Language Teaching (2023), **56**, 261–275
doi:10.1017/S0261444821000422

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THINKING ALLOWED

Language socialization and academic discourse in English as a Foreign Language contexts: A research agenda

Debra A. Friedman

Indiana University, Bloomington, USA
Email: debfried@indiana.edu

(Received 1 October 2021; accepted 8 October 2021)

Abstract

In this paper, I argue for expanding language socialization research on the academic discourse socialization of speakers of English as an additional language to less-commonly researched settings outside of English-dominant countries. Following an overview of some theoretical and methodological issues involved in conducting such research, I lay out a research agenda, focusing on several topics and issues that have the potential to illuminate issues of interest in both language socialization and second language acquisition regarding how COMPETENCE and COMMUNITY are defined in a globalized, multilingual world. These include: (a) closer investigation of presumed 'cultural differences' between 'Western' and 'Asian' academic discourse practices, (b) the effect of social categories such as ethnicity and 'nonnative speaker' status on the construction of 'expert' and 'novice' identities in these settings, (c) the role of socializing agents outside of the classroom, and (d) the extent to which students in these settings are being socialized into practices and ideologies that promote multicompetence.

1. Introduction

Academic discourse (also referred to as ACADEMIC LITERACIES; see Duff, 2010; Lea & Street, 1998) comprises the practices, registers, genres (both oral and written), and ways of knowing that mediate individuals' participation in academic and/or disciplinary communities. Much more than a set of 'skills' to be mastered, academic discourse is a 'social, cognitive, and rhetorical process and an accomplishment, a form of enculturation, social practice, positioning, representation, and stance-taking' (Duff, 2010, p. 170) and is situated within specific social, political, disciplinary, and institutional contexts that shape what counts as knowledge (Lea & Street, 1998). When entering new academic communities, newcomers are therefore not only faced with the task of understanding academic content, but must also develop competence in the discourses and practices through which meaning is conveyed and constructed in that community.

One approach that has been adopted to study the process through which individuals develop such competence has been variously referred to as ACADEMIC DISCOURSE SOCIALIZATION (Duff, 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2017; Morita & Kobayashi, 2008) and ACADEMIC LANGUAGE AND LITERACY SOCIALIZATION (e.g., Duff & Anderson, 2015), with both terms encompassing written and oral language, practices, and genres and the interaction between them; for example, academic writing may entail oral activities such as peer review, and oral presentations may involve preparatory reading and summary writing. Academic discourse socialization (ADS), the term that I will use in this paper, is grounded in language socialization theory (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), which explores how (or whether) newcomers appropriate the ways of speaking, acting, and being in the world that are recognized as legitimate within a community (or communities) of practice

© The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as they engage in socially meaningful activities with more experienced members. Language socialization also foregrounds how language and other 'embodied communicative practices' (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012, p. 11) mediate this process through explicit and implicit messages conveyed through socializing interactions; for example, in addition to sending an explicit message about expected language usage in class, an 'English only' policy in a classroom may also send an implicit message regarding the relative value of other languages in academic discourse. By participating in these interactions, newcomers are potentially socialized both to USE language in ways deemed to be appropriate by their community and THROUGH language into practices, behaviors, beliefs, and values that constitute community membership (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). This research further situates this micro-level focus within the larger sociopolitical and sociocultural contexts in which these interactions occur, both at the meso-level of institutional and social structures (e.g., schools, families, workplaces, etc.) and the macro-level of beliefs, values, and ideologies about language learning and use (Duff, 2019; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Riley, 2012).

In the field of language learning and teaching, ADS research has investigated the socialization of individuals who speak English as an additional language (EAL) as they engage with English academic discourse practices in educational settings ranging from primary schools to graduate-level disciplinary communities (Duff, 2010; Duff & Anderson, 2015; Kobayashi et al., 2017; Morita & Kobayashi, 2008). However, thus far, this research has primarily focused on immigrant or international students in North American settings in which students are immersed in an English-dominant community of practice of which they are potential members (Duff, 2010; Duff & Anderson, 2015; Kobayashi et al., 2017). As a result, there have been calls for more research attention to how students are socialized into and through additional languages in educational spaces across a wider range of geographical settings (Kobayashi et al., 2017; Moore, 2017).

In this paper, I lay the groundwork for further extending the scope of ADS research to educational settings located outside of communities in which English constitutes the dominant or majority language. Following common usage in applied linguistics, I refer to these as 'English as a foreign language' (EFL) settings, although I acknowledge that this term is imprecise. For example, access to technology that enables communication across borders (Douglas Fir, 2016), widespread adoption (or imposition) of 'Western' language teaching methods and practices (e.g., Butler, 2011), and the fact that many students and teachers are transnationals who move across settings during their academic careers (as noted by an anonymous reviewer) may have blurred traditional distinctions between 'English as a SECOND language' and 'English as a FOREIGN language' contexts. In addition, grouping all English language classrooms located outside of English-dominant countries under the term 'EFL' risks obscuring the diversity that exists both across and within these settings in terms of English language use, practices, values, ideologies, and access to educational resources (e.g., Ortega, 2009). Nevertheless, given its focus on the situated nature of learning and academic discourse, I believe that ADS research would benefit by continuing to diversify into less-commonly researched educational settings worldwide (however we label them) to consider how the affordances and constraints present in these settings shape ADS practices and outcomes.

I will first review some theoretical and methodological issues relevant to doing ADS research in EFL settings, followed by suggestions for possible areas and specific tasks that such research might address. While not unique to EFL contexts, the areas highlighted represent those in which I feel that EFL research has the potential to illuminate issues of interest in both language socialization and second language acquisition (SLA) regarding how (and by whom) COMPETENCE and COMMUNITY are defined in a globalized, multilingual world (de León & García-Sánchez, 2021; Douglas Fir, 2016; Duff, 2019), a topic I take up in more detail at the end of the paper.

