appealed to go to Turkey.

4. DISCUSSION

Certain skills and rules that people follow through discursive processes enable them to account for joint actions, hence indicate that they know when it is appropriate to say something and what happens after saying it (Harré & Langenhove, 1998). Knowing these discursive processes and adapting them in a social interaction is one of the aspects of language socialization, which will enable the language learners to become a legitimate member of the target language culture (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The findings of this study, then, provide evidence for Turkish students' language socialization since the findings revealed similar discursive processes adopted by both Turkish and American speakers in their social interactions with each other.

As far as the increment of common ground is concerned, Turkish students not only engaged in common ground building acts but also assessed, accepted, and added the emergent common ground into the immediate discourse. For instance, in her conversation with Jen, Dilek successfully brought the common ground into the discourse that she could eventually gain the information that she needed from Jen (Excerpt 3). Another similarity in the discursive skills adopted in these social interactions was interlocutors' repeating each other's utterances as a way to indicate the acceptance of the common ground proposed by the other party. More specifically, both Turkish and American speakers repeated each others' previous presupposition as a way to confirm the common ground and integrated it in the ongoing conversation while at the same time expanding it. According to Enfield (2008), through socialization into how people behave and how things are in social discourses, caretakers build "the cultural common ground that will soon streamline an individual's passage through the moment-by-moment course of their social life" (p.

230). In this respect, the Turkish students' discursive skills as demonstrated in their interactions with the American speakers provided insights into their language socialization since they displayed competent participation in the social context in terms of becoming acquainted with speech activities not only from their own attempts but also from the perspective of those who respond to them (Ochs, 2004a).

The second conversation which took place between Gül and Dave suggested that the two interlocutors successfully established common ground (Turkey), and advanced the conversation with the inclusion of a presupposition, which was in the discursive mode of embedded narratives. Turkey, as the common ground, allowed Gül to have her Turkish culture and identity validated and reaffirmed by Dave, therefore enabled her to be a legitimate and contributing member of the American culture. Gül displayed similarities not only in the increment of the common ground as Dave, but also in the way she positioned herself in the speech situation. For instance, both Dave and Gül positioned themselves as having gone through experiences pertaining to Turkey, which is the common ground. Through their stories, Dave and Gül also positioned themselves interactionally vis-à-vis each other: Dave positioned himself as a person who would like to travel to Turkey to explore, while Gül was positioned as the Turkish person who talked about the beautiful places in Turkey to attract Dave's attention as a visitor to Turkey. It is also noteworthy to mention that both embedded narratives not only voiced but also positioned other people in their narrative. For example, Dave alluded to the Turkish girl he used to chat with while Gül voiced her childhood caregivers. According to Gee (2005), a spoken or written text can incorporate words from another text through indirect or direct quotation, a process called intertextuality. This sort of intertextuality indicates that both interlocutors created a network of texts that helped them establish common ground and positionings by situating *now* to their past experiences.

Ochs (2004a) argue that people who enter a new speech community face challenges in relation to the appropriate ways of carrying out a social activity via the actions and stances taken. Misunderstandings and communication breakdowns are likely to occur when these particular social roles, status and relationships are inappropriately displayed. In this respect, the findings of the present study demonstrate that the Turkish students successfully established common ground with the co-present interlocutors, which enabled themselves to display positioning that were appropriate to the speech context. While the findings are in favor of the Turkish students' language socialization in the American culture, a longitudinal study is needed to examine the process of language socialization since it is a developmental process requiring the use of ethnographic as well as discourse analytic approaches.