2. Theoretical issues

There are two main concerns that might be raised regarding language socialization as a theoretical framework that could potentially hinder its application to EFL settings. The first is whether an

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

approach that locates learning in socializing interactions between 'expert' and 'novice' members of a community is applicable to contexts that lie outside of what has traditionally been considered the 'target' (i.e., English-dominant) academic community. However, the 'target' community in an ADS study should not be assumed a priori, but determined empirically; that is, the aim should be to investigate what kind of community students in EFL settings are being socialized into. This community may be one governed by Anglo-American practices and norms, but alternatively it may be one in which these practices have been 'localized,' one in which English serves as a 'contact language' (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 56) among users from different language backgrounds, or one characterized by multilingual and/or multimodal practices (e.g., Canagarajah, 2013, 2018; Rose et al., 2021).

In addition, the term SOCIALIZATION is sometimes taken as implying that 'the appropriation of target cultural norms is ALWAYS desirable, virtuous, inevitable, and complete' (Duff, 2002, p. 291; see also Lea & Street, 1998). Such assumptions may not always apply, especially among adolescent or adult EAL students who bring to the classroom their expertise in a range of knowledge domains from prior socialization experiences and who may not necessarily aspire to membership in an English-dominant academic community (e.g., Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008; Duff, 2007; Duff & Anderson, 2015). However, although early language socialization research tended to focus on the seemingly unproblematic socialization of children into local community values and practices, the field has always recognized that socialization is achieved or resisted through negotiation (e.g., Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). More recent research has increasingly highlighted the contingent and multidirectional nature of socialization and emphasized the possibility of diverse outcomes, from full to partial to non-participation in community practices, as well as newcomers' agency to resist or transform the beliefs and practices into which others endeavor to socialize them (e.g., de León & García-Sánchez, 2021; Duff, 2007; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012).

3. Methodological issues

As language socialization has been adopted by researchers in disciplines beyond its origins in linguistic anthropology, a debate has arisen around what constitutes a language socialization study. Those working in the anthropological tradition have prioritized ethnographic research that includes: (a) immersion in the research setting for an extended period in order to develop understandings of local beliefs and practices and to trace changes over time, and (b) close analysis of socializing interactions that have been audio- or video-recorded (e.g., Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004). However, some applied linguists have argued for a more flexible approach, noting that insistence on ethnography as the sole legitimate methodology may close off potentially fruitful avenues of research where it may not be feasible (Duff, 2010; Duff & Anderson, 2015). Below, I review methodological options for ADS research based on four-way taxonomy proposed by Bronson and Watson-Gegeo (2008): language socialization as a TOPIC (i.e., studies that are consistent with a focus on 'the intersection of social life, language use, and language development' (p. 48) but that do not adopt language socialization as a conceptual or methodological framework), an APPROACH (i.e., studies that locate learning within its social context but may not be longitudinal), a METHOD (i.e., studies that follow language socialization conceptual and methodological principles), and an INTERVENTION (i.e., language socialization studies that aim to effect positive change).

ADS researchers adopting language socialization as a method employ ethnography or case study and collect data from multiple sources. Ethnographic ADS research typically involves longitudinal observation and recording in one or more classrooms, schools, writing center tutorials, or other learning spaces and aims to understand the practices that mediate socialization in these communities (e.g., Beiler, 2020; Duff, 2002; Friedman, 2019a; Talmy, 2008). Case studies focus on the experiences of one or more individuals, who may be observed across multiple sites or over a period of time (e.g., Anderson, 2021; Fujioka, 2014; Kobayashi, 2016). Recorded interaction in ethnography and case study is typically analyzed at the micro-level in order to enable a detailed and empirically grounded account of socializing interactions (e.g., Duff, 2002; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In addition to language, analyses may examine features such as turn-taking as well as other semiotic resources employed by participants, including non-verbal features (e.g., gestures, eye gaze), orientations towards physical objects (e.g., books, blackboards), or the multiple modalities (e.g., words, pictures, music, emojis, etc.) through which meaning is constructed in online environments (e.g., Schreiber, 2015; Talmy, 2008). Although LS research has traditionally privileged face-to-face interaction, ADS studies using LS as a method have also examined computer-mediated environments (e.g., Hafner & Yu, 2020; Yim, 2011) and written feedback (e.g., Anderson, 2021; Séror, 2014) as sites for socializing interactions. These data may be supplemented by interviews to provide an emic (insider) perspective to complement the researcher's etic (outsider) perspective and collection of relevant artifacts (e.g., syllabi, assignments, textbooks, curricular guidelines, educational policy documents, etc.) to situate socializing interactions within a larger institutional, social, or political context.

ADS research for which language socialization serves as a topic or approach may draw primarily or exclusively from indirect sources such as questionnaires, interviews, narratives, or diaries in which participants describe their current or past socialization experiences (e.g., Kim & Duff, 2012; Okuda & Anderson, 2018; Zappa-Hollman & Duff, 2015). These sources can provide valuable information that might otherwise remain inaccessible to researchers; for example, interviews and writing logs enabled Zappa-Hollman and Duff (2015) to identify the major role played by peer interactions outside of the classroom (which they could not observe directly) in the socialization of Mexican undergraduates at a Canadian university.

The fourth category in Bronson and Watson-Gegeo's (2008) taxonomy, language socialization as an intervention, does not prescribe any particular methodology, but rather encompasses research that addresses educational inequities and gives voices to marginalized research participants. For example, ADS studies have examined issues such as the impact of social identity categories such as race (Talmy, 2010a), social class (Kanno, 2003), gender (Morita, 2009), or 'ESL student' (Talmy, 2008) on ADS trajectories and outcomes. Other critical ADS research has investigated how EAL students are socialized into academic discourse practices that privilege certain languages over others in multilingual English-medium educational settings (Beiler, 2020).

Consistent with a view of academic discourse as being socially constructed, ADS researchers typically regard research findings as co-constructed between the researcher and participants rather than a set of objective facts, a stance that requires critical reflection on the relationships between the researcher, the researched, and the knowledge being created between them (e.g., Starfield, 2013; Talmy, 2013). For example, there has been increasing awareness that data from sources such as interviews should not be treated as factual reports of participants' experiences and feelings, but as subjective accounts produced for a specific audience at a specific moment in time for a specific purpose (e.g., Talmy, 2010b). Interviews themselves may also constitute a context for socialization (Friedman, 2019b); for example, asking interviewees to reflect on past experiences may contribute to their reframing of those experiences in ways that affect their ongoing socialization. It is therefore important to consider factors that may have influenced data collection and interpretation, such as relationships and power differentials between researchers and participants, the social identities that interviewers and interviewees display in interviews, and the interactional and social contexts in which the data were produced.

A final methodological issue is documenting the outcomes of socialization, that is, the extent to which students have taken up, resisted, or transformed the language or practices promoted through socializing interactions (e.g., Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004). In longitudinal ADS research, this may involve tracking changes (or documenting the lack thereof) in participants' language, levels of participation, and/or ability to engage in valued academic practices over time (e.g., Kobayashi, 2016). In studies of written academic discourse, analyzing textual changes across multiple drafts can provide evidence of socialization into (or resistance to) the writing practices and norms promoted through feedback or other socializing interactions (e.g., Anderson, 2021). Technologies such as screen capture recordings (Hamel & Séror, 2016) have also been used in a number of recent studies to document and analyze writing processes and how these may have been influenced by socializing messages (e.g.,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Beiler, 2020; Séror & Gentil, 2020). Interviews may be used to ascertain the perspectives of instructors and students on the outcomes of socialization (e.g., Anderson, 2021; Friedman, 2019a).

4. ADS and 'cultural differences'

Since Kaplan's (1966) famous 'doodle' article positing the influence of 'cultural thought patterns' on ESL students' academic writing, researchers have debated how ostensibly 'cultural' factors shape orientations towards features of academic discourse such as text organization (e.g., Chien, 2011; Li, 2014), source attribution (e.g., Li & Flowerdew, 2019; Pecorari & Petríc, 2014), critical thinking (e.g., Tian & Low, 2011), critical literacy (e.g., Crookes, 2021), and peer feedback (e.g. Hu, 2019; Yu & Lee, 2016). Early discussions around this question drew attention to the fact that academic discourse practices that are valued in Western academia are culturally and ideologically mediated. However, they also tended to make sweeping assertions regarding 'cultural differences' between 'Western' societies, which were said to emphasize textual ownership, directness, originality, and individualism, and 'Asian' societies that supposedly valued collectivism, indirectness, memorization, rote learning, and deference to authority (e.g., Carson & Nelson, 1996; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999). These assertions were subsequently criticized as reflecting monolithic, static, and essentialist views of 'culture' that ignored individual variation within communities (e.g., disciplinary differences regarding source use in Western academia; see Pecorari & Petríc, 2014) and based on unsupported and possibly inaccurate assumptions about academic discourse practices in non-Western societies (e.g., Belcher, 2014; Kubota, 1999, 2004).

The question of how (or whether) academic discourse conventions and practices differ cross-culturally remains of interest in the field of English language teaching; however, attention has shifted towards a closer investigation of the processes through which orientations to English academic discourse are socialized in EFL settings and a more nuanced consideration of the multiple factors at the micro-, meso-, and macro-levels that shape these experiences. These may include local contextual factors such as teacher workloads and large classes (Tian & Low, 2011) or emphasis on preparing students for high-stakes exams (Curdt-Christianson, 2010) rather than (or in addition to) 'cultural' preferences. Other studies have documented how instructors and students in EFL contexts in Asia have reshaped 'Western' practices such as peer review (Tsui & Ng, 2010) to local expectations and norms.

With its view of classroom practices as embedded within larger institutional and sociopolitical contexts, the ADS framework is well positioned to contribute to and extend this research. Questions that might be addressed include which academic discourse practices (e.g., skills-based vs. critical literacy) are privileged in specific settings; the attitudes, values, practical contingencies, and/or political imperatives that support or constrain these practices; and how teachers and/or students adopt, resist, or transform academic discourse practices that have been imposed from above or outside.

Research task 1:

Examine the academic discourse practices into and through which students in EFL settings are being socialized. Consider how these are shaped by local beliefs, values, ideologies of learning, and the larger sociopolitical context in which the classroom is situated.

Adopting an ethnographic or case study design for this task would enable researchers to situate the focal practice (peer review, essay organization, etc.) within a larger social environment. For example, in her study at two universities in Mexico, LoCastro (2008) contextualized a comparative discourse analysis of students' writing in both English and Spanish with classroom observations and teacher and student interviews in order to understand how students had been socialized into academic writing conventions. Recordings of classroom interaction would allow for a detailed examination of socializing interactions, while collecting data in multiple sites (e.g., EFL classes and content-area classes) would be

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

valuable for investigating possible variation across language, disciplinary, or institutional boundaries. When classroom observation is not feasible, interviews and/or diaries can provide insights into participants' perspectives on past and/or current socialization experiences; for example, Ene et al. (2019) and Wette and Furneaux (2018) asked international students to compare their experiences with academic writing in English and their first language and discuss how they negotiated differences between them. Textbooks can also provide insights into the knowledge and practices that are promoted within a given academic community (e.g., Li & Flowerdew, 2019; Liao & Chen, 2009). However, textbooks by themselves do not socialize students (Curdt-Christiansen, 2017), and textbook analyses should be supplemented with data such as classroom observation and/or interviews in order to understand how textbooks are used and interpreted within a particular setting.

Regardless of the approach taken, researchers should take care not to make facile judgements regarding the 'cultural' origins of observed behaviors or expressed attitudes and to keep in mind that notions of 'cultural difference' may be 'socially, politically, and historically produced' (Kubota, 2004, p. 29). For example, noting some researchers' tendency to accept at face value interviewees' culturally-based explanations of prior academic experiences (e.g., that critical thinking is discouraged in Japan in order to 'create harmony,' p. 22), Kubota (1999) cautioned that such accounts should not be taken as 'objective truths or individual expressions divorced from social, political, and ideological dimensions' (p. 22), but rather understood as ideologically mediated perspectives that may have been shaped by prior socialization into discourses of cultural difference. She further encouraged researchers to deconstruct such discourses by critically examining the social, historical, and ideological forces that brought them into being.