5. CONCLUSION

International students who study in an English-speaking country are at the same time L2 users/learners who need to adapt the subconscious internalized presuppositions that guide social interaction (Gumperz, 1996). Therefore, this study employed a discourse analytic approach to shed light on the ways Turkish students employ these discursive strategies in daily social contexts. Asking language learners to assess samples of speech or to make judgments in terms of appropriateness would not reveal insights into how they would really engage in successful conversational exchanges since in a social interaction, the speakers not only use linguistic and pragmatic units to put their ideas into words but also interpret each other's ideas and negotiate with them with the help of rhetorical strategies (Gumperz, 1996). Moreover, language form and content are not only constructed by the socio-cultural frames of a communicative event, but communicative events themselves are organized based on social order and cultural knowledge (Leung, 2001). For this reason, more studies that examine L2 user and target language speaker interaction in naturalistic settings are needed to explore the extent to which language learners are competent in adapting these discursive skills. Nevertheless, the findings of this study should be interpreted with caution since the American students who attended the event might have already

been familiar with the Turkish culture and/or they were willing to engage in conversations related to Turkey. Also, since the event took place on campus, it was possible for school-related subjects to emerge in the conversations. Similar studies that involve different neutral contexts (e.g., coffee shop) should be conducted to observe the extent to which the structural contribution of the context itself determine the interlocutors' efforts to establish common ground.

This study highlights that engaging in real-life conversations with the target language speakers (Gumperz, 1996) through L2 socialization enables language learners to embrace the discursive practices shared by a particular speech community. In that sense, especially foreign language teachers should be careful in the selection of the materials to be used in order to expose learners to real, authentic language. For instance, Wong's (2002) study on phone conversations in ESL textbooks indicates a discrepancy between the textbook language and naturally occurring conversations. Therefore, instructional materials should provide accurate samples of language use in naturalistic contexts. Additionally, L2 classrooms should be designed in such a way that they should operate as crucial agents of language socialization by providing a socializing space in which the target language culture is reflected to the learners (Ohta, 1991).

6. REFERENCES

- Arundale, R. (2008). Against (Gricean) intentions at the heart of human interaction. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 5(2), 231-256.
- Atkinson, J. M. & Heritage, J. (2006). Jefferson's transcript notation. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The Discourse Reader* (pp. 66-78). Great Britain: Routledge.
- Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. (2003). Introduction: Toward a dynamic model of language socialization. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language Socialization in Bilingual and Multilingual Societies* (pp. 1-6). Great Britain: Multilingual Matters, Cromwell Press Ltd.
- Clark, H. (1996). *Using Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, H. & Brennan, S. (1991). Grounding in communication. In L. Resnick, J. Levine and S. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition* (pp.127-149). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Colston, H. L. (2008). A new look at common ground: memory, egocentrism and joint meaning. In I. Kecskes & J. Mey (Eds.), *Intention, Common Ground and the Egocentric Speaker-Hearer* (pp. 151-187). Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 20, 43-63.
- Dings, A. (2012). Native speaker/nonnative speaker interaction and orientation to novice/expert identity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 1503-1518.
- Enfield, N. J. (2008). Common ground as a resource for social affiliation. In I. Kecskes & J. Mey (Eds.), *Intention, Common Ground and the Egocentric Speaker-Hearer* (pp. 223-254). Berlin: Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and method* (2nd Ed.). USA: Routledge.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2007). *Small Stories, Interaction and Identities*. USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Giora, R. (2003). *On Our Mind: Salience, context and figurative language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica*, 25(1/2), pp. 1-29.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. USA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1996). On teaching language in its sociocultural context. In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social Interaction, Social Context and Language: Essays in honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 469-480). USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (Eds.). (1998). *Positioning Theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*. Great Britain: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction* (pp. 219-248). New York: NY: Academic Press.
- Kanagy, R. (1999). Interactional routines as a mechanism for L2 acquisition and socialization in an immersion context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1467-1492.
- Kecskes, I. & Zhang, F. (2009). Activating, seeking and creating common ground: A socio-cognitive approach. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 17(2), 331-355.
- Kecskes, I., & Mey, J. (2008). Introduction. In I. Kecskes & J. Mey (Eds.), *Intention, Common Ground and the Egocentric Speaker-Hearer* (pp. 1-4). Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, B. P. H. (2001). Mutual knowledge, background knowledge and shared beliefs: Their roles in establishing common ground. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 21-44.
- Leech, G. (2003). Recent grammatical change in English: Data, description and theory. In Aijmer, K., & Altenberg, B. (Eds.), *Advances in corpus linguistics: papers from the 23rd international conference on English language research on computerised corpora (ICAME 23)*. (pp. 61-81). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Leung, S. (2001). Language socialization: Themes and advances in research. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-18.
- Matsumura, S. (2000). *A study of the second-language socialization of university-level students: A developmental pragmatics perspective*. Unpublished Ph.D., The University of British Columbia, Canada.
- Ochs, E. (2004a). Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. J. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language Acquisition and Language Socialization: Ecological perspectives*. Great Britain: Continuum.
- Ochs, E. (2004b). Narrative Lessons. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. B. (2012). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.) *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ohta, A. S. (1991). Evidentiality and politeness in Japanese. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 2, 211-238.
- Ohta, A. S. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1493-1512.
- Ortaçtepe, D. (2013a). Formulaic language and conceptual socialization: The route to becoming nativelike in L2. *System*, 41(3), 852-865.
- Ortaçtepe, D. (2013b). "This is Called Free Falling Theory not Culture Shock": A narrative inquiry on L2 socialization. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 12(4), 215-229.
- Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The Ethnography of communication: An introduction*, 3rd Edition. UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Schieffelin, B. B. & Ochs, E. (1986). *Language Socialization across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural Communication: A discourse approach*. Great Britain: Blackwell Publishing.
- Smith, C. S. (2003). *Modes of Discourse*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1999). The Display of (Gendered) Identities in Talk at Work. In M. Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, and L. A. Sutton (Eds.), *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*, (pp. 221- 240). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vickers, C. (2007). Second language socialization through team interaction among electrical and computer engineering students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 621-640.

- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, Language, and Epistemology: Toward a Language Socialization Paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(3), 331-350.
- Wong, J. (2002). "Applying" conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating English as a second language textbook dialogue. *International review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 40(2), 37-60.
- Wortham, S. (2000). Interactional positioning and narrative self-construction. *Narrative Inquiry*, 10, 157-184.
- Wortham, S. (2003). Accomplishing identity in participant-denoting discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 13, 1-22.
- Wortham, S. & Gadsden, V. (2006). Urban fathers positioning themselves through narrative: An approach to narrative self-construction. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin & M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and Identity*, (pp.315-341). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Uzun Özet

Dil sosyalleşmesi çocukların anadillerini kullanarak hem dil becerilerini geliştirdiklerini hem de kendi kültürlerini ve sosyal kuramları öğrendiklerini vurgulayan bir teorik çerçevedir (Schieffelin ve Ochs, 1986). Bu bağlamda, ikinci dil sosyalleşmesi, ikinci dil öğrenenlerin o dildeki dilbilimsel ve pragmatik yapıları söylemsel süreçler içerisinde o dilin kendi kültüründe yaşayarak nasıl öğrendiklerini incelemektedir (Kanagy, 1999; Matsumura, 2000; Ohta, 1999). Bir dildeki söylemsel süreçlerin iki ana işlevi vardır: 1) anlamsal ifadeler ve iletişimsel mesajlarda bulunmak, ve 2) sosyal kimlik ifade etmek. Ortak zemin hazırlamak, anlamsal ifade ve iletişimsel mesaj için bir gereksinim sayılırken, konuşmacıların söylemsel süreçler boyunca birbirlerini konumlandırması da sosyal kimlik ifadesi olarak adlandırılabilir. Kecskes ve Zhang'ın (2009) dinamik ortak zemin modeli, sosyokültürel yaklaşıma dayanıp, iki ana yapıdan oluşmaktadır: ortak bilgi ve önceki deneyimleri içeren ana ortak zemin ve var olan sosyal durumda ortaya çıkan, bireylerin o andaki deneyimlerine dayanan ortak zemin. Ortak zemin, konuşmacıların başarılı bir şekilde iletişim kurabilmeleri için gerekli iken, her iletişim aynı zamanda sosyal bir sonuca hizmet etmektedir. Bu sosyal sonuç, konuşmacıların hem kendilerini hem de diğer konuşmacıları konumlandırması ile ilgilidir (Davies ve Harre, 1990). Diğer bir deyişle, iletişim içerisinde olan konuşmacılar, sadece anlamsal ve iletişimsel etkileşimde bulunmayıp, aynı zamanda sosyal kimliklerini de içinde buldukları konumlandırmalarla ortaya koyarlar (Wortham, 2000).