5. ADS and 'expert/novice' identities

Although the idea that 'experts' (e.g., instructors) socialize 'novices' (e.g., students) has long been central to LS, the field has also recognized the fluidity of expertise across situations or even within a single interaction (e.g., Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Morita, 2000), as well as the possibility of BIDIRECTIONAL SOCIALIZATION in which 'novices' socialize 'experts' (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012). It is also acknowledged that expertise is predicated on asymmetries of knowledge that are, in turn, bound up with regimes of power and authority that favor certain kinds of knowledge as 'ratified' (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012, p. 6) and mediated by ideologies that may constrain individual agency to claim expert identities and have those claims validated by others (Duff & Anderson, 2015; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012). For example, in the field of English language teaching, research has demonstrated how social identity categories such as race or ethnicity (e.g., Von Esch et al., 2020) and 'nonnative speaker' status (e.g., Moussu & Llurda, 2008) can call instructors' expertise into question, thus restricting their ability to serve as socializing agents (e.g., Lee & Schallert, 2008; Liu & Tannacito, 2013). Similarly, membership in these categories may also cause students to be differentially positioned as relatively 'expert' or 'novice' compared with each other, even in settings that supposedly value multilingualism and multicultural perspectives, thus impacting their socialization (e.g., Morita, 2009; Ou & Gu, 2021). These findings raise intriguing questions regarding the situated, contingent, and ideological nature of expertise that might be productively explored in EFL settings, especially those that bring together individuals with diverse linguistic and educational backgrounds, thus creating an environment in which individuals may be positioned along a continuum as more or less 'knowing' in a particular knowledge domain. For example, Duff and Uchida's (1997) study at a private language school in Japan examined how the professional identities of four EFL instructors (two American and two Japanese) were co-constructed around different kinds and levels of linguistic, cultural, and professional expertise and how these, in turn, shaped students' responses to each instructor's teaching. Other contexts in which to further this line of inquiry would be settings where local instructors co-teach with foreign 'native speakers' (who may be untrained in language pedagogy) or those that include instructors and/or students who have studied abroad.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I propose two research tasks related to this topic. When researching either, it is important to remember that the process of identity construction does not take place in isolation, but is situated within specific historical and sociopolitical contexts (Duff, 2012, 2017; Norton & De Costa, 2018). Interviews with stakeholders (e.g., instructors, students, policy makers, school administrators, parents, etc.) and collection of data regarding educational policy, school hiring standards (e.g., employment advertisements), or admissions criteria would allow for a critical analysis of what counts as ratified knowledge and who is assumed to possess it within a specific setting.

Research task 2:

Examine how identities as 'experts' and 'novices' are displayed, resisted, and/or negotiated in EFL classroom interaction and the implications for academic discourse socialization.

This task requires recordings of classroom interactions (instructor–student and/or student–student), ideally collected over the course of a semester or academic year in order to document any changes over time. Analysis of these interactions would trace how claims of expertise are co-constructed across turns as they unfold moment-by-moment in talk. Possible foci would be the discursive features through which claims of expertise are made (e.g., correcting or evaluating others' utterances, using metalanguage, providing explanations, etc.), the degree of certainty with which these claims are made (e.g., falling vs. rising intonation), and the extent to which they are validated by others.

Research task 3:

Examine the personal, educational, and workplace experiences through which instructors in EFL settings are (or are not) socialized into identities as competent professionals.

While classroom observations can provide insights into how expertise is co-constructed at particular moments in time, it can also be informative to examine how instructors' personal histories have shaped their self-identification as 'experts.' Research on professional socialization in North American Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) programs has provided a mixed picture regarding EAL speakers' success in negotiating expert identities as English language instructors (e.g., Cho, 2013; Ho, 2011). Examining professional socialization in programs outside of English-dominant countries could provide insights regarding the extent to which struggles and negotiations over the right to claim expertise and the relevance of social categories such as 'nonnative speaker' are also operational in this setting. One approach to this task would be a case study that follows one or more students through a language teacher education program. Extending the study into participants' own classrooms following graduation would allow for investigation into the extent to which pre-service socialization experiences shape actual teaching practice, an issue of particular importance given reports of mismatches between how English academic discourse expertise is construed in TESOL programs (especially those based on Western methodologies) and the realities of teaching in EFL classrooms (e.g., Casanave, 2009; Lee, 2013). Another possibility that would allow for a longer-term view of socialization experiences involves narrative analysis (e.g., Benson, 2014) of instructors' accounts of professional identity development before, during, and/or after their training. For example, using data from interviews and reflective diaries, Tsui (2007) traced a Chinese EFL teacher's struggle to formulate a competent teacher identity at a university in Hong Kong, where his village origins and resistance to the preferred 'communicative' teaching methodology initially marginalized him.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6. ADS beyond the classroom

Although classrooms have long been the primary sites for ADS research, instructors are not the only, or necessarily the most competent, agents of socialization (e.g., Duff, 2007, 2010; Duff & Anderson, 2015; Morita & Kobayashi, 2008). ADS studies of international students in North American universities (Kobayashi, 2003; Séror, 2011; Zappa-Hollman & Duff, 2015) and an English language program in Japan (Bankier, 2019) have identified peers as potential sources of support and socialization into both oral and written academic discourse. In some cases, peers were found to be more capable and influential than instructors, thus calling into question the 'expert instructor/novice student' dichotomy that has often been the focus in ADS research (Duff, 2007; Duff & Anderson, 2015). A related line of research has demonstrated the role of 'literacy brokers' (Lillis & Curry, 2010), such as journal editors and reviewers (Lillis & Curry, 2010), graduate advisors (e.g., Ferenz, 2005), and language and disciplinary experts within and beyond the local academic community (e.g., Li, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Luo & Hyland, 2016), in shaping the writing of both established and novice multilingual scholars who are working in English outside of English-dominant countries.