Bu sebeplere dayanarak, bu çalışma, Kecskes ve Zhang'ın (2009) dinamik ortak zemin modelini, konumlandırma teorisiyle (Davies ve Harre, 1990) bağdaştırarak, Amerika'da okuyan Türk öğrencilerin ikinci dil sosyalleşmeleri üzerine ışık tutmayı hedeflemektedir. Çalışmanın verileri, Amerika'da bir üniversitede düzenlenen 23 Nisan Ulusal Egemenlik ve Çocuk Bayramı resepsiyona katılan Türk öğrencilerin diğer Amerikalı konuşmacılarla aralarında geçen iletişimlerine dayanmaktadır. Bu iletişimler, üniversitedeki Türk öğrenci birliği tarafından kayıt edilip, arşivsel veri oluşturulmuş ve araştırmacı tarafından Jefferson'ın (Atkinson ve Heritage, 2006) transkript notasyonu kullanılarak kâğıda geçirilmiştir. Toplam veri 1707 kelime ve 13 iletişimden (sohbet) oluşmaktadır. Bu makalede, bir Amerikalı ve bir Türk öğrenci arasında geçen iki iletişim, içerdikleri hikâyelere göre incelenecektir. İki hikâye de sohbetin içine eklenmiş olup, bir önceki konuyu hem devam ettirmiş hem de yeni konuya bir geçiş sağlamıştır. Dolayısıyla, bu iki hikâye, basit bir olay anlatma işlevinden öteye geçip, konuşmacıların ortak zemin oluşturarak konumlandırmada bulunmalarına yardımcı olmuştur.

Daha ayrıntılı olarak açıklanacak olursa, konuşmada yer alan Amerikan konuşmacı, Dave, Antalya'da yaşayan arkadaşı ile ilgili hikâyesini, hem Türk konuşmacı Gül ile ortak zemin oluşturmak hem de Türkiye'ye gitme isteğine değinerek, Türkiye'yi bilen ve de görmek isteyen biri olarak kendini konumlandırmak için anlatmıştır. Dave'in bu hikâyesine, Gül, Türkiye'de her yerin tehlikeli olmadığını bir Türk konumlandırmasıyla çocukluğuna dair bir hikayeden örnek vererek karşılık vermiştir. Dolayısıyla, Dave ve Gül'ün kullandıkları hikâyeler ve bu hikâyelerin hem ortak zemin oluşturmak hem de konumlandırmada bulunmak için kullanılmış olması, bu Türk öğrenci ile Amerikan öğrencinin benzer söylemsel strateji ve becerileri kullandıklarını, dolayısıyla Türk öğrencinin ikinci dil sosyalleşmesine dair izlenimlerini ortaya koymuştur. Çalışmada sunulan diğer söylem analizinde Jen ve Dilek'in yine benzer stratejiler kullanarak ortak zemin oluşturduklarını ve bu zeminler doğrultusunda ilk önce öğrenci-direktör, sonrasında iş arkadaşı ve de sonrasında bir arkadaşına yardım etmek isteyen kişi olarak konumlandırma örnekleri göstermiştir.

Ancak bu çalışmanın bulguları sadece bir konuşmaya dayanmakta olup, daha genelleştirilebilen bulgular için daha çok konuşmacıyı içeren uzun süreli etnografik çalışmalara ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. Çalışmanın altını çizdiği konulardan biri de ikinci/yabancı dil eğitimine ilişkindir. Bu çalışma, sınıf içi İngilizce öğretiminin, gerçek sosyal etkileşimi yansıtacak öğretim tekniklerine dayandırılması gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır. İkinci/dil sınıflarının dil sosyalleşmesine yol açabilmesi için bir sosyal ortam olarak yeniden tasarlanmasının ve öğrencilere gerçeğe yakın iletişim olasılıklarının sunulmasının da altı çizilmiştir.

Citation Information

Ortaçtepe, D. (2014). Common ground for positioning: a discourse analysis on second language socialization. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [Hacettepe University Journal of Education]*, 29(2), 160-174.