Digital environments represent another area that has been receiving increasing research attention as settings for ADS (e.g., Reinhardt & Thorne, 2017; Thorne et al., 2009). This work has highlighted the affordances of technology in support of academic discourse development as well as the hybridity of discourses in online spaces, which may involve use of multiple languages, 'non-academic' registers, or remixing material (e.g., pictures, video) from other sources (e.g., Schreiber, 2015; Wu, 2020). Interaction in digital spaces therefore has the potential for socializing users into new practices, genres, conceptualizations of TEXT, and identities as multilingual users of English that may conflict with those promoted in the classroom (Reinhardt & Thorne, 2017; Thorne et al., 2009).

Findings from this diverse body of research point to the need to shift from the sole focus on classrooms, which has been characteristic of many ADS studies, in favor of further consideration of the impact of socializing interactions outside of formal class settings and attention to students' roles as active agents in seeking out alternative resources for their own socialization (Duff, 2012; Duff & Anderson, 2015). Taking up this inquiry in EFL settings would allow for investigation into a range of issues, such as how different types of expertise and knowledge (e.g., linguistic, disciplinary, cultural) are displayed and valued within these alternative spaces and how factors such as power dynamics, relative language proficiency, and personal relationships shape participation. Other critical questions include how the limited access to outside resources (e.g., private tutors, writing centers, disciplinary or language experts, Internet connections, etc.) that exists in some EFL settings affects the trajectory and outcomes of socialization, the extent to which socializing messages in these contexts support or challenge those of the classroom, and how students respond to these mixed messages.

Research task 4:

Examine the role of socializing agents outside of the classroom (e.g., peers, advisors, tutors, online communities, etc.) in academic discourse socialization in EFL settings.

This task would best be pursued through a case study design that follows one or more focal participants as they engage with academic discourse across spaces, interlocutors, and rhetorical situations (e.g. different assignments or genres). There are two main challenges in conducting such research. First are the practical and ethical concerns regarding observation and recording of interactions outside of classrooms, which may be spontaneous, occur in spaces where it is difficult to record, or unfold in settings (homes, professors' offices) where the presence of a researcher might be unwelcome or invasive. For this reason, most researchers have relied on indirect data sources, such as interviews and/or logs in which writers document their experiences (e.g., Bankier, 2019; Kim & Duff, 2012; Li, 2007;

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zappa-Hollman & Duff, 2015). However, given the limitations of self-reports, researchers should also seek out more direct sources where possible. For example, collecting written correspondence between participants and potential socializing agents (e.g., emails, reviewer comments, feedback, transcripts of online chat, etc.), in addition to self-report data, would allow for a more finely grained and triangulated analysis of the socialization process (e.g., Lillis & Curry, 2010; Séror, 2011). Another option is to supply participants with recorders and ask them to record relevant interactions as they arise, as in Surtees's (2018) dissertation on the peer socialization of Japanese undergraduate study abroad students at a Canadian university.

The second challenge is how to capture the complex interplay among socializing interactions that may take place across multiple spaces, individuals, and academic communities. One option is to choose a single text (e.g., a draft of a research article by a Chinese doctoral student in Li (2007)) or project (e.g., a group oral presentation by Japanese undergraduate students in Canada in Kobayashi (2003)) and trace its development over time (see Lillis & Curry (2010) for an example of this on a larger scale). Alternatively, some ADS studies have focused on individual participants, examining the type and intensity of their interactions with members of their social networks (e.g., Bankier, 2019; Ferenz, 2005; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Zappa-Hollman & Duff, 2015).

7. ADS and multicompetence

In recent years, the 'multilingual turn' in applied linguistics has advocated for a MULTICOMPETENCE (Cook, 1992) perspective to the study of language learning that repositions multilinguals as competent users of a hybrid semiotic system rather than imperfect users of an additional language (e.g., Douglas Fir, 2016; Ortega, 2013). One result has been increasing research attention to how multilingual students and/or instructors employ a range of languages and other semiotic resources in oral or written academic discourse (e.g., Canagarajah, 2013, 2018). There have also been calls to reframe 'second language' literacy as BILITERACY (Gentil, 2011; Ortega & Carson, 2010) and to investigate how multilinguals draw strategically from their full repertoire of linguistic, rhetorical, and genre knowledge to suit the demands of different discourse communities and rhetorical contexts.

Since students in EFL contexts may be continuing to develop academic discourse competence in the local language of instruction as they simultaneously develop such competence in English, researching multilingual socialization in EFL settings could address a problem noted by Gentil (2011) regarding the difficulty of finding individuals who are engaging in academic discourse in multiple languages in the monolingual environments of English-dominant universities. However, as Hall et al. (2006) noted in their critique of the multicompetence model, the attainment of multicompetence cannot be assumed even in these settings; rather, it is a variable process that emerges within specific communities of practice and is contingent on a range of factors such as the frequency and type of encounters with each language. For example, the Korean scholars interviewed by Cho (2010) claimed that owing to lack of attention to writing in the Korean educational system and the dominance of English in academic publishing, they had developed advanced academic literacy in English, but not in Korean. In addition, language ideologies can shape understandings regarding which languages are suitable for academic discourse (e.g., Beiler, 2020) or the acceptability of multilingual practices such as TRANSLANGUAGING in academic settings (e.g., Séror & Gentil, 2020).

These findings argue for research that not only examines HOW individuals use multilingual and material resources to create meaning, but also the micro-, meso-, and macro-level contexts in which they are socialized into the beliefs and knowledge that facilitate or constrain such practices. With its long tradition of research on multilingual socialization in postcolonial or immigrant communities (de León & García-Sánchez, 2021; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Moore, 2017), language socialization can provide a rich theoretical framework for exploring how (or whether) students in EFL settings are socialized into multicompetence in academic discourse. Possible foci include how practices and policies at the classroom and institutional levels both shape and are shaped by ideologies about language learning and use, the value placed on the various languages in students' repertoires as a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

medium for academic discourse, or the extent to which English is seen as a threat to the vitality of the local language.

Research task 5:

Investigate how students in EFL settings are being socialized into practices and ideologies that promote or discourage multicompetence in academic discourse.

As with the research tasks listed above, this task would best be undertaken through a longitudinal ethnographic or case study approach, ideally including recording of socializing interactions in or outside of the classroom, in order to capture the process of socialization as it unfolds. Including multiple sites where students engage with academic discourse in various languages would allow for a more comprehensive picture of the linguistic resources and academic practices made available to students across the curriculum and the extent to which they are being socialized into seeing these as assets. When multiple languages are used in the classroom, attention to how they are functionally distributed (e.g., English for academic work, the local language for small talk) can also be revealing of the implicit socializing messages regarding what each language is best suited for (e.g., Beiler, 2020). Interviews with instructors and students would provide both a window into participants' perspectives and attitudes towards multilingual practices, as well as accounts of past socialization experiences that may have contributed to shaping these perspectives and attitudes (e.g., Séror & Gentil, 2020). Collection and analysis of classroom interaction and/or student-produced academic texts in a variety of genres (oral and/or written) could provide evidence regarding the extent to which students had taken up ideologies or practices related to multicompetence (e.g., Beiler, 2020; Cavazos, 2017). Students' texts can also be the basis for text-based interviews in which students comment on the choices they made during the process of writing and extent to which attitudes towards multilingualism shaped these choices (e.g., Beiler, 2020; Kaufhold, 2018).

8. Conclusion

This article has outlined a number of (but by no means all) research tasks and potential foci that might inform a further expansion of ADS research into EFL settings. In addition to allowing for the study of ADS across a wider range of educational contexts, pursuing these tasks would also have the potential to provide insights into issues that have animated recent discussions regarding the nature of COMPETENCE and COMMUNITY in multilingual learning and socialization (de León & García-Sánchez, 2021; Douglas Fir, 2016; Duff, 2019).

Within the field of SLA, conceptualizations of competence have begun to shift away from a supposedly universally applicable, monolingual, and idealized 'native speaker' model to one that views competence as 'complex, dynamic, and holistic' (Douglas Fir, 2016, p. 26) and constituted within specific communities of practice and/or social networks. Yet, as language socialization researchers have long recognized, understandings of competence are inexorably linked to larger social systems and ideologies that may hinder acceptance of more fluid notions of competence at the local (e.g., classroom) level (de León & García-Sánchez, 2021). EFL settings would provide productive sites for exploring crucial questions posed by Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002): 'How is competence assessed and evaluated, and by whom? What are the consequences of such assessments? How might evaluations of competence be negotiated and contested?' (p. 346). These questions might be framed around issues such as whether competence is defined as proficiency in a Standard or 'native' variety of English versus the ability to manipulate a range of multilingual and multimodal communicative resources, the extent to which the power of English and its associations with Anglo-American norms and practices influences assessments of competence, whether access to the discourses and practices in online

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

communities has challenged traditional school-based notions of competence in English academic discourse, and how (or whether) instructors, peers, or others in students' social networks are able to claim the competence necessary to be perceived as potential socializing agents.

In addition, the 'increasingly transnational, deterritorialized, unbounded, and bi-/multilingual sociolinguistic realities of many language users' (de León & García-Sánchez, 2021, p. 43) has also stirred debate on the nature of the 'communities' in which norms for academic discourse are defined and socialized. While this issue is relevant in all contexts of multilingual socialization and learning, characteristics of EFL settings, in particular, their location at a nexus of multiple communities of practice (local, national, international) bring them into high relief and position these settings as sites where competing sets of norms, values, and practices may be contested and negotiated. For example, ADS research in such settings might critically examine whether (and why) students are being socialized into an academic community defined by Anglo-American norms and practices versus one in which 'biliteracy is needed cultural capital' (Ortega & Carson, 2010, p. 62). It might also investigate the extent to which EFL classrooms truly constitute 'communities of practice' shaped by the actions of their members as opposed to groups of individuals whose actions are constrained by factors (e.g., standardized testing regimes, national educational policy, expectations of parents and other stakeholders) imposed from outside and the extent to which instructors and/or students are able to overcome these constraints.

Finally, I close with the observation that to do justice to the diversity of ADS experiences of EAL students requires both building upon the existing body of research in EFL settings and expanding to under-researched regions such as Africa, Southeast Asia, and South America (Moore, 2017), as well as to classrooms outside of English-dominant countries where refugees and immigrants are learning EAL. More knowledge of how English academic discourse is defined, socialized, and practiced in classrooms around the world will contribute another piece to a rich and complex puzzle.

References

Anderson, T. (2021). The socialization of L2 doctoral students through written feedback. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *20*(2), 134–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1726758

Bankier, J. J. (2019). *Second language academic literacy socialisation through individual networks of practice: An ethnographic account of learning to write in an academic English programme in Japan* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Lancaster University.

Beiler, I. R. (2020). Negotiating multilingual resources in English writing instruction for recent immigrants to Norway. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(1), 5–29. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.535

Belcher, D. (2014). What we need and don't need intercultural rhetoric for: A retrospective and prospective look at an evolving research area. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *25*, 59–67. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.06.003

Benson, P. (2014). Narrative inquiry in applied linguistics research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *34*, 154–170. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000099

Bronson, M. C., & Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2008). The critical moment: Language socialization and the (re)visioning of first and second language learning. In P. A. Duff, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8* (2nd ed., pp. 43–55). Language socialization.

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 36–57. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000122

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2018). Materializing 'competence': Perspectives from international STEM scholars. *Modern Language Journal*, *102*(2), 268–291. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12464

Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *5*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(96)90012-0

Casanave, C. P. (2009). Training for writing or training for reality? Challenges facing EFL writing teachers and students in language teacher education programs. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 256–277). Multilingual Matters.

Cavazos, A. G. (2017). Translingual oral and written practices: Rhetorical resources in multilingual writers' discourse. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *21*(4), 385–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916629225

Chien, S.-C. (2011). Discourse organization in high school students' writing and their teachers' writing instruction: The case of Taiwan. *Foreign Language Annals*, *44*(2), 417–435.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cho, S. (2010). Academic biliteracy challenges: Korean scholars in the United States. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*(2), 82–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.02.002
Cho, S. (2013). Disciplinary enculturation experiences of three Korean students in US-based MATESOL programs. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *12*(2), 136–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2013.775881
Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning*, *42*(4), 557–591. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1992.tb01044.x
Crookes, G. V. (2021). Critical language pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, 1–18. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000609
Curdt-Christianson, X. L. (2010). Competing priorities: Singaporean teachers' perspectives on critical literacy. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *49*(6), 184–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2011.04.001
Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2017). Language socialization through textbooks. In P. A. Duff, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (3rd ed., pp. 195–210). Springer.
de León, L., & García-Sánchez, I. M. (2021). Language socialization at the intersection of the local and the global: The contested trajectories of input and communicative competence. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, *7*, 421–448. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011619-030538
Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *Modern Language Journal*, *100*(S1), 19–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12301
Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(3), 280–322. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.3.289
Duff, P. A. (2007). Problematising academic discourse socialisation. In H. Marriott, T. Moore, & R. Spence-Brown (Eds.), *Learning discourses and the discourses of learning* (pp. 1–18). Monash University e-Press.
Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *30*, 69–192. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048
Duff, P. A. (2012). Identity, agency, and second language acquisition. In S. M. Gass, & A. Mackey (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 410–426). Routledge.
Duff, P. A. (2017). Language teacher identities and socialization. In G. Barkhuizen (Ed.), *Reflections on language teacher identity research* (pp. 170–175). Routledge.
Duff, P. A. (2019). Social dimensions and processes in second language acquisition: Multilingual socialization in transnational contexts. *Modern Language Journal*, *103*(S1), 6–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12534
Duff, P. A., & Anderson, T. (2015). Academic language and literacy socialization for second language students. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 337–352). Wiley.
Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(3), 451–486. https://doi-org.proxyiub.uits.iu.edu/10.2307/3587834
Ene, E., McIntosh, K., & Connor, U. (2019). Using intercultural rhetoric to examine translingual practices of postgraduate L2 writers of English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *45*, 105–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100664
Ferenz, O. (2005). EFL writers' social networks: Impact on advanced academic literacy development. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *4*(4), 339–351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2005.07.002
Friedman, D. (2019a). Citation as a social practice in a TESOL graduate program: A language socialization approach. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *44*, 23–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.01.004
Friedman, D. (2019b). Reflecting on the research interview as a socializing interaction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(1), 266–275. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.549
Fujioka, M. (2014). L2 student-U.S. Professor interactions through disciplinary writing assignments: An activity theory perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *25*, 40–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.05.004
Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *31*, 339–361. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085352
Gentil, G. (2011). A biliteracy agenda for genre research. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*(1), 6–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.12.006
Hafner, C. A., & Yu, C. (2020). Language socialization in digitally mediated collaborative writing: Evidence from disciplinary peer and teacher feedback. *RELC Journal*, *51*(1), 14–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/003368822090134
Hall, J., Cheng, A., & Carlson, M. T. (2006). Reconceptualizing multicompetence as a theory of language knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(2), 220–240. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml013
Hamel, M.-J., & Séror, J. (2016). Video screen capture to document and scaffold the L2 writing process. In C. Caws, & M.-J. Hamel (Eds.), *Language-learner computer interactions: Theory, methodology and CALL applications* (pp. 137–162). John Benjamins.
Ho, M.-C. (2011). Academic discourse socialization through small-group discussions. *System*, *39*(4), 437–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.10.015
Hu, G. (2019). Culture and peer feedback. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 45–63). Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jacoby, S., & Gonzales, P. (1991). The constitution of expert-novice in scientific discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 149–181. https://doi.org/10.5070/L422005141

Kanno, Y. (2003). Imagined communities, school visions, and the education of bilingual students in Japan. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *2*(4), 285–300. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327701JLIE0204_4

Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, *16*(1-2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x

Kaufhold, K. (2018). Creating translanguaging spaces in students' academic writing practices. *Linguistics and Education*, *45*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.02.001

Kim, J., & Duff, P. A. (2012). The language socialization and identity negotiations of Generation 1.5 Korean-Canadian university students. *TESL Canada Journal*, *29*(6), 81–102. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v29i0.1111

Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *59*(3), 337–368. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.59.3.337

Kobayashi, M. (2016). L2 academic discourse socialization through oral presentations: An undergraduate student's learning trajectory in study abroad. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *72*(1), 337–368. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.2494

Kobayashi, M., Zappa-Hollman, S., & Duff, P. A. (2017). Academic discourse socialization. In P. A. Duff, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (3rd ed., pp. 239–254). Springer.

Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(1), 9–35. https://doi-org.proxyiub.uits.iu.edu/10.2307/3588189

Kubota, R. (2004). The politics of cultural difference in second language education. *Critical Inquiry In Language Studies*, *1*(1), 21–39. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427595cils0101_2

Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Blackwell.

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, *23*(2), 157–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380364

Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using 'identity' as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*(3), 330–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.07.001

Lee, G., & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Meeting in the margins: Effects of the teacher–student relationship on revision processes of EFL college students taking a composition course. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(3), 165–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.002

Li, X. (2014). Are 'cultural differences a mere fiction'?: Reflections and arguments on contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *25*, 104–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.06.004

Li, Y. (2007). Apprentice scholarly writing in a community of practice: An intraview of an NNES graduate student writing a research article. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(1), 55–79. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00040.x

Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (2019). What really is the relationship between plagiarism and culture? Some thoughts from the Chinese context. In D. Pecorari, & P. Shaw (Eds.), *Student plagiarism in higher education: Reflections on teaching practice* (pp. 140–156). Routledge.

Liao, M.-T., & Chen, C.-H. (2009). Rhetorical strategies in Chinese and English: A comparison of L1 composition textbooks. *Foreign Language Annals*, *42*(4), 695–720. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01050.x

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global world: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. Routledge.

Liu, P.-H., & Tannacito, D. J. (2013). Resistance by L2 writers: The role of racial and language ideology in imagined community and identity investment. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*(4), 355–373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.05.001

LoCastro, V. (2008). 'Long sentences and floating commas': Mexican students' rhetorical practices and the sociocultural context. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 195–217). John Benjamins.

Luo, N., & Hyland, K. (2016). Chinese academics writing for publication: English teachers as text mediators. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *33*, 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.06.005

Moore, L. C. (2017). Multilingual socialization and education in non-Western settings. In P. A. Duff, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (3rd ed., pp. 155–168). Springer.

Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(2), 279–210. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587953

Morita, N. (2009). Language, culture, gender, and academic socialization. *Language and Education*, *23*(5), 443–460. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780902752081

Morita, N., & Kobayashi, M. (2008). Academic discourse socialization in a second language. In P. A. Duff, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (2nd ed., pp. 243–255). Springer.

Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, *41*(3), 315–348. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005028

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Norton, B., & De Costa, I. (2018). Research tasks on identity in language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, *51*(1), 90–112. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000325
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* (pp. 1–21). Blackwell.
Okuda, T., & Anderson, T. (2018). Second language graduate students' experiences at the writing center: A language socialization perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, *52*(2), 391–413. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.406
Ortega, L. (2009). Studying writing across EFL contexts: Looking back and moving forward. In I. R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 232–255). Multilingual Matters.
Ortega, L. (2013). SLA for the 21st century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and the bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning*, *63*(S1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00735.x
Ortega, L., & Carson, J. (2010). Multicompetence, social context, and L2 writing research practice. In T. Silva, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Practicing theory in second language writing* (pp. 48–71). Parlor Press.
Ou, W. A., & Gu, M. M. (2021). Language socialization and identity in intercultural communication: Experience of Chinese students in a transnational university in China. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *24*(3), 419–434. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1472207
Pecorari, D., & Petríc, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, *47*(3), 269–302. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000056
Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(1), 45–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80112-X
Reinhardt, J., & Thorne, S. (2017). Language socialization in digital contexts. In P. A. Duff, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8: Language socialization* (3rd ed., pp. 397–410). Springer.
Riley, K. (2012). Language socialization and language ideologies. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 493–514). Blackwell.
Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Galloway, N. (2021). Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching*, *54*(2), 157–189. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000518
Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *15*, 163–191. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.15.100186.001115
Schreiber, B. R. (2015). 'I am what I am': Multilingual identity and digital translanguaging. *Language Learning & Technology*, *19*(3), 69–87. http://llt.msu.edu/issues/october2015/schreiber.pdf
Séror, J. (2011). Alternative sources of feedback and second language writing development in university content courses. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(1), 118–143. https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19870
Séror, J. (2014). 'Or, it's just my fault, right?' language socialization through reflexive language writing feedback. In J. S. Byrd Clark, & F. Dervin (Eds.), *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education* (pp. 64–80). Routledge.
Séror, J., & Gentil, G. (2020). Cross-linguistic pedagogy and biliteracy in a bilingual university: Students' stances, practices, and ideologies. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *76*(4), 356–374. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/776627
Starfield, S. (2013). Researcher reflexivity. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1–7). Wiley-Blackwell.
Surtees, V. (2018). *Peer language socialization in an internationalized study abroad context: norms for talking about language.* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of British Columbia.
Talmy, S. (2008). The cultural productions of the ESL student at tradewinds high: Contingency, multidirectionality, and identity in L2 socialization. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(4), 619–644. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn011
Talmy, S. (2010a). Becoming 'local' in ESL: Racism as resource in a hawai'i public high school. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, *9*(1), 36–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348450903476840
Talmy, S. (2010b). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *30*, 128–148. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000085
Talmy, S. (2013). Critical ethnography. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1–7). Wiley-Blackwell.
Thorne, S. L., Black, R. W., & Sykes, J. M. (2009). Second language use, socialization, and learning in internet interest communities and online gaming. *Modern Language Journal*, *93*(S1), 802–821. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00974.x
Tian, J., & Low, G. D. (2011). Critical thinking and Chinese university students: A review of the evidence. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *24*(1), 61–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2010.546400
Tsui, A. B. M. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(4), 657–680. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00098.x
Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. M. Y. (2010). Cultural contexts and situated possibilities in the teaching of second language writing. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(4), 364–375. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110364855
Von Esch, K. S., Motha, S., & Kubota, R. (2020). Race and language teaching. *Language Teaching*, *53*(4), 391–421. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000269
Wette, R., & Furneaux, C. (2018). The academic discourse socialisation challenges and coping strategies of international graduate students entering English-medium universities. *System*, *78*, 186–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.09.001

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wu, Z. (2020). Tracing EFL writers' digital literacy practices in asynchronous communication: A multiple-case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *50*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100754

Yim, Y.-K. K. (2011). Second language students' discourse socialization in academic online communities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *67*(1), 1–27. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/420628

Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Peer feedback in second language writing (2005–2014). *Language Teaching*, *49*(4), 461–493. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000161

Zappa-Hollman, S., & Duff, P. A. (2015). Academic English socialization through individual networks of practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(2), 333–368. https://doi-org.proxyiub.uits.iu.edu/10.1002/tesq.188

Debra A. Friedman is an Associate Professor in the Department of Second Language Studies at Indiana University, Bloomington. In her research, she takes a language socialization approach to study language pedagogy and language teacher education, with a focus on social, political, and ideological aspects. She has also published on qualitative research methods in applied linguistics, including a book (co-authored with Charlene Polio) on research methods in second language writing research.

Cite this article: Friedman, D. A. (2023). Language socialization and academic discourse in English as a Foreign Language contexts: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, *56*(2), 261–275. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000422 Published online by Cambridge University Press